

Narcotics Policy and The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.

*The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* was released in September of 2002. That document is available now as a PDF file at The White House web site:  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov>

This analysis of illicit narcotics policy is within the framework of that official U. S. security document and is long overdue. Looking at relationships between the words and concepts associated with national and international security in the broader sense, and examining the more narrowly defined narcotics policy within the security context, should spark a more effective connecting of dots regarding the interrelatedness of what otherwise are too often seen as separate and unrelated issues. They are neither separate nor unrelated.

At the outset, objectivity requires that this particular security interest (not that others are unimportant) be declared. It explores the national and shared international security implications of modern agricultural biotechnology used against narcotic drugs, and subsequently, the terrorism, corruption and criminality that are their attendant outcomes. Just as the national security strategy contemplates a defense shield against one weapon type of mass destruction, this analysis advocates a defense shield already identified and tested against another weapons system, one of narcotics weapons aggression. This analysis directs needed focus upon the promise of modern agricultural biotechnology as a national security ‘protective shield’ option for the early twenty-first century. It is now practical to control the cultivation of narcotics producing plants with complete safety to humans, other plants, animals, aquatic life, and to fragile environments. The defense shield agent is commonly known in agriculture as a mycoherbicide.

Using this broadened security perspective, I will draw direct comparative attention between the U. S. national security strategy document, the narcotics/terrorism issue and the threat posed to national and international security—but with added documentation illuminating the linkages between stated and unstated security policy strategy

This paper does not represent the detractor’s views of current narcotics policy. This is not an argument for another day in court for the advocates of legalizing illicit narcotics. That day has already passed. On the contrary, the time for this argument has matured. A prevailing lack of understanding of the advances within agricultural biotechnology is roadblock enough. It hampers the long established and internationally respected science that makes control of narcotics producing plants both feasible and economical. There is also an anti-science bias that narcotics advocates regularly exploit. This hampers civil discourse. The pro-narcotics position, which ultimately must be argued against the evidence, must not stifle either present strategic security analysis or subsequent scientific proofs of efficacy. Finally, both critics and policymakers have too often failed to grasp the security policy implications of the trafficking of narcotics. We must remember that while all germs are pathogens, not all pathogens can be described as germs. Pathogens and their use are central to biocontrol and have been in use for over a century. In America, agricultural biocontrol has been a successful academic discipline since 1884.

In this analysis, I define narcotics plants as those unwanted plants which are threats against both the human health and political and economic security of nations, not as normal crops that are

desirable, legal and pose no threat to the legitimate security issues of nations. These contentions are made clear today by the conclusive evidence linking the cultivation and trafficking of narcotics with terrorism and murder, an international terrorism that includes Afghanistan, Colombia, Myanmar, Mexico and others. In fact, over half the 30+ terrorist organizations listed as such by the U.S. Department of State have narcotics connections.

What is the tone, in general terms, of *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*? What comes across clearly as a central theme, is that the nation's security is no longer just a defense of borders against aggressive states issue, but now includes the defense, both at home and abroad, of ideals, freedoms and human rights against more diverse aggressors, some not states at all, but virtual states—states without borders, including both large and small groups of determined criminals and terrorists. And it follows throughout as well, that the legitimizing premise of the state is that it is based on the will of the people and is constituted for their material benefit and for maximizing their opportunity. That inclusive thrust of intellect; that the words and the worlds of security and defense take on, and rightfully should take on, new and broader meanings today. The world is changed. Security includes not only protecting our bodies but our freedoms and our souls—even our moral outlook and those of like-minded others. And this means changes are needed—total reviews of our past thinking. A striking example of this is that, perhaps for the first time, AIDS is seen as a security issue, both of national and international import. I will talk more about the security implications of AIDS later on.

It is easy to think of large organizational structures like nations as protectors against the big threats, like wars with major adversaries, for example, and of the relegation of smaller perceived threats to smaller internal agencies, like law enforcement, drug enforcement, intelligence and the like. The Security Strategy document today makes it clear that all responsibilities, broad and narrow, are changing—that the organizational structure itself should accommodate the threat. In the overall strategy for international betterment—of increasing opportunity or security worldwide, both large and small players are learning to work together; and not only to work together, but to draw new and old threats under broader umbrellas of protective responsibility. The document also concludes that today there are direct and indirect threats to security short of all-out wars that must be met more regularly and with shorter response times. Such threats may also soon be accommodated by formerly war-fighter only organizations, like the military, for example.

Therefore, this analysis of the U.S. security document's meaning explores the broader meanings of both words and security concepts; meanings that suggest that both security and defense words in use may have multiple meanings, even though the same people must often assume responsibility for security policy to implement strategies. To make the case more persuasive and yet remain in context, my plan is to move progressively through the actual security document, noting the exact page and reference and then following with what might be considered an inclusive, but not exclusive, interpretation, titled: Comment: (Hereafter, all actual security document references will be indicated in *italics*)

*(Cover Page) The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*

I will begin with the document's title, which is instructive for what it does not say. Because it is not titled: *The National Defense Strategy*; the reader understands immediately that defense in the usual sense is only one part of a more important national and international security strategy.

The four-page introduction is not numbered. It comes from The White House and was signed by President, George W. Bush on September 17, 2002.

*Paragraph 1. People everywhere want to be able to speak freely; chose who will govern them; worship as they please; educate their children—male and female; own property, and enjoy the benefits of their labor. These values of freedom are right and true for every person—in every society—and the duty of protecting these values against their enemies is the common calling of freedom loving peoples across the globe and across the ages.*

Comment: Security against narcotic drugs and attendant terror and criminality are common enemies to civilized societies across the globe and across the ages. Such security is a value.

*Paragraph 2. We will defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants.*

Comment: Not all tyrants rule an entire country and not all terrorists blow up buildings. Many traffic in narcotics. But they all commit anti-democratic acts of violence and murder. Some murder policemen, judges, public officials and members of the press, to say nothing of thousands of citizens, often children. Those with narcotic products kill many more. As one example, Russia's struggle for democratic institutions is also a fight to the death with organized crime and terror, the Russian Mafia. Russia is being counted upon to become one of our great allies for freedom, as are others. We must help our friends.

*Paragraph 3. Defending our nation against its enemies is the first and fundamental commitment of the Federal Government. Today, that task has changed dramatically. Enemies of the past needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger America. Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank. Terrorists are organized to penetrate open societies and to turn the power of modern technology against us.*

Comment: Today, these shadowy networks also traffic in drugs. They have long ago discovered how to penetrate our open societies. They turn our technology against us daily, not only with computers and modern science, but also with agriculture (improving the yields of narcotic plants) and weaponry. In many nations, the narco-terrorists have greater firepower than the opposing military or law enforcement. They have fleets of aircraft, ships and armies of human couriers, sometimes in the thousands, infiltrated among us.

*Paragraph 4. To defeat this threat, we must use every tool in our arsenal—military power. Better homeland defenses, law enforcement, intelligence and vigorous efforts to cut off terrorist financing.*

Comment: In particular, modern agricultural biotechnology is a tool now available to our arsenal, and in particular, to “cut off terrorist financing.” It is unused. Mycoherbicides are a relatively permanent and economical choice to control the cultivation of narcotics producing plants. To make good on the promise, the potential of agricultural biocontrol must be examined fully, including all testing. We have hundreds of capable weed scientists, including the experts who have researched the available pathogens. Only with useable tools, is any arsenal built. We should have test plots of poppies and coca shrubs under cultivation now, waiting the testing that allows scientific claims of safety to be evaluated objectively.

Both the current administration and the security document see it as proper to view the arsenal concept as one of strengths combined. I believe the Department of Defense, too, must broaden its view, when needed, to include the reinforcement of security in the anti-narcotics arena, including the development of special military forces to assume related actions, both covert and overt. This force should be, in this opinion, trained military forces, (either/or U.S., coalition) not law-enforcement and not spies, as too often, intelligence operations make compromises to protect sources. It should not be the CIA’s secret army. The new force should not be tempted to forget its reason for being. This unconventional military force should come from a military background. (For example, mercenary forces might come from a coalition partner or partners. For example, underutilized and underpaid military personnel from partner nations might welcome collective security operations.)

It is instructive to note the opportunity so clearly present in Afghanistan, where heretofore, security policy implementation has not matched policy declaration. General Franks has opposed the use of military forces to aid doing what the weak Afghan government is not capable of undertaking on its own. In the interim, last year’s production of 3400 metric tons of heroin may exceed 4000 tons in 2003. Afghanistan will supply over 70% of the world’s heroin. This is a major defeat, not a victory. Major Afghan warlords commit murder, hinder the growth of democratic institutions, endanger U.S. and coalition forces, and make it impossible to eliminate terrorist influences. How is the Hamid Karzai government to succeed? Nearby, scientific associates in Tashkent have already studied poppy control pathogens. Why shouldn’t we help them?

Paragraph 5 *Our enemies have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction...The United States will not allow these efforts to succeed. We will build defenses against ballistic missiles and other means of delivery.*

Comment: Weapons-of-mass-destruction. I spoke earlier that some commonly used words had insufficiently expanded meaning. May I suggest that narcotic drugs are, in true fact, ‘weapons-of-mass-destruction’ and are so proven by their results, and are guilty as charged! May we claim that any weapon so damaging to such large international groups of persons is well defined as being within the meaning of ‘weapons-of-mass-destruction?’ Should we quibble over whether or not the destructive weapon has previously benefited from not having been so identified? If we would build protective defenses against those weapons not already falling upon us, (missile defense shields) might we not build defenses (narcotics defense shields) against those already falling on our citizenry, particularly when the latter defenses (mycoherbicides) have, at taxpayer expense, already been built? (Much of the research to date has been funded by USDA.)

Paragraph 5. (Con't) *History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but who failed to act. In the new world we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of action.*

Comment: And with the added caution that history will judge even more harshly, those who had a security solution put right in their lap and fumbled it. This is another arena where the U.S. must take the technological leadership role, (that it already possesses in this research) not pass the ball to UNDCP, who has neither the money nor a tradition of taking the path of action. We can and should work with others, but America must lead the way. Coalition building is already somewhat pre-established.

Paragraph 6...*The United States will build on these common interests (against the common dangers of terrorist violence and chaos) to promote global security.*

Comment: The NATO nations, in particular, should be interested common partners, as narcotics trafficking and its result, unfortunately, gravitates to those nations where dedicated criminals can profit most from the human weaknesses of more affluent others. We should not allow the reality of human weakness result in either damaged security or damaged citizens. All civilized societies have anti-child abuse laws and speed limits for good reasons. We don't fail to immunize weak human immune systems against known health dangers. Why would we fail to protect against narcotics?

Paragraph 7...*The events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong states. Poverty does not make poor people into terrorists and murderers. Yet poverty, weak institutions and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders.*

Comment: We need to pay closer attention to what we say U.S. policy is, because we are a role-model nation that others look to as worthy of being listened to and copied. For example, contrary to what Ambassador Richard Haass often says in public regarding the defeat of opium production in Afghanistan being only lesser in importance to destroying al Qaeda and the Taliban, opium production has returned to record levels, (over 3400 metric tons in 2002—2003 production may exceed 4000 tons) even though we have a large in-country military and air presence. Every nation watching our performance there knows our deeds have not matched our word. We cannot and must not, allow the corrupt warlord system to continue the drug production and traffic from Afghanistan to the outer world. al Qaeda and Taliban will continue to be a terrorist presence until their drug money is cut off! That is our job, what we have already promised to do. Until we can support stronger democratic (In the short term, we will need to replace farmer's income received from growing poppies.) institutions than do warlords, we will make a weak state continually vulnerable to terrorists and drug cartels within those borders. Afghanistan is also a place where we passed up the opportunity to destroy caches of narcotics because we did not recognize anti-narcotics actions as being part of our ongoing security need. When our objective is not to seize another nation's territory, we should not be reticent to build democratic institutions that are drug-free.

Paragraph 8...*We will continue to lead the world in efforts to reduce the terrible toll of AIDS/HIV and other infectious diseases.*

Comment: I promised to return to the importance of AIDS. Are you startled that we have recognized it as both a national and international security issue? In a moving State-of-the-Union address, President George W. Bush made the important acknowledgement that diseases that affect nations and individuals are themselves both security issues and are also weapons-of-mass-destruction. These diseases are not only threats to those nations that are presently infected, but also to those likely to be—and to unknown millions who may consider themselves safe from attack. Yes, we are speaking of AIDS; not even a threat of aggression made with deliberation, but one occurring without prior malice. Yet, no nation is safe! The devastation to an entire continent and the spread of the disease throughout the world makes AIDS a health problem and security issue for the entire world. Are illicit narcotics in the same, nation-harming category?

Are you surprised that we officially acknowledged AIDS as both a security issue and a WMD, yet did not specifically say that narcotics aggression, which is a deliberate act, met both interpretations? We need to become better at seeing these obvious relationships and connections. Here's another direct relationship. If we want to reduce AIDS we will also reduce the use of needles by drug users. We can do this directly only by reducing injected drug use. We can do this with surety through narcotics mycoherbicides. Is there a connection? What do you think the world would say about America and its plan for global security if we had a cure for AIDS and withheld it? What should be said about the fact that we already have a likely cure to eliminate most narcotics producing plants and elect not to test it? What degrees of moral equivalence might shame us into action?

If we can see and understand the interconnectedness of international security and AIDS, we can understand the relationship between narcotics, terrorism, criminality and security.

Paragraph 9...(We have just given other nations an accountability line. Then we say:) *For freedom to thrive, accountability must be expected and required.*

Comment: How does one require fairly elected officials in a democratic government to be responsible? Granted, one can expect accountability, but *how does one require it?* When we answer that thorny question, our advice to other nations will gain a dramatic impact. For example, science-based narcotics biocontrol groups have addressed various committees and agencies of the U.S. Government since 1999. Advocates for narcotics biocontrol (mycoherbicides) have given testimony to official U.S. agencies. They have conducted scientific research with USDA funding of millions of dollars. They were also able to support one testing requirement that became law; part of the signed Plan Colombia treaty. This provision was subsequently made subject to an Executive Waiver by then President Clinton. Since then, though even better technology has resulted from scientific advances, advocates have not been encouraged (much less required) by official sources to incorporate and test these scientific advances. Nor has the waived Plan Colombia testing provision been reinstated. Why? Who is *accountable* and what is *required*?

Paragraph 11...*Today, humanity holds in its hands the opportunity to further freedom's triumph over all these foes. The United States welcomes our responsibility to lead in this great mission.*  
Signed: GW Bush

Comment: George W. Bush has the right idea; the right words, and seems the right man for the job. The question is whether or not the challenge to solve such problems can triumph over the built-in partisanship of the democratic governance of a free society, one where public officials are expected to do right, but are not required to do so? Who in government will welcome this responsibility?

Page 1: *National Security Strategy. Overview of America's International Strategy*

*Paragraph 3. America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones. We are menaced less by fleets and armies than by catastrophic technologies in the hands of an embittered few. We must defeat these threats to our Nation, allies and friends.*

Comment: Speaking of failing states, note that the world's major narcotics producing states overwhelmingly share the designation of political and economic failure. Major examples are Afghanistan, Colombia, Myanmar and Mexico. In the latter example, few officials are brave enough to speak against Mexico, and those in government who do are either ignored or demoted, or both. There is much evidence to support the contention that the growing corruption of Mexico by drugs is longstanding and pervasive—that the Mexican economy floats on the trafficking of narcotics. Therefore, we must be willing to acknowledge that those who must be defeated in specific aspects of their threat-making capacity are those who we insist are friends and allies. Sometimes, the catastrophes are partly of our making.

*Paragraph 4. The U.S. National Security Strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism that reflects the union of our values and our national interests. The aim of this strategy is make the world not just safer but better.*

Comment. Narcotic drugs do not fit in with distinctly American values. *Safer* or *better* are not words that describe narcotics, either for America or the world.

*Page 2; Paragraph 3. ...transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century.*

Comment: One might expect that a *transformed* DOD would not pass up another twenty-first century opportunity to destroy a cache of processed narcotics, or assume again that such an action had no place in the national security strategy. It has been claimed that neither Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, nor Secretary of State, Colin Powell, have inclinations to be drug warriors. I do not know this to be true or false. We know they are champions of American values and hope that as part of the American transformation, that neither will waste their huge talent nor their inclinations to think more broadly regarding both their responsibility and opportunity. Regarding a *transformed* Department of State, in particular, drug cultivation and production

should receive the same negative stigma, as does the production of other weapons of mass destruction, We should welcome the matching of twenty-first century technology with twenty-first century opportunity.

*Page 3, Part II: Champion Aspirations for Human Dignity*

*“Some worry that it is somehow undiplomatic or impolite to speak the language of right and wrong. I disagree. Different circumstances require different methods, not different moralities.”*

*President Bush—West Point, NY—June 1, 2002*

Comment: President Bush has an opportunity to speak more candid language to and about Mexico—the *language of right and wrong*. We cannot have a good neighbor until we can talk honestly over the back-yard fence. All good marriages are based on honesty—warts and all. One need only read Charles Bowden’s brilliant book on that subject of Mexican corruption. Anyone who reads *Down by the River* will know the true scope of narcotics money and its attendant corruption and violence in Mexico. We need to talk straight talk with our closest neighbor—a neighbor already neighboring on becoming a first-rate enemy. There is nothing dignified about either buying or selling drugs—no moral triumph.

*Page 4, Paragraph 2 We will: speak out honestly about violations of the nonnegotiable demands of human dignity using our voice and vote in international institutions to advance freedom.*

*We will: use our foreign aid to promote freedom and support those who struggle non-violently for it, ensuring that nations moving toward democracy are rewarded for the steps they take.*

Comment: For example, if the Mexican government wants liberal amnesty and more open borders, they should be willing to allow us to help them become a narcotics free state, both in terms of cultivation of narcotics plants and in the traffic of drugs over our borders. They should not expect *rewards* without performance, something for nothing. Mexico is the largest transit point for narcotics that enter the U.S. *Quid pro quo*, is an honest bargaining chip. Nations can use it productively. It is the entrepreneurial response; something in return for an investment of value.

In Colombia, for example, we should be willing to reflect the huge savings dividend we would derive in the U.S. from the absence of cocaine. The savings at the demand end is always much larger than the lost income at the grower interface. The money received by an actual farmer is minute. Therefore, we can support alternate economic development to replace lost income from narcotics cultivation. We should *promote freedom* by sharing our dividend, not expecting to pocket it all at the expense of the peasant farmer. In due time, democratic institutions should make an alternate economic driver self-sustaining. Democratic constitutions cannot make democracies until their guarantees can be delivered in the public square. We can *use our foreign aid* in Colombia. The government of Colombia should request mycoherbicide testing in Colombia.

*Page 5, Part III. Strengthen Alliances to Defeat Global Terrorism and Work to Prevent Attacks Against Us and Our Friends*

Comment: Every time a shipment of narcotic drugs crosses our border or the border of like-minded friendly nations, an act of unwanted *global terrorism* takes place. Trafficking in narcotics is an act of terrorism, a war-like act of narcotics aggression. There are always victims! This war is being waged by stealth, deceit and murder. Criminal others have attacked, not merely for financial gain, but to weaken the moral fabric of the target nation; not only to take advantage of human weakness, but also to make humans weak. Up until recent events, until the ties between drugs and terror were forcefully acknowledged and denounced, we had not recognized such ongoing acts against us as warfare, as true aggression — as components of terror. This is no longer a mere law enforcement problem, but a direct national security issue, both here and internationally. It must now be included within our national security strategy because that actual war is being waged against us by stealth, deceit and murder. Defense against it must now be measured by dramatic action, not just in cloaked in the soft words of our national security strategy. This aspect of *terrorism can be defeated*.

The insight that narcotics aggression is a form of warfare is not new. New — is that victims of such aggression seem mysteriously oblivious to having been attacked, perhaps because narcotics aggression is unrelenting, without pause in our world. Nonetheless, a defensive response is not only called for, but also fully legitimized by the aggressor's persistent warfare. Through that set of factual circumstances, the stage is set for what is a justifiable retaliatory response. It is incorrect to think of a justified response as being a preemptive action of the victim. Despite such logic, people often ask me if an attack on illegal poppy fields doesn't violate someone's personal rights? "Wouldn't they seek revenge," I am asked, "if we destroyed their fields?" Revenge against what rights; their own lawlessness? The answer, of course, is that the field's owner, first of all, is a criminal — an accessory to acts of warfare; 'narcotics aggression,' against the laws of other states. Justifiable response of victims to illegal aggression should never be confused with a preemptive act. The preemptive act of warfare was the original aggressive violation!

*Paragraph 3. The struggle against global terrorism is different from any other war in our history. It will be fought on many fronts against a particularly elusive enemy over an extended period of time. Progress will come through the persistent accumulation of successes — some seen, some unseen.*

Comment: This terrorist aggressor is *not particularly elusive*. Through international agencies and aerial and satellite imaging, we know exactly where the cultivation occurs.

*Paragraph 5. Our priority will be first to disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations of global reach and attack their leadership, command, control and communications, material support and finances.*

Comment: *Finances*. It is widely reported in many sources that the estimated gross take from illicit narcotics worldwide is between 750 billion and one trillion dollars annually! Rather than argue about every last dollar, let's agree with the late Senator Dirksen "A billion here, a billion there — Pretty soon you're talking about real money!" These huge sums are those terrorist and

criminal organizations receive. It does not attempt to measure what the same money might do if used productively. It does not include the public and private costs to nations, nor measure the heartache, violence and murder—the value of broken dreams. Given that, what will we do to demonstrate our *priority*?

*Page 6, Paragraph 2. The United States will continue to work with our allies to disrupt the financing of terrorism. We will identify and block the sources for funding for terrorism.*

*We will disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations by:*

*Paragraph 6, defending the United States, the American people, and our interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders.*

Comment: If we say *we will disrupt the financing of terrorism*, what are we waiting for? Although modern computer and eavesdropping technology is assisting us in destroying many terrorist threats before they reach our borders, our borders are porous, and only a small portion (3-5% at most) of the narcotics aggression reaching our shores are interdicted. With concentrations of homeland defense forces spread too thinly today, the interdiction of human terrorists has gained primacy. But we can destroy the narcotics threat *before it reaches our borders*—at the source, and thereby free up needed human resources and money to increase our security against threats that cannot be as easily identified or destroyed abroad.

*Paragraph 6, continued....we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right to self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country...and*

*Paragraph 7. ...compelling states to accept their sovereign responsibilities.*

Comment: This strongly reflects the theme that sovereignty no longer protects nations that do not exercise in fact, what they promise in word, even if that word is a written constitution. In this new interpretation, nations earn the right to sovereignty, and they must also fulfill the promises they make to their own citizens, including the respect of human rights. It follows directly that nations with laws against the cultivation or trafficking of narcotics must enforce their own laws in order to maintain the protection of the sovereignty of enforcing those laws themselves. In this example, “If you won’t do it, we will,” becomes an operative option to coalitions willing to enforce the present law. According to the present Biological Convention treaty, all nations can currently exercise the peaceful use clause within its own borders. Perhaps the ‘peaceful use’ clause of the current Biological treaties might also provide an opportunity for assisting nations *to exercise sovereign responsibilities* under the compulsion proviso?

*Paragraphs 8-9. We will also wage a war of ideas to win the battle against international terrorism. This includes”*

*...making clear that all acts of terrorism are illegitimate so that terrorism will be viewed in the same light as slavery, piracy, or genocide, behavior that no respectable government can condone or support and all must oppose.*

Comment; Funding terror with drug money is also an act of terrorism, a violation of national security systems *that all respectable governments must oppose and which none may support and remain respectable*. One may take note of the fact that no major religion, including Islam, finds the use of narcotics to be acceptable or desirable. One may take note again that the hopes and aspirations of freedom in the newly liberated Afghanistan are endangered by the persistence of a criminal warlord system engaged in drug production and trafficking. We must build an economic future Afghanistan not dependent upon poppy cultivation controlled by criminal warlords. Otherwise, we help to fuel the fires of slavery, piracy and genocide.

*Page 9, Part IV. Work With Others to Diffuse Regional Conflicts*

*Paragraph 2. No doctrine can anticipate every circumstance in which U.S. action—direct or indirect—is warranted. We have finite political, economic, and military resources to meet our global priorities.*

Comment: *The Ultimate Finite Resources Solution*. This action option respects the finite nature of resources. Because it is a natural biological solution, it can be expected to be effective over long periods of time. Because the host-specific pathogen selected to eliminate the growth of a particular host plant remains in the selected soil, reintroduction of that narcotic producing plant in that ground is unlikely. In addition, contrasted with chemical agents, such as the glyphosate (Round-Up) used in Colombia, it needs only to be applied once and does not affect other plant life. It has no ill effects to either the environment, to animals or humans. Colombia, because of its moist soil, is ideal. It would accomplish at a fraction of the cost of chemicals, relatively permanent elimination of a large portion of the worldwide traffic in cocaine and its derivatives. (The total cost to accomplish this one-time application in the Andean Region has been estimated at 80-100 million dollars)

In return for a one-time investment of less than 100 million dollars, the criminal/terrorist income to be eliminated worldwide over a short time period of 10 years is estimated in the magnitude of 3 trillion dollars! (No cocaine over ten years) In addition, the personnel resources needed would be smaller than presently used, two or three large cargo planes over any large area for the period of a month at most.

*Page 10. Paragraph 6. Parts of Latin America confront regional conflict, especially arising from the violence of drug cartels and their accomplices. This conflict and unrestrained narcotics trafficking could imperil the health and security of the United States. Therefore, we have developed an active strategy to help the Andean nations adjust their economies, enforce their laws, defeat terrorist organizations and cut off the supply of drugs, while—as important—we work to reduce the demand for drugs in our own country.*

Comment: By cutting off all supply, demand would no longer enter the cocaine equation. Therefore, the U.S., hopefully with other nations, can easily afford to be generous to Andean

nations in adjusting their economies to the loss of illegal commerce. To repeat a recurring theme, the cost savings at the buyer end is larger than the loss suffered at the cultivation stage, particularly as peasant farmers receive such a small portion for cultivating the illegal plants. In the longer range, narcotics do not represent a proper underpinning for sustainable economic growth. These farmers must have better opportunities. This a better *active strategy* than any presently contemplated.

*Page 10. Paragraph 7. In Colombia, we recognize the link between terrorist and extremist groups that challenge the security of the state and the drug trafficking activities that help finance the operations of such groups. We are working to help Colombia defend its democratic institutions and defeat illegal armed groups of both the left and right by extending effective sovereignty over the entire national territory and provide basic security to the Colombian people.*

Comment: A treaty provision to test narcotics biocontrol for coca was included in the signed version of Plan Colombia. President Clinton waived this part of the treaty by executive order. We believe this to have been, at best, in error, particularly given the more precarious situation now. The indiscriminate effects of glyphosate spraying, killing all emergent growth, is compounded by the fact that a single coca shrub produces multiple yearly harvests, requiring the ongoing spraying of a bad solution. The U.S. Department of State has already published documentation of the disastrous environmental effects of coca cultivation and the use of precursor chemicals in the Andean Region. This solution argues in favor of testing mycoherbicides as a more effective, economic and environmentally sound solution. It is clear, also, that Colombia is losing its claim to sovereignty by reason of its inability to enforce its own laws or guarantee its own citizens the rights given to them constitutionally. This would certainly be a prime instance to compel the acceptance of responsibilities of the state, as the doctrine of the National Security Strategy now sets forth.

*Page 13. Part V. Prevent Our Enemies From Threatening Us, Our Allies, and Our Friends With Weapons of Mass Destruction*

*Page 14, Paragraph 7. We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends. Our response must take full advantage of strengthened alliances, the establishment of new partnerships with former adversaries, innovation in the use of military forces, modern technologies, including the development of an effective missile defense system, and increased emphasis on intelligence collection and analysis.*

Comment: We contend that both terror groups and criminal organizations, whether al Qaeda or the Russian mafia, are *rogue states*. They are often groups operating within a state, or cross the borders of states, However organized, they have their own rules, methods of operation, etc. They act as states, even though in a virtual way. We have already made the argument that *narcotic drugs are weapons of mass destruction*, particularly when used to damage the values of societies and cultures and when used in conjunction with the financing terrorism and criminality. Heretofore, we had not thought sufficiently of rogue states, much less virtual states without borders that are not states at all. The enemy today may be thought of as criminal entrepreneur;

part criminal, part terrorist, part extremist. Such an enemy can be large or small, fueled by hate that rejects human values, the United States and the other values of freedom-loving peoples. As the directly quoted paragraph states, *we must be innovative in the use of modern technologies and military forces*, including the creation of special forces to accomplish tasks never before assigned to the military. Such a capability would be for military drug warriors to perform actions beyond our borders for which current agencies are not well suited. Certainly we must advantage ourselves with technologies, of which agricultural biocontrol is an effective *defense system*. .

*Page 15. Paragraph 1. It has taken almost a decade for us to comprehend the true nature of this new threat....We cannot let our enemies strike first.*

*Paragraph 6. We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today's adversaries. Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack us using conventional means....instead they rely on the use of weapons of mass destruction—weapons that can be easily concealed, delivered covertly, and used without warning.*

Comment: What could be more descriptive of illicit narcotics? We have yet to recognize officially that *we are already being attacked using unconventional means*. We most recently read of clothing impregnated with narcotics, and when received, then treated to cumulatively extract millions of dollars in illicit contraband. Clever? Yes, but we have a more clever idea in mind.

*Paragraph 7. The targets of these attacks...are our civilian population, in direct violation of one of the principal norms of the law of warfare. As was demonstrated by the losses on September 11, 2001, mass civilian casualties is the specific objective of terrorists...*

Comment: We don't believe it is remarkably out of context to observe again that narcotics are weapons of mass destruction and that *the targets are primarily the civilian populations of industrialized nations*, including America, where the annual drug deaths are 16,000 + annually, (National Institutes of Health) five times our losses of September 11, 2001. Correspondingly, in Colombia, a nation approximately only 10% the population size of the United States, the drug-related losses are 100,000! Why do we permit Colombia to lose 100,000 precious lives when we could stop it without sending one marine? How can we say we care about South America when we demonstrate such a shallow disregard for the value of their lives? What we do, must relate to what we value.

*Paragraph 8. The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction—and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves...To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States, will, if necessary, act preemptively.*

Comment: The direct cost of narcotic drugs to the United States government is 160 billion dollars at annually at this juncture. (Source, National Drug Control Strategy—2002) This alone *is a sufficient threat to our national security*. That doesn't include what is spent for the drugs by users or the "soft" societal costs, nor the cost in lost dreams and shattered lives. How much greater must *the risk of inaction* be? Such results are the direct product of hostile acts by

aggressive *adversaries*. We have seen the result of 9/11, financed largely by narcotics. Those who die one-at-a-time do not make such a splash in the daily news. How much is too much? The *time to act, and preemptively*, if necessary, has come.

*Paragraph 9. The United States (should not use preemptive action as) a pretext for aggression. Yet in an age where the enemies of civilization openly and actively seek the world's most destructive technologies, the United States cannot remain idle while dangers gather.*

Comment: Why do we remain idle while terrorists use narcotics aggression and drug money to acquire the world's most destructive technologies? Not only do criminal groups employ destructive technologies, but also they acquire legitimate businesses, integrating criminal thinking into commercial society. In contrast, narcotics biocontrols can be shown to be destructive only to the unwanted plants designated for destruction. Why may scientists not prove this contention, particularly since it is a solution that does not require the use of force? Just so no one loses sight of this fact, let it be repeated. Narcotics biocontrol does not require the use of force, nor troops, or loss of life. It is an economic solution that lends itself to coalition building and cooperative action.

*Page 16. Paragraphs 1-5. We will always proceed deliberately, weighing the consequences of our actions. To support preemptive actions, we will:*

*Build better, more integrated intelligence capabilities to provide timely, accurate information on threats, wherever they may emerge:*

*Coordinate closely with allies to form a common assessment of the most dangerous threats; and*

*Continue to transform our military forces to ensure our ability to conduct rapid and precise operations to achieve decisive results.*

*The purpose of our actions will always be to eliminate a specific threat to the United States or our allies and friends. The reasons for our actions will be clear, the force measured, and the cause just.*

*Page 17. Part VI. Ignite a New Era of Global Economic Growth Through Free Markets and Free Trade.*

Comment: In keeping with a thesis that the world is changing from that of nation-states to market-economies, (not that the nation-state will disappear) it is appropriate that the National Security Strategy contains a strong emphasis toward the opportunities to spread the growth of parliamentary democracies through the system of open markets.

*Paragraph 2. We will promote economic growth and economic freedom beyond America's shores. All governments are responsible for creating their own economic policies and responding to their own economic challenges. We will use our economic engagement with other countries to underscore the benefits of policies that generate higher productivity and sustained economic growth, including:*

*Pro growth legal and regulatory policies to encourage business investment, innovation and entrepreneurial activity.*

*...rule of law and intolerance of corruption so that people are confident that they will be able to enjoy the fruits of their economic endeavors.*

Comment: Market building, *intolerant of corruption*, is difficult where government officials sustain a pervasive culture of bribery. Nations with an economic dependence on the cash flow fix of narcotics cultivation and trafficking revenues make poor models to sustain economic growth, protect the legal and regulatory structures, and to merit the investment needed to become partners in global economic prosperity. *The National Security Strategy* suggests that there will be expectations that will condition through merit, those asking for support. It suggests a *quid quo pro* in that our security strategy will not hesitate to ask for improvements in the rule of law as a condition of U.S. support. It suggests the unashamed use of carrot and stick diplomacy, as adherence to certain values is not only acceptable policy, but also desirable. As previously mentioned, a uniform characteristic of drug producing economies is that they are underdeveloped and will be among those struggling the hardest to join a globalizing world. Least of all do these nations need to be held back by being saddled in a drug cultivating society when what is called for is for them to join a world of manufactured goods, computers and so on. The biggest favor industrialized nations can do for those trying to carve their own piece of the pie is to encourage them in every way possible to engage in activities more sustainable than narcotic drug aggression. It is instructive that China fought the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Opium Wars over the fact that Great Britain wanted to force a drug culture upon their citizens. Unfortunately, Great Britain prevailed at the time. Such great nations today do not attempt to repeat that discredited history. The game today is figuring out how to join a more sophisticated and transparent world of economic growth.

*Page 18. Paragraph 2. Improving stability in emerging markets is also key to global economic growth. International flows of investment capital are needed to expand the productive potential of these economies. These flows allow emerging markets and developing countries to make the investments that raise living standards and reduce poverty. Our long-term objective should be a world in which all countries have investment-grade credit ratings that allow them access to international capital markets and to invest in their future.*

Comment: The balance of *Part VI* addresses a series of important economic security issues; free trade, trade promotion, development, trade agreements, unfair trade, environmental protection, energy security, and international cooperation. All are important, but it is most interesting to note that they are included because *they acknowledge that national security is a broad topic*. Just as defense no longer equates directly with military defense, economic security no longer equates directly with banks and international finance. *Part VI* acknowledges the concept that issues have relationships with other issues and that twenty-first century thinking must accommodate that. We make the point again that international narcotics aggression and trafficking have their own direct connections to economic growth, official corruption, money laundering, terrorism, public health and the justice systems of every nation.

*Page 21. Part VII. Expand the Circle of Development by Opening Societies and Building the Infrastructure of Democracy.*

*“In World War II we fought to make the world safer, then worked to rebuild it. As we wage war today to keep the world safe from terror, we must also work to make the world a better place for all its citizens,” President Bush—Washington, DC. March 14, 2002*

*Paragraph 2. Decades of massive development assistance have failed to spur economic growth in the poorest countries. Worse, development aid has often served to prop up failed policies, relieving the pressure for reform and perpetuating misery. Results of aid are typically measured in dollars spent by donors, not in the rates of growth and poverty reduction achieved by recipients. These are the indicators of a failed strategy.*

*Paragraph 3. Working with other nations, the United States in confronting this failure. We forged a new consensus at the U.N. Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey that the objectives of assistance—and the strategies to achieve those objectives—must change.*

*Paragraph 4. This Administration’s goal is to help unleash the productive potential of individuals in all nations. Sustained growth and poverty reduction is impossible without the right national policies. Where governments have implemented real policy changes, we will provide significant new levels of assistance...*

Comment: Asking other nations to change policies that impact development, growth, poverty reduction, criminality, terrorism, and broad national security objectives requires that we change our own policies that influence these matters. The productive potentials of individuals in any land are not improved by relationships with narcotics, either as growers, traffickers or users. It is a lose/lose proposition for all. At the end of a lifetime, no individual will be proud to answer the question: “What did you do with your opportunity, your talents?” with “I made my contribution with drugs.” We suggest that all nations set ambitious goals. We hope that we will also take our own advice.

*Page 22. Paragraph 5. Increase the amount of development assistance that is provided in the form of grants instead of loans.*

Comment: Narcotics biocontrols are *development assistance*, both in the United States and the aggressor nation. Let’s consider a scenario that should make just as much sense as the stated policy goal. By cooperating with the United States, Colombia invites a special-forces group under the Defense Department to eliminate the growth of the opium poppy and the coca shrub in Colombia. With American technological and economic assistance, this joint effort is successful. As a result, the United States estimates that the savings in America alone in reduced direct cost is approximately 80 billions annually, not including social and individual costs. The savings outside America (in other industrialized nations) are also large, as cocaine is heavily trafficked around the world. But just for the sake of argument, assume that other nations are not sufficiently grateful and that the United States has to find satisfaction in their own annual savings. Would we be willing to aid Colombia’s development by half the amount saved, a direct grant of 40 billion? How about 20% of our savings windfall, or 16 billion? The hidden question is: *What better*

*example might one create to justify a grant rather than a loan?* The reality is that if we aren't willing to reward such mutually beneficial behavior, what kind of behavior do we encourage more? It seems that if we are going to be in the "designing democracy" business, that we should design without the influence of drugs.

*Page 23. Paragraph 4. Continue to aid agricultural development. New technologies, including biotechnology, have enormous potential to improve crop yields in developing countries while using fewer pesticides and less water. Using sound science, the United States should help bring these benefits to the 800 million people, including 300 million children, who still suffer from hunger and malnutrition.*

Comment: Narcotics biocontrols are *(and aid) agricultural development*. Thinking specifically and more broadly, ideas which this national security policy statement concurs, think now of an expansion of interpretation. Imagine that using the same biotechnology that controls the weeds that threaten the yields of agricultural crops, that we can also control the weeds that are the sources of illicit narcotics. Ask yourself why it would be proper to use biocontrols to eliminate a weed threatening the *yields of an edible crop*, but not proper to use the identical technology to control unwanted narcotics. Imagine, too, that use also preserves the native environment, conserves the water supply and rainforest, and keeps water table free of the caustic chemicals now used to process the narcotic plants. Then further imagine transforming the land use from cultivating noxious plants that have no health value for the poorly nourished to productive use where sound science can improve the yields of highly nutritional crops and the health and life expectancies of the citizens.

*Page 25. Part VIII. Develop Agendas for Cooperative Action with the Other Main Centers of Global Power*

*"We have our best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the 17<sup>th</sup> century to build a world where the great powers compete in peace instead of prepare for war." President Bush—West Point, New York—June 1, 2002*

*Paragraph 1. America will implement its strategies by organizing coalitions—as broad as practicable—of states able and willing to promote a balance of power that favors freedom. Effective coalition leadership requires clear priorities, and appreciation of other's interests, and consistent consultations among partners with a spirit of humility.*

*Paragraph 3. The attacks of September 11 were also an attack on NATO, as NATO itself recognized when it invoked its Article V self-defense clause for the first time. NATO's core mission, collective defense of the transatlantic alliance of democracies—remains, but NATO must develop new structures and capabilities to carry out that mission under circumstances.*

Comment: And so must we all. We have defined a new relationship between those of drug trafficking and terrorism, but other than more closely monitoring flows of money, there is no new structure, capability or action plan to carry out the mission of removing the threat of ongoing trafficking of narcotics. We have no specially trained forces that can act internationally, on short notice, and in a highly mobile way. There is no anti-narcotics aggression alliance, as the

National Security Strategy suggests, controlling narcotics cultivation worldwide. We are reliant upon combining reports from UNDCP, CIA, DEA, Interpol and others, but have no coordinated strategy to protect the industrialized nations from the predations of virtual states, criminals and terrorists. Such an effort must be undertaken immediately.

*Page 26. Paragraph 12 With Russia, we are already building a new strategic relationship based on a central reality of the twenty-first century: the United States and Russia are no longer strategic adversaries...Russia's top leaders have a realistic assessment of (Page 27. Con't.) their country's current weakness and the policies—internal and external—needed to reverse those weaknesses. They understand, increasingly, that Cold War approaches do not serve their national interests and that Russian and American strategic interests overlap in many areas.*

Comment: A specific overlap is in the need to control terrorism, drug trafficking and criminality exists for both nations. We have already acknowledged needs for collective action and for special forces specifically trained for anti-narcotics actions. Considering that much of the computer service and clothing manufacture of America is already outsourced to other nations, would it bear serious consideration of a United States/Russia joint effort to support anti-narcotics special needs? Such a specific co-operation would enable two former adversaries to join against terrorism with global reach. Unemployed former Russian officers and military personnel might welcome such an opportunity. For our benefit, personnel costs of such an outsourced effort would economize the joint operations.

*Page 27. Paragraph 2. United States policy seeks to use this turn in Russian thinking to refocus our relationship on emerging and potential common interests and challenges. We are broadening our already extensive cooperation in the global war on terrorism....We will continue to bolster the independence and stability of the states of the former Soviet Union in the belief that a prosperous and stable neighborhood will reinforce Russia's growing commitment to integration into the Euro-Atlantic community.*

Comment: *To use this turn in Russian thinking.* Drug trafficking and attendant criminality are characteristic weaknesses of all the former Soviet “stans,” Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, etc., etc. An important biotechnology research resource is in Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan. Scientists there are already familiar with the development of narcotics biocontrols. We might assist them by making our latest narcotics control technologies and scientific research available.

*Page 28. Paragraph 4. The events of September 11, 2002, fundamentally changed the content for relations between the United States and other main centers of global power, and opened vast, new opportunities. With our long-standing allies in Europe and Asia, and new leaders in Russia, India and China, we must develop agendas of cooperation lest these relationships become routine and unproductive.*

*Paragraph 5. Every agency in the United States Government shares the challenge. We can build fruitful habits of consultation, quiet argument, sober analysis, and common action. In the long-term, these are the practices that will sustain the supremacy of our common principles and keep open the path of progress.*

*Page 29. Part IX. Transform America's National Security Institutions to Meet the Challenges and Opportunities of the Twenty-First Century*

*Paragraph 1. The major institutions of American national security were designed in a different era to meet different requirements. All of them must be transformed.*

*Paragraph 3. The unparalleled strength of the United States armed forces, and their forward presence, have maintained the peace in some of the world's most strategically vital regions. However, the threats and enemies we must confront have changed, and so must our force...We will channel our energies to overcome a host of operational challenges.*

Comment: *Forward a Scientific Presence.* To combat the terrorist implications of narcotics production and aggression, we have no forward presences, (except unproductive spraying in Colombia) we have not been concerned in the past over the drug/terrorist/security implications, and therefore some of the world's most strategically vital regions have largely been ignored. Consequently, the operational challenges required to meet the security challenges we face, will require that we develop action-oriented bases and stations in drug aggression arenas.

*Paragraph 5. Before the war in Afghanistan, that area was low on the list of major planning contingencies. Yet, in a very short time, we had to operate across the length and breadth of that remote nation, using every branch of the armed forces. We must prepare for more such deployments by developing assets such as advanced remote sensing, long-range precision strike capabilities, and transformed maneuver and expeditionary forces.*

Comment: *And Anti-Narcotics Activities.* Unfortunately, we had the need before having a policy. In Afghanistan, with all branches of our armed forces on the ground, we were still unable to destroy existing caches of narcotics (valued in billions) nor were we able to prevent the planting of two successive bumper crops of opium poppies, despite the policy declaration to do away with all poppy cultivation. If we are to continue to establish democratic institutions in that nation, the *quid pro quo* should be that democracies do not grow in poppy tainted soil. The warlord system must end. As we have said concerning Iraq, "We need a regime change."

*Page 30. Paragraph 2. Innovation within the armed forces will rest on experimentation with new approaches to warfare, strengthening joint operations, exploiting U.S. intelligence advantages, and taking full advantage of science and technology. We must transform the way the Department of Defense is run.*

Comment: We must do away with the "War on Drugs!" It represents sloganeering, not warfare, We must change our thinking to "warfare against drug producers" as being an integral part of the National Security Strategy, so that it becomes a legitimate goal of warfare to protect the nation and its citizens—the first duty of government.

*Page 30. Paragraph 5. We must transform our intelligence capabilities and build new ones to keep pace with the nature of these threats. Intelligence must be appropriately integrated with our*

*defense and law enforcement systems and coordinated with our allies and friends.*

Comment: Strategic use of satellites, and unmanned aircraft will provide continuous location and types of narcotic plants under cultivation.

*Paragraph 12. ...We will ensure that the Department of State receives funding sufficient to ensure the success of American diplomacy. The State Department takes the lead in managing our bilateral relationships with other governments. And in this new era, its (Page 31) people and institutions must be able to interact equally adroitly with non-governmental organizations and international institutions. Officials trained mainly in international politics must also extend their reach to understand complex issues of domestic governance around the world, including public health, education, law enforcement, the judiciary and public diplomacy.*

Comment: *No free lunch.* In the past the Department of State has been hesitant at drug-related diplomacy. All too often, if not always, narcotics production has been treated as an economic issue, not an issue of aggression related to terrorism, criminality or national security. This must change—and changing a culture of soft diplomacy will require a subtle changes of perspective. Diplomats in prior times have rejected the idea of treaties that made clearly spelled-out demands conditioning the giving of aid with tight strings attached. It is clear today that *adroit*, strategic thinking must gain something in return for what it gives, We must not always be so reticent to insist on results, else our policies are doomed to failure as reflections of stated security strategy.

*Page 31. Paragraph 6. Today, the distinction between domestic and foreign affairs is diminishing. In a globalized world, events beyond America's borders have a greater impact inside them. Our society must be open to people, ideas and goods from across the globe. The characteristics we most cherish—our freedoms, our cities, our systems of movement, and modern life—are vulnerable to terrorism.*

Comment: Whether one classifies narcotics as products of aggressive behavior or bad ideas, they are a form of aggressive terrorism to which our borders must not be open. The things we most cherish are at risk if we allow them equal freedom of movement. They are weapons of mass destruction, destroyers of values and cultures.

*Paragraph 7. In exercising our leadership, we will respect the values, judgment, and interests of our friends and partners. Still, we will be prepared to act apart when our interests and unique responsibilities require...We will not allow such disagreements (on particulars) to obscure our determination to secure together, with our allies and our friends, our shared fundamental interests and values.*

Comment: No civilized nation, nor no friend or ally of America, values narcotics as a good. We are in agreement with our proven friends. Those who value narcotics for their citizens are only playing at being friends—playing a game of deceit for some other advantage. Such friends we do not need.

---

Within this particular set of comments and strategy statements, I hoped to find an unexplored opportunity to ending the assault perpetrated upon America and other industrialized nations by states or virtual states too weak militarily to attack nations of greater might by conventional means. Such a thesis maintains that a militarily weak, economically or politically unsophisticated, or otherwise underdeveloped nation, can and does commit aggression against the world's mightiest nations by exporting (or by allowing the export of) narcotic drugs into the developed nation or nations against their will. It is the "against their will" aspect of such unwanted actions that define them as '*acts of aggression.*' (*Italics mine*) This leads logically to the idea that America and other developed nations should not have wars against drugs, but should conduct "retaliatory actions" against other nations or virtual states over the issues of aggression by narcotic warfare by those parties. Such nations can then be given the alternative of either ending such aggression or entering a state of actual warfare over the aggression established in fact.

What I have attempted to establish is a fresh scope of definition and understanding for concepts and words that are already known, used and accepted within the context of policy discussions of national and international security. We maintain that for every civilized nation, narcotic drugs are an important national security issue, an issue of whether or not the state has acted to maximize the potential betterment of citizens. Our concentration is on broadening the definitive concepts of aggression, weapons of mass destruction, deterrence, counter-proliferation, terrorism and both coalitions and strategic alliances. Throughout this discussion, the effort has been to suggest additional meanings, meanings more expansive, but not alternate interpretations.

I would like to put the term "War on Drugs," to final rest. It is much more appropriate that we have wars against specific enemies; whomever the drug enemy is, whether a nation, a virtual state, or a criminal group within a state. Our enemies should be more specific than "drugs," particularly when we can or have already identified who and where those enemies are. For example, if Colombian terrorists are also identified as drug producers and traffickers, we know who the enemy is. If it is the warlord class of Afghanistan or warlords of Myanmar, we know who that enemy is. If and when their states are complicit, they too, join the "enemies list."

Given that it took 9/11 to make the connection between drug trafficking and terror, is it now also possible to make the same kind of intellectual leap that was needed to see AIDS as a national and international security issue—a threat to the well-being of nations? We know we now have that capacity. The need for maximizing individual opportunity and opportunity among nations is associated with an absence illicit narcotics. Will terrorism and drug trafficking redefine narcotics aggression as being within a nation's greatest security strategy interests? We hope so.

Finally, I hope that the official security establishment of our nation will give our scientific colleagues the opportunity to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of advanced narcotics biocontrol, both for the long-term benefit the National Security Strategy of the United States of America and to the betterment of the world.

Thank you.  
Walton Cook