

**Interview with Bob Angarola of Domestic Policy Staff
November 26, 1980, in the Old Executive Office Building.**

Interviewer: Emily Soapes of Presidential Papers

Transcriber: Winnie Hoover

Soapes: When you came, Mr. Angarola, to Domestic Policy Staff were you like Mr. Dogoloff with the Drug Abuse section with Peter Bourne and then it was assigned to Domestic Policy?

Angarola: Yes, that's right.

Soapes: I had not realized that until this morning.

Angarola: Yeah, that occurred in '78, the official transfer, administrative transfer, and then that was administrative really in paper only. We did not --

Soapes: Didn't change your function at all?

Angarola: Not at all, did not change offices or even reporting responsibilities. We went through Peter Bourne until his resignation at which time after a few months basically it was determined that we would stay on DPS and report through Stu Eizenstat.

Soapes: And when I read your title, it was something to do with International Affairs so that didn't give me a clue that you were in the Drug Abuse section, in fact --

Angarola: I have a feeling that was just an oversight in putting it in because what I am really responsible for is International Affairs for Drug Policy as well as Legal Affairs. However, it's evolved because of my background. My first job out of law school was with the Nixon White House as an attorney with the office of General Counsel in the Special Action Office to Drug Abuse Prevention which Mr. Dogoloff worked in also. I was there for that fourteen months and then went to the United Nations in Geneva as legal advisor to a small treaty body which is called the International Narcotics Control Board. I spent four years there and of course worked on the international side of things -- one hundred sixty governments are part of this treaty. I visited forty different countries, governments and I came back here. Obviously, that expertise was used so that the international side of drug abuse was (inaudible).

Soapes: And so you are not connected in any way with domestic programs? Dogoloff had solely the international --

Angarola: No, again, it was such a small office, only four people, and so I would get involved in law enforcement questions as well as the international--law enforcement, health, prescription drugs--in handling most of the issues that came up. But while I was here and on the DPS and before that because of my UN background--it interested Peter Bourne in the UN activities--I advised him a lot on non-drug related UN activities, such as world hunger, international health,

the World Health Organization, which I had a lot of dealings with. The International Labor Office which we left as a member in 1977 and came back in 1978, just came back last year, non drug related. In addition in the last couple of years –

Soapes: Go on and talk about some of your work.

Angarola: Sure. I again--having lived in Europe four years--the American community around the world, which is about three million people, private citizens, feel that they are unrepresented. They have no real representation in Congress although they can vote through their representative in the States. Those numbers are so small that those representatives really don't reflect their constituents who are living in Somalia, etcetera, and there was a real concern that not enough attention is given to problems of Americans living overseas. I was designated by Stu to be the contact person in the White House for those complaints and spent a lot of time on that in terms of trying to identify some of the real problems that those folks face that do exist and to get some changes made, regulatory, well not regulatory as much as legislative change, particularly taxation.

Soapes: Were you then partly responsible for their representation at the Democratic Convention each year?

Angarola: Well, yeah.

Soapes: That was the first time I had ever heard tell of what - Americans Abroad?

Angarola: Americans Abroad --those functions, probably Jack Oriello was among it for several years but I had something to do with that.

Soapes: What are some of the problems of Americans abroad?

Angarola: Well the major one which has a real economic impact is the fact that we as a government are the only major western nation that taxes its citizens on the basis of their citizenship and not their residency. So when I was in Switzerland, for example, I was exempted from Swiss tax as a UN civil servant. However, I had to pay US taxes.

Soapes: New York and –

Angarola: No, again, I had come from Washington so I am not sure what the law is – it's kind of bizarre in terms of working for the UN. But let's take a hypothetical. I'm a businessman who goes to Geneva and works with Caterpillar Tractors. I am an engineer and I would have to pay Swiss taxes. Let's take a better one. I'm a construction worker, engineer, in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabians want to encourage people to come to Saudi Arabia to build things. They don't tax foreigners. I am an American. I *have* to pay taxes on the basis of my citizenship, federal taxes. Federal taxes include not only my salary which would necessarily be higher to encourage

me to go to Saudi Arabia, but also living expenses. So say if I bought a house, I am supposed to pay the fair market value in that country for the housing. Well for sub-standard housing in Saudi Arabia it is extraordinarily expensive as it is in any other developing country, and that's a fact, and so for a company to hire me, they have to pay an awful lot of money to get me over there in the first place, and then pay more to make sure my taxes are taken care of. If I'm an Englishman with the same credentials, maybe not as good perhaps, but I can go to Saudi Arabia and I don't have to pay any taxes to England, not to the UK, nor to the Saudi Arabians. So as an employer, as a corporation, who am I going to hire? I would hire the Englishman or hire the South Korean or hire some other nationality. What has happened in Saudi Arabia is that we used to be the number one contractor, contracting country, as of five years ago. With the change of the tax law which occurred in 1976 initially, it really didn't go into effect until '78, we have become number twelve and a lot of that rests on the basis of this taxation question and-- for a country that is running increased exports-- we've really been shooting ourselves in the foot, is my belief. The Export Council, President's Export Council, I've been working with them, also, they believe the same thing and last summer in the economic package the President proposed a relaxation of that law which would grant exemptions for Americans living overseas up to a certain point for earned income which is a step in the right direction, I believe. On the other side you have the tax policy people and the Treasury Department --

Soapes: I was going to say the opposition --

Angarola: --who say this is revenue; this is going to cost us a couple of hundred million dollars because we are not going to collect taxes that were being collected. On the other side you have the economist people and the Export Council who say what we are doing is forcing Americans to come back here, ending employment, affecting exports negatively and in turn losing our competitiveness with other major trade countries, so it's really revenue raising versus export promotion, hence, the crunch came. It's very interesting. Several meetings were held on the Hill; the lobbying efforts of the construction industry in particular were pretty effective.

Soapes: They were *pro* reducing taxes, I guess.

Angarola: Yeah, this is just one of the issues.

Soapes: And one that you don't think about every day.

Angarola: Right, and there are other things like Medicare for Americans overseas. They pay if you are an American citizen. You pay for how many years you're in the Social Security system. You move out of the country, you don't get Medicaid, uh Medicare and the people over there feel it is a real inequity. Now on the other hand the HEW--now HSS--says, well, they didn't have to move, they could have stayed here. If they had stayed here, they would collect the benefits. If we have to give it to them, we have to get some kind of mechanism of entering into treaties with most of the countries in the world where these people reside to provide these

services and then, of course, you will have to provide for foreigners who come to the US. They came up with a very high figure for how much this was going to cost. Their point was that perhaps that amount of money, several hundreds of millions of dollars, could be better spent in providing care to low income Americans living in this country. It is an equity question, one that is very difficult to make a call on that one. It hasn't been decided. There is some legislation pending in the Congress. It got fairly far along and got dropped out because of the controversial issue of it. I am sure it will come up again.

And there's Veterans Affairs; there are a number of issues, citizenship, for example, very emotional one where under the laws now in existence, if I marry a French woman, live in Belgium, it is quite possible that my kid, reaching the age of twenty-one, would have no citizenship. It is said that there are cases of that that have been heard. We in the administration have pushed to reduce a lot of the focus on the transfers of citizenship by Americans living overseas. A good example of course is the Soviet representative to the UN who meets a passing female or male through the territory in the UN and they have a baby in a New York hospital. That kid is American, whereas if the American parents are living overseas the child may not be, so those are the kinds of issues in that area.

Soapes: Now how many people roughly are we talking about when we talk about Americans abroad and how well organized are they?

Angarola: The statistics are kind of squishy. Three million is the figure we use, but it's a lot, it's a lot. It is getting less and less every year because of the tax policy. They are organized in several ways. The International Chamber of Commerce has businesses basically. There is a principal American group called American Citizens Abroad which is based in Geneva a, a small but vocal group. There's a federation in Paris, and American clubs in most of the major cities of the world. They are federated in that sense, they have banded together but consistently they have not been terribly well united. They also – well if you're living in Mali, you are going to have as an American different problems than if you live in Paris.

They did get some legislation as Citizens Abroad group in Geneva, got so much legislation in foreign assistance authorization a couple of years ago, requiring that we put together a couple of - that the President report to Congress on the treatment of Americans abroad. The two reports came out of that. Basically, I don't think it was terribly responsive, but evidently this group came up with about fifty to sixty different issues they thought that they were being discriminated against because of where they lived. A citizen of the United States should not have the same problems as they had and several of them were extraordinarily valid--some were, some weren't. It is an issue I am not sure the next administration is going to listen to. It was happenstance really that I happened to take a personal interest in, having experienced some of the problems that they did. I just handled that.

Soapes: And how did that come about? I mean did you – were you discussing with Stu Eizenstat your background or how did it happen that they did become a liaison?

Angarola: The fact is that one or two people, one person was very vocal and kept bombarding the White House from the twenty-first of January on these issues, and finally he got the thing into the law, he got the requirement in the law that the President should make a report. That was Tom Smith. It bounced around. Steve Selig was handling that for a while. It was in deep discussion and it was handled for some time. He was then with Halloran I believe. Yeah, I think he was one of Halloran's deputies related to the business community and then he went on to other pursuits and there was sort of a gap and I saw it and I was just interested in it and I just wrote a memo to Stu saying I would like to be designated a such and such. He said "sure." What it is basically is when an issue would arise I could do the mail drop if you will. The taxation question of course would do – the taxation people would be there; a health issue, the health people with the various departments and agencies. So that was how it did happen.

Soapes: Yes, it was happenstance very definitely. There might or might not be someone in the next administration. You don't think the citizens groups are organized enough that they would be able to push – if one man did it this time –

Angarola: Well, in many respects the next administration I would imagine will be more responsive to the business community's concerns. And I would think when you hit the issues such as the taxation question, someone here will hear about it and will possibly be interested enough and if they can make their case convincing, which I think they have a real good case, that *issue* at least will probably be addressed whether in the context of an overall person who takes an interest in it, again this is five percent of my time, I just wouldn't know. Knowing McNathy and some of the people over there then, they would feel a bitterness about how they did the tax without being represented. I think we will hear from them and again--with the business community so obviously interested in the Chambers of Commerce people--there will be some kind of recognition of the problems also.

Soapes: And the other ninety five percent of your time, is that of drug use policy?

Angarola: Pretty much, it could be a little less than that. I did a UN piece. I spoke as a member of the President's committee on the International Labor Organization which keeps me involved in developing our policy or posture towards that organization we had difficulties with in the past. But most of it is certainly the drug side.

Soapes: Could you talk about some of the functions that you perform in that?

Angarola: Well, with my background they said I should handle a lot of the international issues, certainly relations with the UN. The UN has a role in the drug problem. The policy that we have been trying to evolve is to get away as much as possible from bilateral assistance projects in the

international slot and go multi-national. Get the European community, for example--which has experienced some extraordinarily serious problems in the area--more interested, more committed, and more responsible for providing a cutting off of supplies, changing farmers' growth of opium poppies to something more useful for the community. Meanwhile continuing with the international bilateral activities such as the Mexican program which is very useful, Turkey, other countries of course were interested, enforcement, having some US enforcement agents overseas to work with counterparts in other countries. Those issues would be the ones that I would be involved in. In addition, depending on the day, it seems the federal government agencies are always fighting. That's a fact of life, usually justifiably so in many cases. I was involved in a major effort which was to try to get the IRS more involved with criminal prosecutions of drug traffickers, finding major organized crime figures. What happened was that in 1976 they had passed a tax law which severely restricted the access to the disclosure of IRS held information for law enforcement purposes. From the IRS perspective that was wonderful. Their job, and rightfully so, their main job is to collect taxes; they raise revenue. The fact that the information they collect might disclose criminal activities of another sort, tax fraud, it's not their responsibility. They say they feel very strongly that way, and the law as written protected them quite a bit in not disclosing this information.

For example, I'm a drug trafficker and I collect \$500,000 a year in illicit drug transactions. If I fill out my tax return and say, "income, \$5,000 for running a bakery, miscellaneous income \$500,000," the IRS cannot – or I could just put down miscellaneous, gained through drug trafficking and my taxable income is \$505,000, the IRS cannot tell the Justice Department that, so you are protected through strict confidentiality. And even if they look at that and the IRS says, "gee, this is kind of strange, we had better check it out, let's have an investigation," even if the investigators do not go through the tax return itself but through other data gathered from the forms of the third parties and say, "Oh yeah, Joe, you know, Joe" the gift is there, a real club to original thinking, that still was protected. And the criminal division--the Justice Department goes crazy! You are really protecting – who are you protecting? The IRS would say that they protect the tax payers' *morale*. The reason our system of taxation and collection works is that taxpayers voluntarily comply and they voluntarily comply because they think the information they give is sacrosanct. The Justice Department on the other hand says, nonsense, they comply because they are afraid they are going to get caught and the information that you have is very useful to us and in fact would *bolster* taxpayer morale for the 99.9% of the people who aren't crooks, seeing that the information is being used to get people who *aren't* paying their taxes who *are* engaged in organized crime, or bribery. So that issue went on for nine months. Trying to get an administration position defined is difficult.

Soapes: Which was the IRS --

Angarola: We would go for a loosening of continuing major privacy protections. You still can, in your tax return, you still can write down that you got \$100,000 from bribery. That will not be turned over to the Justice Department under our proposal.

Soapes: But how many people on their tax return are going to write that they got \$100,000 from bribery?

Angarola: People do.

Soapes: And that is amazing right there.

Angarola: As long as they haven't violated the tax laws, they will not be prosecuted. However, with that type of person there is usually enough of a question about "What the heck is going on-- How did you generate that income?" and investigation will occur.

If that investigation uncovers information, not from the taxpayer himself, but from talking to people, informants, *that* type of information can be turned over. In addition if the Justice Department has a reason to believe that Emily Soapes is a crook, and she is bribing senators, the Justice Department can go to a court and ask for a court order, saying we have believable cause. For these reasons we are conducting an investigation of Emily Soapes. We believe for these reasons that her tax return and information attached to that will be useful to our investigation. A court can grant the right to give that. That is under consideration. I hope it will be passed next year.

Soapes: And this is something you have been working on for the past four years?

Angarola: Well, this actually came to the floor about this time last year. Senator Nunn took a particular interest in it and he will get us going. It is fantastic--the adversaries. The Commissioner of the IRS, Joel Kurtz, was just spectacularly intelligent and a real fighter and a fellow named Herb Nathan who is the Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Criminal Investigation, who is equally brilliant and aggressive and the sparks went flying. Oh that was fun! That is the type of issue that you get into and just try to chip away and find out what the issues are and determine what kind of agreement you can get--which was a *lot*, surprisingly. We had to go to the President for this one issue, but it worked out, to nobody's total satisfaction but everyone agreed that it was a fair position to take.

Soapes: So your job would have been to, say, get those two organizations together first before they went to Congress?

Angarola: Right, exactly.

Soapes: Then any legislation that would follow, would you follow up on that or is that for Congressional Liaison?

Angarola: We would work with Congressional Liaison but we would speak out specifically in dealing with AI, for example, or other people who would have jurisdiction in it. My feeling is that almost every issue, be it international or domestic, the role that we would play would be one to identify the problem. A lot of times people come in and get you going and nobody knew what it really meant. Always formulate clearly what is the issue. Try and analyze after that what are the sub issues of that. What are the pieces that have to be fitted in to come to a policy decision, whatever it is. That can entail negotiations, conciliation, yelling and screaming sometimes and finally you come to the agreement that this is what should be done; this is the policy that should be put in place. And then, of course, it needs following up to ensure that after the policy is developed that, in fact, the agencies were doing what they were supposed to do or the congressional people were following the legislation that had to be passed. Almost every issue was like that. I tried to get my resume ready. I tried to answer people who say I don't know what the White House does. It's true. I tried to get it down to one sentence and after that why there was this, then education, analysis, negotiation and then follow up.

Soapes: Could you give an example of another issue that you would follow through the procession?

Angarola: This is a question of the importation of narcotics into the country, legitimately produced narcotics. Traditionally we as a country and under legislation have imported opium, gum opium, from India basically and Turkey where it was produced. You grow the opium poppies, you cut it, you lance the leaves – that is opium. You scrape the opium off. You pile it up and then supposedly it is controlled and it is sent in bulk, the opium, into the United States where there are free processors who had authority to convert that to morphine, codeine and other such products for medical purposes. Over the last ten years there is a new way of doing that where you don't cut – let's go back.

In the early '70s the Turks, who had been the source of most of the heroin coming in, diverted from illicit production into licit markets. They banned the production of opium. It had a dramatic impact of reducing drug abuse in the United States, heroin availability in the US. What did happen also was that there was also a reduction in the amount available that was needed for medical purposes, so there was a real shortfall. A number of countries went into the market then of growing opium poppies because there was an awful lot of fuss. But instead of cutting it and producing opium, they would just chop off the head of the opium poppy and you could process it and it would be a thing called "castrated poppy straw" which then could be manufactured into codeine and morphine also but no opium was produced. France, Australia, Hungary, Poland a number of countries did this to meet the shortfall. Well in the late 70s we saw that there was much too much produced in the international body. So there was too much available on the world licit market. In the meantime the Turks had gone back to this poppy stalk process which did not produce opium and controlled the growth extraordinarily well. We have not seen any heroin produced from Turkish poppies in this country. In fact, it is just not to be found. They

have done a fantastic job but they did it on the basis that “we will control it but we have to make some money out of our licit growth” and we sort of agreed, okay. So you have two major traditional producers, India and Turkey. This is very complicated – sorry.

Soapes: Oh no, that is okay.

Angarola: So that these are the two, we would get the opium from India and now we were getting poppy stalks, supposedly stalks, from the Turks. It went through the Netherlands before it came to the United States. At the same time these other producers, the French, for example who had come and really bailed us out during the shortfall and the Hungarians and the Australians most importantly say, “Well we want a piece of the market. You know we were good guys during the 70s and we want to ask now why are you giving preference to the Turks and the Indians?” At the same time there was a United Nations resolution which basically – there is some argument about this – basically said the whole world community should give preference to the Turks and Indians, traditional producers, over roughly fifty years or more.

What you got there then was economic confrontation. We had American companies who had invested in Australia on the assumption that this is a safe process, there is no diversion, there is no problem with heroin availability. There is good money in it or used to be and they wanted to be able to bring it into the country and we had the right to determine who can and cannot bring it in.

The Turks on the other hand said, “Wait a second, if you do that, our market share is going to go down and in fact we will not be able to pay for the controls that we have imposed to keep you happy so that heroin doesn’t come into your country.”

Then you say, “Oh my God”-- now you have the other instance. Some of the State Department concerns are: we want to make sure the Turkish, the Turks are very important not just for the production of morphine but for you know the southern part of NATO and this is a very highly emotional issue where the Turks said, “By God we’ve done this for you at great political cost internally because the influential people were making money in the illicit traffic.” On the other hand you have the Australians who say, “You son of a bitch, you told us to go into this, we help you out, we help the world community out in the 70s, we have a very under developed island called Tasmania where all this is occurring, 25% of our economy is based on this and now you are telling us you won’t buy it, you won’t allow it to sell in the US.”

On the health side domestically, that is the State Department, domestically they say, “Well, we need the medication. We have to be ensured that--who knows what might happen in Turkey tomorrow, who knows what might happen in India? We need a constant supply, a source of supply coming from a country like Australia.”

On the enforcement side they say, “Wait a second. If you let the Turks – if you don’t support the Turks, the system might break down at which time heroin might start coming back into the US.”

So into that traffic you’ve got to mix all these different issues and give them perspective and all tied in there with the economic pressures from the manufacturers and producers of the domestic confidence. It was interesting, still is interesting. The hearing held last September--I’m expecting to get some kind of reading from that next week-- but it is an issue that is just extraordinarily interesting also because you get these people, the Chairman of the Board of Abbott Laboratories, a really tough nut and he is very, very sharp and trying to explain this – this guy wants to know bottom line numbers – now I’m losing X millions of dollars I’ve invested and you try to put it in context of what is happening and why it is being done. It does make some sense.

Soapes: But you are still losing X millions of dollars.

Angarola: But he is the type of guy you can explain it to in terms of – you put it in terms of responsibility to the society, to the health of the US, because it really is. I mean this whole production of narcotics has had dramatic impact on heroin availability in the US. It could in the future and he understands that there is a linkage although it is not readily apparent between Tasmania and Turkey. There is probably going to be a debate at the general assembly of the UN this year maybe. Certainly there is a narcotics meeting every year in Vienna which I have attended. It will be raised again there.

Soapes: You did say you continued UN contact --

Angarola: Right.

Soapes: --with the international problem. By example, it worked out beautifully.

Angarola: That’s it. So there is a body, I should say a work force that has responsibility for assessing the supply and demand for these drugs and attempting to work with consumer and producer countries to make sure the balance is maintained. I work closely, informally quite often, with these folks giving them my readings of what the situation is, of course--for several years now.

Soapes: And do you feel that you have worked with good support?

Angarola: From?

Soapes: Well, from the DPS, from the administration in general, the State Department?

Angarola: Well, see again, support is probably not the word because they see their interest or the interest of the people from their perspective and it is very valid but I might disagree with that. In the final analysis one of the roles that we play here is to probably have to make that decision

or at least formulate it in such a way that the President can make a decision in an informed way. Someone has got to be happy, very happy, always happy. You go on the basis that, and usually you can find some kind of compromise position, and you know once that is formulated someone is not going to be happy. Can I just excuse myself one second. I have a call from Vienna.

[Break]

Soapes: So you were beginning to say about the fact that you saw this as bipartisan, not always international –

Angarola: The drug question, sure I think so. I worked with the White House-- Peter Bourne, as a matter of fact-- so it is important. In fact, most people here were included in previous administrations and the support really is bipartisan, I think, in Congress also. It is just not, not really, of course. I'm happy to have policy with the nation, but by and large it has been quite cooperative. And for example this person I have been pushing to be reappointed to the Bourne position was appointed by Ford and again worked very closely with us over the four years and I am sure will work very closely with the next administration.

Soapes: It is comforting to know that there is a continuity in a social issue like this.

Angarola: I think so.

Soapes: I would have thought that you were the guardian just for the Carter administration and any way you possibly –

Angarola: Oh, I'm going. I was going to leave anyway--this was something that was going to happen one way or the other. I've just been in this issue too long. But there *is* continuity and some of the players I first got involved with in '72 and some of the players are still around, different positions perhaps but still there and that is good and bad. I think it is good obviously because of the institutional knowledge that is there. Bad in the sense that you would like to see some kind of new blood get in and maybe approach it with a different perspective. I mean we had pride in a lot of things, otherwise things would not work. But maybe there are other ways to approach it so I give full support to having some new thinking come in. I'm perhaps a little bit pessimistic that it might be too much different but let's hope. I hope they have success.

Soapes: Well, could you evaluate what you've been doing, how successful it has been, where it is going in a good kind of summary way?

Angarola: Yeah. Here in the drug side of it anyway you have numbers which give you an indication of whether you have done it or whether you haven't done it. In terms of heroin which when we first came was the primary drug of concern vis-à-vis the health consequences as well as the social consequences--it has an implication about the family. We have seen something like an 80% drop in overdose deaths from 1977 to 1979. We have seen a similar drop in emergency

room visits of people who are having problems with heroin, a precipitous drop. We have seen the purity of the heroin on the streets of the United States go down a lot. We have seen the number of addicts cut almost in half. That's a combination of working with the Mexicans basically, having worked with Turks basically, enforcement activities overseas and some even in this country. So on that side, yeah, it has been very successful.

There is this new threat now with some of the heroin coming from Southwest Asia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iran—particularly--which is showing up in New York and a couple of other cities. Real threat – it hasn't really struck, I don't think. We hear a lot of noise about it and see it in newspapers. I'm not so sure that it is going to be as terrible as certain people would like to portray it. For budgetary reasons it is nice to have a problem, you get more money to solve that problem, but maybe it will be a major problem. It could very possibly be. There is a lot of stuff being produced over there and no zone controls, so we are concerned.

On the score of prescription drugs like barbiturates, tranquilizers, amphetamines, things like that we have seen an amazing drop off, a 50% cutback in the number of prescriptions written for a lot of drugs that should not have been written. It is an educational process. In fact we have just ended a conference yesterday aimed at that and it stressed the need for more physician education, closer monitoring by peer groups in this area. I think we have been very successful there. I think we are going to see more of that in the next four to five years, and awareness on the part of consumers and the professionals that you need to question medication before you just take it blindly, very healthy.

On the other hand we have not been as successful certainly with cocaine coming into the country. Big production down in South America--in Bolivia where there is just no governmental control. In some degree there is still probably some governmental collusion producing it, lots of money to be made. Columbia is a transport point. Marijuana, a lot of it, is coming in. Fantastic efforts have been made, seizures have been made, Coast Guard particularly and still it is available. It's ubiquitous.

One of the problems and one of the failings—it was well intentioned but I think it was a real failing--of this office was early on. We put together--we probably mentioned--a presidential message, the President's message on drug abuse in 1977 outlining fifty steps that should be taken. Forty-nine of those steps were really useful. I think a lot happened because the follow up was very directive, it was very clearly – you could evaluate what had to be done, and whether it was done the next year. We did that. But the message on marijuana was “decriminalization” and he did mention that – I can't repeat too much – it was misconstrued. I'm in favor of, zillions of people went to jail and often people went to jail for possession of marijuana, but the single idea that went out to the American public was “marijuana is not dangerous so let's not worry about it.” That was a very serious error I feel and I'm part of it. Again, I still believe that the concept of removing criminal penalties for possession is *right*, there is no question it is right, but

the message that was given kids in particular, combined of course, you know, with popular culture, I think pushed the use of marijuana very high up particularly adolescents. I am very troubled and I'm not a goody two shoes, I'm not the type that says –

Soapes: A goody two shoes?

Angarola: Yes, but on this issue too many kids are getting screwed up. I'm not particularly upset over a twenty-five year old that smokes a joint every once in a while. It is not good for you but neither is a martini but when you get twelve or thirteen year olds at that age getting spaced out; you are just missing some options. You are really having an impact that is going to go long beyond the particular moment. I mean it involves growing up and that's not the way to grow up. We are really working hard to change that and we have been fairly successful I think.

There is the matter of the paraphernalia laws. It was at our instigation that the Justice Department writes these constitutional laws and nobody here is naïve enough to say that is going to solve the problem of drug abuse. It's not, but it is going to get a message out that this is not to be tolerated. Society doesn't approve of this particularly about kids and by God we are not going to put up with it and if that's hard line then I'm very hard line. So, on balance I'd say we've been pretty successful. A lot of it has to do with gaining the trust of the people who run the program, the operational people, which we do by personal contact. We know each other. We come here once a month, sit down and discuss what the problems are. Second is, I guess the competence of most of those people. And sometimes a little bit of luck. The weather went bad in Southeast Asia. There was a drought. The opium poppy didn't grow. Actually, I'm satisfied in some sense but I think this administration has done a real good job in approaching a very emotional problem by taking the steps that need to be taken actually so I'm quite satisfied with it. I'll defend this record for the next four years, anyway.

Soapes: So you're going to be leaving. If we had to get in touch with you, say in three, five, seven years, how would probably be the best way to go about it? Would there be an alumni association with the Mothers –

Angarola: Yeah, probably I would say the best thing would be the University of Virginia Law School Alumni Society would probably be a good way to do it. You know they put me –

Soapes: They will always find you? We are asking people for a permanent address and I also want either parent's address or also want people to give their alumni associations. They do keep in touch.

Angarola: My main thing is to work with a law firm. I haven't lined one up yet but I expect to be in the Washington area.

Soapes: Okay. Well we can check first in Washington which would be very dependable.

Angarola: Yeah.

Soapes: And then try the UVA Law Alumni.

Angarola: Yeah, I would give you a home address, but that's probably not going to be –

Soapes: But they change, they always change. We tried that for a while and we found out that wasn't dependable.

Angarola: Yeah, I think the UVA instead of tracking down with a guide.

Soapes: Okay. The interesting thing is going to be if we can have an expanded program and go back in five years and say, "Now how do you feel about it?"

Angarola: That's interesting. You should do that and I strongly recommend that.

Soapes: I do too.

Angarola: I remember in high school, '59, there was a test called "Project Talent." The Army put it out and it was a three day battery of questions on achievement questions--not really achievement because I didn't know anything--but all kinds of things.

Soapes: Psychological?

Angarola: No, not psychological really. It was more aptitude and it went from home economics to literature to aviation to biology. It must have been thirty categories and you would get certain percentiles of what you did best in and if you did best in these six probably you should think about those professions. And I took the test at thirteen years old and the things I did best in said I should be a lawyer, and they said they were going to follow it up and they did do it after five years, ten years, then I lost them. But it is interesting. I would be very interested to see what – how that predictor worked out – I guess another perspective.

Soapes: Well thank you for taking time to talk.

Angarola: I enjoyed it.