

Interview with Lee Dogoloff of the Drug Abuse Policy Section of the Domestic Policy Staff on November 26, 1980 in his office in the Executive Office Building. Interviewer: Emily Soapes of the Presidential Papers Project

Soapes: The simplest way to start is to ask you how you came to the Domestic Policy Staff. You must have had some background.

Dogoloff: Yes, I have been working in the field of drug abuse since 1969 when I began as a Deputy Director of the Narcotics Treatment Administration, Washington DC, which was the primary agency in the District of Columbia to treat heroin addiction. And then I worked at the Executive Office, the Special Action Office regarding drug abuse of HEW and then OMB. Along the way I worked with Peter Bourne at the Special Action Office and then came to the administration with Peter, was appointed by the President as the Deputy Director of the Office of Drug Abuse Policy and then after the first year we reorganized the Executive Office and those functions were transferred to, in effect, an Associate Director for Drug Policy after Peter Bourne left. The President signed an executive order which mandated functions that, by law, were given to the President for management and coordination of the total federal program and he by executive order assigned the job of assisting him with those functions to the Associate Director for Drug Policy.

Soapes: And how did it come to be under DPS? Was that just the only place really to put it?

Dogoloff: Well, there's no real place to put it because it deals with both treatment and enforcement issues, both domestically and internationally and as you know there's only two major groups, the DPS and the National Security Council. It didn't fall neatly into either so we just chose the DPS and it has worked out quite well.

Soapes: Now when we talk about drug abuse are we not only talking about, you know, hard drugs like heroin and cocaine but the legislation for regulating "over the counter" and prescription drugs? Did that come under your office as well?

Dogoloff: Only to the extent of the abuse potential of those, so we got into the psychoactive drugs and those which had potential for abuse as opposed to the antibiotics types of drugs.

Soapes: Yeah, yeah.

Dogoloff: So we weren't involved with some of the FDA work which developed into generally marketing the drugs, etc. We were very much involved with what are known as controlled substances and prescription drug use, misuse, abuse, misprescribing. In fact, after the last couple of days we had hosted a national conference bringing together the American Medical Association and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association with a letter to each governor

asking them to designate someone from their staff to come together to look at this issue and there were nearly three hundred people in a very successful conference.

Soapes: Congratulations. So then the function of the Drug Abuse Policy Section is to *tighten* legislation, maybe, or is it to have a public outreach program? What would you say it is?

Dogoloff: Well, we do a number of things. In some ways we are responsible for the overall coordination and policy setting for the total program. It is a unique program in government in that in most other programs, although many agencies, for example, might have *health* functions like the VA has--the Veteran's Administration has a health program and the Indian Health Service might and lots of other places in government--but everybody recognizes that the Surgeon General is the nation's chief health officer and the Department of Health and Human Services is the locus for that function within government. With drug abuse it is a different issue because there are legitimately competing health, law enforcement, and international issues which involve at least twenty-two agencies in some major way in the government. It ranges from everything from the Department of Agriculture who, for example, is involved in crop substitution and crop destruction programs to the more traditional, like the program in the military for drug abuse, the VA and the ones that one would normally think of, such as the Customs Service and Treasury, the Criminal Division and Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration and Justice, the National Institute of Drug Abuse and even the Department of Transportation and the Coast Guard are very much involved.

In terms of the management what we have done is to host what I call my "principles group" which is a group composed of the following people: the commandant of the Coast Guard, the Commissioner of Customs, the Head of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division which does prosecution, the Head of the National Center of Drug Abuse, the Assistant Secretary of State for narcotics matters as well as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. This group has met over the last four years once a month for two hours to come together around policy issues and coordination issues. I think that one of the major accomplishments has been to improve the management of the program by having a team that worked together as a team so that the cooperation was infinitely better. Whereas we didn't *eliminate* all the squabbles that go on, for example, between Customs and DEA people in the field, it was the clear notion in the field that the people in Washington were in fact together. We dealt with a lot of difficult issues in that group and some that are still yet to be dealt with but it was a good group of fine managers that really worked together as a team in what I think is an absolutely unique experience in government bringing together people, none of whom reported to me personally obviously, they all reported directly to their own – within their departments – but recognized that working together as a team they could accomplish things that none of them could do individually. It *did* in fact work out very nicely.

Soapes: Now was this group a creation of your work --

Dogoloff: Yes!

Soapes: or something that had preceded this administration?

Dogoloff: No, it was a new thing.

Soapes: It was a new thing. I thought I understood that.

Dogoloff: It was something that the group itself, as we are continuing to meet, really does want to continue, whatever the configuration is. I'm not sure that there's not enough momentum, even if a couple of them stay on, like the Commandant of the Coast Guard, who would not be doing so on their own. Interestingly enough, the Commandant of the Coast Guard has attempted to *duplicate* that experience on war issues, both laws at sea and other issues that involve multiple agencies and the government and has not been successful in doing so. And it surprises me because he is a superb manager. Really it is a unique experience and experiment in government, I think.

Soapes: Without, you know, giving away any secrets could you give an example of an issue and the way it was worked out through this group. Give an idea of exactly how the group worked.

Dogoloff: One issue had to do with how we dealt with the whole marijuana issue which has taken a lot of time and some of the things we worked out okay in that group and some we have agreed to disagree because of differences. And we took up issues like domestic cultivation of marijuana, what to do with that, the use of herbicide in spraying marijuana internationally and how that could be worked out. There were a number of cooperative arrangements of flow, the flow from that group relative to interdiction of marijuana coming up from Colombia with the Coast Guard and the DEA and Customs Service working *very* closely together in a number of joint operations off the coast of Florida and the Caribbean.

Another example has to do with the parent movement and I think it is one of the major accomplishments of this office and this administration, having to do for the first time entering a new component, as I see it, into the drug program and that may be the most significant component of all which is trying to get at a shift in public attitudes. We had been extremely concerned about what has been an increasing social acceptance of drug abuse in our society and we need to begin to change that. In order to do that we identified a heretofore kind of forgotten group in this whole saga which is parents and sought to target, very specifically, drug abuse prevention messages at parents, and did a number of things in that regard. For example, we hosted in cooperation with HEW a meeting here of the twenty major physicians groups, physicians' associations, medical writers, etc. for a day session around the issue of adolescent drug use and how they can play an important role as the medical profession in their own

communities by getting the message out that the Surgeon General keynoted and from that many of the medical associations are putting articles in their journals and working on it. In addition to that, with the cooperation of HEW, the National Institute of Drug Abuse and the DEA produced a movie called, "For Parents Only – What Kids Think About Marijuana." That movie which first appeared I guess in April or May of last year has to date been seen by some forty-two thousand people. We've made it available across the country on a freewill basis and it is an interesting kind of exercise in interagency cooperation. What this office did is formulated a group, an advisory group, composed of the major national organizations, the NEA, National PTA, etc. and people in government as an advisory group and DEA put up most of the money, Drug Enforcement Administration, NIDA-- the expertise as the National Center of Drug Abuse-- *together* produced this film, a discussion guide, etc. which has gotten fantastic reviews and really has been a catalyst to get parent groups at a community level together.

In addition to that I took that one example of cooperation and requested the Department of Justice--which were two members of the "principles" group: the Criminal Division as well as the DEA-- to come up with a model paraphernalia--anti-paraphernalia--law to first look at the issue of whether we could constitutionally draft such model legislation. If so – the answer to that was yes – let's draft it and make it available to states and communities around the country. Now that has in some areas been misinterpreted as a simplistic solution to the problem. It was in fact not meant to do that at all. What it was meant to do and has very successfully done is provide a form and focus for the issue at the community level and its constitutionality has thus far been upheld. In the state of Maryland just this week all the head shops did voluntary compliance of clearing their shelves because the law had been passed there and it has been passed in about a dozen states.

That is another part of the attitude shift. There are today nearly six hundred parent groups across the country that have been formed to deal with adolescent drug use in their community. We have been very much a part of, in fact, acting as a catalyst. They do that with virtually no federal funding at all and get a clear message to schools and parents and so forth. I think that is a very, very significant change that is coming about in our society. I think it's going to be the difference that in the long term is going to make a difference because the public attitude of permissiveness around drug use serves to undermine all that we try to do both domestically and internationally in prevention and treatment and international control, and so forth. That attitude shift, as I see it, is the largest and most significant contribution that we have made in (a) recognizing that and (b) doing something about it.

Soapes: Communicating.

Dogoloff: Yes. Another example is, I guess, one of the things I've learned in the job is that much of the job has to do with leveraging and figuring out which button to push. If you push the right button, a good example of that is that a local drugstore chain which has some fifty to sixty

stores in a three state area called Drug Fair made the move to remove cigarette wrapping papers from its shelves in order to get a message across against marijuana use. They knew that those cigarette wrapping papers were used specifically for that purpose. They came under some fire and defended their position in a letter to the editor in the Washington Post. I then called the person who wrote that letter and said, "That's the right thing to do. We applaud what you're doing." And he said, "Well why don't we sit down and maybe we can get together and do some business." And we met a couple of times. I subsequently involved the National Institute on Drug Abuse. This drugstore chain in the first six months of this past year has invested a quarter of a million dollars in a community-based campaign of making pamphlets available to parents, training their pharmacists as resource people to parents in the community around drug use and abuse and are going to be investing in the next six months another quarter of a million dollars in working with the Psychiatric Institute of Washington which is a private psychiatric treatment facility in leading some parents discussion groups, and so forth. It's a very interesting way of leveraging and getting business and government cooperating together, at virtually no cost to the government, to influence community behavior and attitudes and *support* basically the parent movement.

Another kind of an example of an interagency issue we have dealt successfully with has to do with the cooperation between the IRS and the DEA. In 1976, primarily as a reaction to Watergate, there were very stringent laws passed relative to sharing of information. Not necessarily generated by the tax returns themselves because we felt strongly about continuing the privacy those tax returns deserve. More importantly, third party information or information that is divulged as part of a tax investigation once that situation is referred to the tax division in Justice for prosecution, that information we felt ought to be made available to Drug Enforcement for prosecution if in the course of that information it is ascertained that the person is involved in a major way in drug trafficking or major organized crime.

Well, heretofore there was virtually no communication between those two agencies. I met with the Justice Department, Phil Heyman who is head of the Criminal Division, and the Commissioner of IRS and their staff over a six month period with a fair amount of blood letting but finally did come to grips with two things: one is an agreed upon administration position on revamping that law which is now before the Congress and more importantly some real administrative changes within IRS so that there is now communication at the field level between those two agencies with an agreement that has been signed by the Commissioner of IRS and the head of DEA with everything including desk space for Internal Revenue Service special investigators at some of the DEA regional offices.

That kind of communication information will go far to help with a major innovation that we have had relative to drug trafficking. We are not interested in the lower level trafficker, and we are not even that much interested in the goods themselves. What we are really interested in is what in fact motivates the trafficker--which is the money. We have more and more tried to target

investigative activities at the money and not at the drugs because the money is really the motivator and that's where you can hurt the organization most. There is probably some fifty-five billion dollars a year that is involved in drug trafficking and we have done a couple of things; one is the IRS – DEA thing that we just talked about.

The other is I think another sort of innovative, maybe unique kind of operation of the federal government which has to do with a study group that we created composed of agencies who do and do not have specific drug functions but all of whom in some way deal with money. Like in addition to the regular drug agencies one would suspect--the Secret Service, the Comptroller of the Treasury--all of the major banking operations in our government were involved in what was in effect a *study* group, not an *action* group but a study group that met on a monthly basis for like the last year and a half to give information, exchange information about how money flows internationally, how other people had used that information productively. How, for example, the Justice Department in a group that had no connection with drug enforcement but looks at multinational fraud and how they worked out cooperative arrangements with prosecutors in other countries to get information. That information was very useful to McConnick who knew nothing about that. There are all kinds of examples of how that has gone on and it was just a study group and not meant to make cases or anything else but to provide an exchange of information. The information itself has been used to put forth a number of special activities to target or closely look at the financial aspects of trafficking.

Another example has to do with the Narcotics Intelligence Group which is an interagency group that we formed at the beginning of the administration, chaired by the DEA but also involving the CIA, the Customs Service, the Treasury, and State Department, the National Center on Drug Abuse because it has information. Virtually every agency in the government that produces information, or is a consumer of information, has intelligence in effect around drug abuse and that has worked out very nicely both in terms of *targeting* and figuring out what information we need to get and tasking agencies to produce that information as well as arriving at a government-wide consensus on major statistics relative to the number of addicts, how much is involved in terms of the financial flow, what is the flow of narcotics, where does it come from, trafficking patterns, where do we need to leverage and that sort of thing. So there have been a lot of those kinds of examples.

Soapes: Now we seem to be talking about abuse in the sense of getting at the root, of prevention. Does your work also involve treatment?

Dogoloff: Yes, very much so and my own experiences as a treatment person so I have, I guess, in some ways a special affinity for that. One of the – at the beginning of the administration, we did five or six major policy reviews on each aspect of the drug program, from intelligence, to enforcement, to the international program. One had to – Board of Management as a part of our concerns - one had to deal with demand reduction or treatment part of the equation. And in that

one of the central recommendations had to do with family and looking at the abuser as part of the family constellation and also not focusing in our treatment on the drug, but focusing on the individual and his behavior and thinking about it in those terms as opposed to thinking about in terms of as a heroin user, he is a person who is using *whatever* drug and is dysfunctional because of that. And the recognition that that person lives within a family structure and encouraging treatment centers to think of the person – the unit of service, the focus of the service is the family rather than only the individual and try to deal with that.

Another part of the “demand reduction,” if you will, has to do with prescription drug abuse. We had early in the administration taken on the notion that more people died from prescription drug abuse than virtually all other drugs, all the illicit drugs, combined. And we really wanted to do something about that. As a consequence, a number of things. We have reduced by over thirty percent the number of people dying and coming into hospital emergency rooms with problems associated with barbiturates related to tranquilizers. We first started to get our own house in order by asking the government doctors like the VA, the Human Health Service and the Department of Defense to look at their prescribing practices and begin to cut down on the unnecessary prescribing of psychoactive drugs, if you will, and that has been quite successful.

There has been real diminution in each of those in addition to which we commissioned the Institute of Medicine to do a study on sleeping medication, substantive knowledge which got a lot of circulation and showed, very definitively, that some of the major sleeping drugs that were being used were not effective over the long term, were being overprescribed in that patients were being given many, many more pills than could possibly be useful since the duration of action was a couple of days and they were given, you know, weeks and months supplies. Had a lot of favorable publicity and began to work with the professional organizations like the AMA, the American Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the individual pharmaceutical manufacturers as well as the states who have major control responsibility for diversion to both focus on the problem and to look at specific ways of dealing with it.

That has culminated in a national conference that has just concluded yesterday bringing together about three hundred people who are interested in that area and it was very, very successful. People went away recognizing that a very *small* percentage of doctors and pharmacies, in fact, are responsible for a very *large* percentage of the problem and there are ways of targeting at various levels and groups of practitioners. Everyone pretty much agrees that for the doctor who is in it to make money, or the pharmacist, he ought to be treated in a criminal way and very harshly. But there is a new term called the “dated” doctor which means a doctor who has not kept up with medical literature and whose prescribing practices are not—well, *are bad*, but they are not criminal in intent. It is just a matter of continuing education and now there are movements to get, to identify those through working with other physicians and to get them into continuing education and to upgrading their skills through peer pressure and counseling and

education. And there are also doctors who are just conned, easily conned, and they need to be identified and helped. And lastly there are the impaired physicians or the physician who himself has become addicted and then becomes a problem. And we have very much pushed to get across the notion that each of these people need to be identified clearly and treated in a *different* way. And what had been done heretofore is to think about identifying a physician and trying to get his license taken away. That is a very difficult thing to do, and probably not useful in many, many cases nor appropriate as we have tried to get the motion across for a differential response for different kinds of problems.

Soapes: But do you ever get the feeling that you can only hit the tip of the iceberg? There must be thousands of doctors out there who fit those categories but there are millions of doctors and how are you ever going to find them all?

Dogoloff: Well, we have a system in the federal government that does track prescribing and what we are trying to do is to hone that system so it can in fact identify those physicians and pharmacists who are prescribing scheduled narcotic drugs, psychoactive drugs outside of what would be a normal range and those can be identified pretty easily, as a matter of fact, and there aren't that many of them. And you do a tremendous prevention job if you identify *one* in a community and get the message across because everybody else hears it very clearly so that it is absolutely a doable thing and it is something that saves money and I think it's going to really take off. So we are very excited about what we've done with that.

Soapes: Has it caused, if nothing worse, a good bit of irritation in your work to read articles like I read – I guess it was about in August of September – saying “well people may as well quit worrying about drug use among the administration people who have been so highly publicized because that's just – that's common today and it's really quite accepted.” That article appeared in the Post, I think it was right around the time of Tim Kraft. And that caused an editorial saying, you know, “the world is in a sorry state of affairs when something like this is said in a major newspaper.”

Dogoloff: I think that one of the major--a major--failing in this area of the administration has been our inability to clearly communicate the President's view about drug use. We in one sense did the right thing--and in another sense did not-- in coming out as forcibly as we did in the beginning for decriminalization. Now, let me make clear that this is on the one hand a very misinterpreted word – term. On the other hand everybody agrees that it is not a good idea to put people, particularly youngsters who are possessing small amount of marijuana for their personal use, in jail or give them criminal records as a way of dealing with the problem. It got misinterpreted as the President's condoning drug use, and that was the publicity around several members of the administration which I continually get bombarded with.

Soapes: I'm sure you did.

Dogoloff: Uh, it served to undermine a lot of the very fine things that the President has done in this administration. And I personally feel very badly about that. The fact is that the President does and has adamantly opposed the use of marijuana and other drugs as well but that message has never been clearly communicated and for the most part people don't understand that. I'm absolutely convinced of that and it has – I'm hoping that as people look from a historical standpoint at what this administration has done there will be appropriate credit given for the priority that the President has placed on this issue and the special emphasis that it has gotten. I think that we have made some major changes and some major inroads.

For example, over the last three and a half years there has been an eighty percent reduction in the number of people dying from heroin overdoses in this country. That fact is little known and little publicized. The President has not gotten out in front and waved the flag and said "look what I've done about drug use in our society" but I think that as you look at the record *historically* there will be some very, very tangible kinds of things that have been done here and the most lasting of which, I think, has to do with attitude and that this administration has really taken on the leadership of supporting that and getting that grassroots parent movement under way and if they are going to be a force to be reckoned with both politically at *all* levels and are really going to give a clear message to their children of "no" to drug use.

And more importantly even than the drug issue to me, it signaled the resurgence of the parental role of responsibility and goes very much along with what the President has done in sponsoring the White House Conference on the Family which we have worked very closely with. And I think that there are a number of subtle changes that have gotten masked in some way by some of the overriding energy and economic problems of our country in the last four years but that those subtleties, which are really not that subtle, that the President has really stood for like human rights, like revitalizing the strength of families, like what you've done with the whole drug issue will really serve to clarify the kind of moral leadership, if you will, that the President has provided.

Soapes: And if this has been a change in attitudes fundamentally, it's not work that you see being swept away with new priorities in another administration?

Dogoloff: It's going to go on. The problem is going to go on after this or that but I'm also convinced that the kinds of things that we've set in motion will go on. There was some concern at the conferences yesterday that, you know, why are we holding this conference after an election. And I said that the conference was planned before the election. We did not exactly anticipate the outcome on the one hand. On the other hand it didn't make any difference because it was an issue that was going to continue. The problem wasn't going to go away and that the conference wasn't an ending to anything but rather a beginning and people really took that quite seriously. And we will be putting forth recommendations that came from that conference and specific issue papers that will be developing here for the transition team and the new people

coming in so that hopefully they will be able to at least understand where we were coming from and are committed to a smooth transition.

Soapes: And communication, publicity and outreach is a key, not *the* key. How much help it would be, for example, I read in the paper one of the interviews with Mrs. Reagan, so she's very interested and she wants Carol Burnett involved and Carol Burnett is a well known person. How much help is *that* sort of publicity for this type of program?

Dogoloff: Well I think that's very useful, but it needs also to be coupled with people who are knowledgeable and talented to --

Soapes: --give it direction?

Dogoloff: ...to support it, but that's the kind of support and leadership that is apparently really unique and will be extremely helpful. I am very optimistic about Mrs. Reagan's interest in the subject. I know that during the campaign she has twice visited Baypoint Village which is a community in New York and I'm hopeful that the new administration will in fact be able to attract knowledgeable and talented people and give this the kind of priority that the Carter administration has given it as well. One way of measuring that priority is to understand that almost ten percent of the personnel resources of the Domestic Policy staff is involved in this program and that is a lot and that is a testimony to the President's commitment to the issue.

Soapes: So how is labor divided in your section if you've got that many people working—

Dogoloff: Well, we have one individual that primarily does intelligence types of work. We have--

Soapes: Is that Mr. Williams?

Dogoloff: That's Mr. Bolton. Mr. Williams is primarily our law enforcement person. Mr. Angarola who... [Richard Williams, Seymour Bolton, and Robert Angarola all have oral histories in this collection.]

Soapes: Yes, I'm to see him at 10:00.

Dogoloff: --is our lawyer also has been involved with many legal issues, with prescription drug use issues, the reexamination of the Controlled Substances Act and very much involved with our international aspects of our program. Marty Devine is another Assistant Director who is primarily involved with the parent movement as well as this whole attitude switch and has led in something we haven't talked about which is the whole Southwest Asia issue. Over the past year there have been tremendous increases in production and availability of heroin from Southwest Asia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iran which have flooded the European market with a heroin epidemic over the last couple of years that has begun to show itself in the east coast cities over

the past twelve months or so. Marty has been our chief staff person to coordinate that activity. We've had nearly seventy people from across government involved since last February in anticipating that flow of heroin and looking at what government should do in anticipation of that and she could probably, if you see her, go into more detail about specifics that were done but I think that is another interesting notion of not waiting until you get clobbered but anticipating a problem, moving resources, and with specific initiatives moving like DEA personnel into New York and the northeast corridor. As it is now there has been at least a holding in a half dozen east coast cities of that heroin and we are hopeful that that's going to maintain itself. We are not sure. It could get worse. Even with that influx, however, it is important to recognize that there has probably been a twenty-five percent reduction even today in the total amount of heroin available in this country as opposed to four years ago with a sizable reduction in the number of heroin overdose deaths. In 1976 there were something like sixty or seventy percent, sixty-seven percent I guess it was, of people coming into federally funded treatment centers who were coming in primarily for heroin use. Today that number is thirty-three percent.

Soapes: And nothing else has taken its place instead?

Dogoloff: Well...

Soapes: I mean you kind of switch from heroin to...

Dogoloff: Some people have but lots of people haven't, too. And heroin is a deadly drug and a very dangerous, highly addictive one so people have at least moved away from that as one of our targeted ones, so I feel very good about some of the things we've done. Particularly good that I guess what everybody wants to do is to think in terms of long term institutional change and how you accomplish that in a relatively short time of being here. That's really critical. I think that what we've put into motion in terms of the experiment...

Soapes: I'm going to flip this over. (End of side one of tape). Experiment...

Dogoloff: With federal coordination, interagency coordination will in fact go on. I think what we've done in terms of looking at attitudes and finding ways of leveraging the interest and concern of the American people around this issue to change social attitudes - that, in fact, will go on. One of the interesting things that has happened is that post election there has been a - I'm not saying this for myself - but that the parent groups have gotten together and attempted by letters and by many other ways to influence the transition team and the incoming President to first, keep the office, secondly to keep me. I have encouraged them to do more around keeping the office than me personally, but it definitely feels good personally. More importantly what it says is that they in fact believe that what we have done here has been very helpful to what they are trying to do in their own communities and that's very important and that will in fact go on and I think will continue to multiply and that we will stem the increasing use of marijuana and other drugs. We've already begun to see a difference.

For the last five years there's almost been a doubling of the number of children, high school seniors, for example who have used marijuana daily. So today of to a high of eleven percent last year, eleven percent of high school seniors used marijuana *daily*. That's a very important figure. That figure had been going up for each of the last five years. For the first time last year in our survey, that number leveled off. I think that's very critical. I think that number is still unacceptably high but important that it has in fact leveled off.

And another piece of information developed in the same survey that helps explain why and that is that each year the number of children responding positively to the question of "does the regular use of marijuana cause physical harm?," each year a number of people say "no" to that increase except for this. This year that has finally turned around. The children themselves are beginning to recognize that there are problems associated with marijuana use. I would like to think that our focus and our publicity around that has been part of that. One of the other, I think, real contributions that we've made to *clarify* the marijuana issue. It has been muddled for a long time for lots of reasons. What I've said is that we have not clearly differentiated in the past between that amount of scientific evidence needed by scientists to make a scientific determination and the kind of evidence that one needs as a parent or public policy maker, and that differentiation has never been made before. And as a parent and as a public policy maker there is ample evidence to establish which way one ought to go with marijuana use, particularly among adolescents and that is that it is important to say "no" to it. And let the scientists fight for the next fifty as they did with tobacco to figure it out that we should not have to repeat that experience with marijuana. That message has really gotten across. We had, I guess, a lot of opposition, particularly from the Department of Health and Human Services, interestingly enough.

Soapes: That's surprising.

Dogoloff: Yes. While a lonely battle to try to get a clear message out to parents and that the *fight*, if you will, for clarity around parental and public policy on marijuana and other drug use goes on not only in the community, the larger society, but in the government as well. Maybe that's not surprising in that it is important we've always felt for our government to mirror the attitudes, feelings of the general population. So why should it be different? It should in fact be the same. And the same uphill battle we've had with the public is also true with the government. The problem is that there are not enough parent groups in the government except that as you begin to address government officials and others, not in their *public* roles but as parents they begin to see the issue with more clarity. The difficulty is the young special assistants who themselves have some experience with marijuana, who have a very permissive attitude and who can sometimes really get in the way.

Soapes: So it's not just a problem of apathy. There is some degree of opposition?

Dogoloff: Oh yeah, absolutely. And there is a big industry out there. There is a multi-billion dollar a year industry of paraphernalia manufacturer, of drug dealers, and so forth, that want to keep it going.

Soapes: Yeah, making money off of it.

Dogoloff: There's a heck of a lot of money being made off of it.

Soapes: But overall you do feel optimistic apparently about a shift.

Dogoloff: I feel optimistic about a shift. I'm continually concerned that although there is a decrease in heroin, there are continuing increases in the use of cocaine and marijuana in our society over the past four years, and I think that a challenge for the new administration is going to be to step back and look at what we do and where we go with it. It seems to me that what we have accomplished is planting the seed of getting the start of the plant to really grow relative to attitudes and we have in fact improved to the maximum degree possible the management that anything that we do relative to domestic law enforcement or treatment or even internationally is really going to be at the margin. Because internationally there is question of absorptive capacity and development and all kinds of issues over which we have little control in terms of leveraging.

Domestically there is not much more one can do. It is important to treat, without question. It is important to research. Law enforcement is important but even if you get fifty percent of the material coming in, which is not very likely, you still have not provided a financial disincentive to the trafficker, so that we need to be smarter about our enforcement techniques and I think that we need to more and more home into the attitude of targeting-- that is, where the money--is to be made in this program, not in increased resources and the law enforcement, and so forth, and doing more of what we've been doing. That would be, in my estimation, a problem. We need to think and be smarter about what it is we do rather than just doing more. And had we been reelected that was the process we had begun to think through - how would we do that?

Soapes: Had you come up with -- had you gotten to the idea stage?

Dogoloff: Yes. I had gone around just before the election and interviewed, for example, each of the members of the principles group privately about what their notions were. There were some themes that came through. A major theme, interestingly enough, even from people that came out of the Coast Guard had to do with attitudes. And that has never been ... we took it on in this office as a major initiative. It has never been an integral part of the program, per se. And I think this prescription drug issue is part of the attitude and prevention program and that *that* would be the focus and that we would try to get each of the major players in the federal government to look at the attitude issue as a very important part of their job, whether we had the Drug Enforcement Administration going out and the teacher-parent groups doing some of the things I thought over the past two years at least whenever I've traveled anywhere is part of normal

business would always get in touch with the local community and meet with the parent group as part of that travel. And it has been very rewarding for me personally and because of my position. You know it's just amazing the kinds of crowds you can call. Every April, for example, in a small town outside of Orlando, FL. we packed five hundred people into a church on a Sunday night in two week's notice. That is not atypical. It is symptomatic of the kind of interest the parents have in the issue and the kind of commitment that can be sparked to do something about it.

Soapes: I'm glad you had time to do some describing for me of some of these crowds because I'm not in a parent group, it's not the sort of thing I read about everyday and yet, as we know, it is an important issue and something that is in the news a good bit.

Dogoloff: Seriously, the Gallup ... it comes up very close to the top in all the public opinion polls.

Soapes: Right.

Dogoloff: The Gallup Poll that was done for the White House Conference on The Family, for example, next to issues of economic security, people felt that the most important issue facing the family today was substance abuse. And when asked how they summed it up for family both retrospectively and prospectively, they felt the family – they were very pessimistic – that it was going downhill and it was likely to continue to go downhill. When asked why, more than any other issue, substance abuse was named as the major reason for the continually pessimistic view of the family. With figures like one in five families having a problem related to substance abuse and ten percent of high school seniors using daily marijuana, six and a half using alcohol daily, those are very frightening notions when you think about what the impact of that is for our society five or ten years from now when children only have an opportunity to experiment and develop emotionally during adolescence.

By the time they grow out of adolescence, chronologically, they are expected to be an adult. Well the child who begins ...who goes through adolescence intoxicated, the child who begins to use marijuana on a daily basis at thirteen or fourteen and stops at eighteen is still an emotional thirteen year old. And our society doesn't give kids another chance to catch up and how they're going to be able to cope with adult responsibilities in an ever increasingly complicated and demanding world is a bit beyond me. And it's going to be a problem for which our society will pay dearly unless we are able to deal with it effectively. And the message that I've been getting out is that those children do not belong to the federal government, they don't belong to the police, and they don't belong to schools, they belong to parents-- and that kids learn and develop attitudes through relationships. And I don't know of any kids who have a warm personal relation with the federal government. You know they have a relationship with parents and that's why it is very important for the parents to take on the primary responsibility. And they've done that in

a couple of ways. One is to get educated, to learn themselves about the issues involved. And the reason to do that is so that they can clearly say “no” to drug abuse in their family, to the children in their family. But that’s only a small part of what they need to do, because they then need to reach out to the broader community to make sure that that notion of “no” to drug use is in fact supported rather than undermined. And that gets them into schools and looking at what are school policies and conduct codes.

For example, in the state of Florida it is illegal for children under the age of eighteen to purchase tobacco, yet every school virtually has a designated smoking area. When you point that out to parents they realize the craziness of that and *they* pressure the school to change it which is the way it ought to come. And believe me the thing that the kids are smoking least is tobacco. And teachers have been intimidated and afraid to go out there because they don’t feel they have the support of the parents. That is changing. The paraphernalia thing is another “do drug” message. So the parent is saying “no” at home yet the child goes into the local record store and sees paraphernalia legally displayed and sold. Well that a “yes” message of drug use and parents are identifying – and we are working with them – to identify those “yes” messages and get them turned around so that the community then supports rather than undermines the values that the parents have established for their children in their home. Very basic and makes a hell of a lot of good sense and that’s why it’s working.

Soapes: We are assuming--talking here--that the parents are going to say “no.” Now I saw a report on CBS about increasing parent and child use of drugs within the same family. The percentage I don’t know. Here, we are talking about people, say, of my age--who went to college and thought marijuana was really cool and this sort of thing. How much of a problem does this pose for your work?

Dogoloff: It poses *some* problem. I think that although it can get a lot of publicity because it makes good copy, I think we are talking about a relatively small number of people. It is also important to recognize that marijuana that was used when you were in college is very different from the marijuana that is available today, in that at that time we were talking about a half of a percent of the active psychoactive ingredient, *most* psychoactive ingredient of marijuana. Today, we are talking about five, six, eight percent which makes it a *completely* different drug. Also today we do have emerging evidence, scientific evidence, that clearly shows the problems associated with regular use. So those attitudes will undergo change. I think those parents also are going to be under increasing pressure from other parents in the community and are going to be isolated or at least attempting to deal with that because that is not going to be a prevailing attitude.

In the case of my own daughter in her high school--which I think may be somewhat atypical compared across the country-- the majority of children do *not* use marijuana or other drugs and in fact serve to isolate those that do and so if you want to be in the “in” group, socially,

athletically, scholastically, you don't use drugs. And some of the children who came with her from junior high who were into it have since stopped because it was in effect a bar from membership to that group. I think that is the kind of thing I expect more and more as we go on. I think we are going to see a return to more traditional discipline in schools. I think parents are demanding that because they see it works.

One of the most interesting statistics that I have seen in twenty years is the Youth Gallup Poll where youth themselves, eighty percent, eight zero percent of the youth themselves say they would welcome increased discipline and structure in home and school. *Eighty Percent* – that is a very, very powerful figure. That is one of the lines I use when I talk to parents. We better hear what our children are saying to us and respond to it. And I think that's what is happening and in some ways that is the thing I'm most proud about relative to our contribution in this administration.

Soapes: I must say I am really glad you had the time to talk about the work you've done during this administration because as you point out it is an important issue – yes we all know that – and it is a bipartisan issue. I mean something that is not going to stop because Jimmy Carter is not reelected. It is an ongoing social issue is what it amounts to, not a political issue. So again I thank you for taking time to talk about it. If we needed to get in touch with you from the library, say in five years, how would be the best way to try to get in touch with you? Do you plan to stay in Washington?

Dogoloff: Yes, I plan to stay in the Maryland suburbs of Washington. I have continued to list my name in the phone book and would be happy to be available.

Soapes: Okay, good, because we would like to think that in another few years we could go around and do some more in depth interviews with people in the administration.

Dogoloff: That would be fun because we would have something we don't have today which is perspective.

Soapes: Right – time to percolate, very definitely.

Dogoloff: And we can see what's happening as a result. It would be very interesting to listen to this talk five years from now and say well, "What do I think of it today?" relative to where I was five years ago on the issue.

Soapes: Yeah, we hope we'll be able to do that sort of thing because I think it would provide a great deal of perspective. Okay we'll try to find you in the Maryland suburbs. Thank you!