

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

National Guard Counterdrug Operations: A Case For Greater Participation

by

Lieutenant Colonel Howard S. Thevenet
United States Army National Guard

Colonel Mark V. Montesclaros
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No.
0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 07-04-2003		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-2002 to xx-xx-2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE National Guard Counterdrug Operations: A Case Study for Greater Participation Unclassified			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Thevenet, Howard S. ; Author			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks Carlisle, PA17013-5050			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS ,			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached file.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 43	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Rife, Dave RifeD@awc.carlisle.army.mil	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified			c. THIS PAGE Unclassified	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number DSN
				Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18	

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Howard S. Thevenet, LTC, USARNG

TITLE: National Guard Counterdrug Operations: A Case For Greater Participation.

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 07 April 2003 PAGES: 43 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The National Guard has participated in the "War on Drugs" on several levels, using its unique relationship at the city, county and state levels to assist law enforcement, social services, and community support activities. The Guard has succeeded where federal agencies have not because it can rapidly respond and cooperate with local leaders across the nation. This SRP examines the role the Guard has played in counterdrug operations beginning with an analysis of applicable national strategies from the top down. Next it reviews the key laws involved in using the military in counterdrug operations and discusses specific roles of the Guard in this endeavor. Finally, it recommends changes for improving the effectiveness of the Guard in conducting counterdrug operations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....III

LIST OF TABLES.....VII

NATIONAL GUARD COUNTERDRUG OPERATIONS: A CASE FOR GREATER PARTICIPATION.....1

ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY (ONDCP) AND SOCIETAL IMPACTS OF DRUG ABUSE.....2

THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY AND ASSOCIATED MILITARY STRATEGIES.....6

THE LAW AND THE MILITARY.....9

THE MILITARY LINKAGE TO COUNTERDRUG OPERATIONS.....10

SOME DIFFERENCES: NATIONAL GUARD FORCES VERSUS ACTIVE DUTY IN COUNTERDRUG OPERATIONS.....11

THE NATIONAL GUARD ROLE.....13

WAYS TO ENHANCE THE GUARD INVOLVEMENT IN THE COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM.....18

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENHANCE THE NATIONAL GUARD EFFECTIVENESS.....23

CONCLUSIONS.....25

ENDNOTES.....29

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....33

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1..... COUNTERDRUG SUPPORT CATEGORY DESCRIPTION

TABLE 2.....PRO FORMA PROPOSED NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL BUDGET

NATIONAL GUARD COUNTERDRUG OPERATIONS: A CASE FOR GREATER PARTICIPATION

THE ROLE THE NATIONAL GUARD PLAYS IN COUNTERDRUG (CD) - PREVIEW

The use of the military to conduct the counterdrug mission in the war on drugs has to heated arguments both inside and outside the military establishment. The use of the National Guard is likewise controversial. Research indicates that there are indeed differing views concerning the use of the military, most supported by valid arguments. It appears that the United States will not rush toward legalization of drugs and will continue to conduct the war on drugs through the use of federal, state, and local Drug Law Enforcement Agencies (DLEAs).

The National Guard has uniquely supported the counterdrug mission. As an instrument of national power, the Guard represents one program with fifty-four subunits. But in reality it now has fifty-four units providing counterdrug support. Each program, combined under the National Guard Bureau (NGB), is maintained by a functioning unit in the hands of the governor of the state. The Guard approach works well. A one-size-fits-all plan will not work in each situation, because what works in New Mexico and Arizona may not in Montana or New York. The National Guard counterdrug program relies on each state to formulate an appropriate program to fit the threat confronted in that state. NGB has established a standard format for state plans to facilitate submission and approval. But after the local threat and priorities are specified, no two state plans are the same. Each reveals the individual methods the states employ to conduct the war on drugs.

Each state conducts its own mission analysis and risk assessment to tailor its program to fit state requirements. In New York, drug trafficking organizations importing cocaine, heroin, and other illicit narcotics through the various ports of entry pose the greatest threat.¹ Texas is a primary smuggling route and trans-shipment point for the major drug trafficking organizations, as well as a prominent supplier of domestically grown and synthetically produced drugs of every type.² According to the latest statistics, New Mexico leads the nation in drug

related deaths per capita, at 11.4 deaths per 100,000 persons; the national rate is 5.4 deaths per 100,000. Rio Arriba County, New Mexico, is the most lethal county for drug-related deaths in the US, with 18.3 deaths per 100,000 persons.³ Cocaine and heroin are the principle drugs smuggled into the US Virgin Islands from production sites in Latin American source countries.⁴ Wyoming ranks highest for first-time use in cocaine for thirteen-year-olds, and is second in first-time inhalant use.⁵ These threat numbers demonstrate that one plan will not suffice to fit all fifty-four state programs. This flexible state-by-state counterdrug plan focuses on the drug-related problem that is most pressing, using a Guard team approach. The National Guard team plans out how to counter identified problems. Local soldiers then work the plan in cooperation with law enforcement agencies to carry out the missions. The communities are engaged because the National Guard in their community are directly involved as neighbors. So the Guard designs individually tailored programs that meet the needs of each state and its communities, thereby best serving the public.

ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY (ONDCP) AND SOCIETAL IMPACTS OF DRUG ABUSE

President Richard M. Nixon first used the term “War on Drugs” during his election campaign in 1968. In a message to Congress on 17 June 1971, President Nixon portrayed drug abuse as a national emergency.⁶ When President Reagan observed little results in the late 1980’s, he resolved to form the Office Of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) to head the nation’s fight. He sought to form a single overall controlling headquarters for all agencies involved in combating drugs. This headquarters would be responsible for development of the nation’s counterdrug policy.

ONDCP is the primary agency within the Executive Branch responsible for developing, coordinating, and overseeing the implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy (NDCS). ONDCP oversees and coordinates both the international and domestic

counterdrug functions of all executive agencies and ensures those functions sustain and complement the government's overall counterdrug efforts.

The head of the ONDCP is commonly referred to as the "Drug Czar". Currently, that position is held by John Walters, who is responsible for the overall coordination of the nation's counterdrug policy and strategy in accordance with President Bush's intent. ONDCP consists of two major departments: Supply and Demand. A Deputy Director heads each of these departments. These Deputy Directors for Supply Reduction and Demand Reduction are responsible for assisting with the development of strategy and the coordination of all activities within their respective departments.⁷ This organization allows each of the two departments to concentrate on one aspect of the drug problem for maximum efficiency. It is the Drug Czar's responsibility to ensure that the efforts of both departments are consolidated and support the overall NDCS.

The 2002 NDCS has three national priorities, as opposed to the five presidential goals set forth in the 1999 strategy. Both the 1999 and the 2002 strategies cover the three means used to combat drugs in the United States: demand reduction, treatment, and supply interdiction. Demand reduction remains the highest priority, as it was in the 1999 NDCS. The president's NDCS seeks to reduce use of illegal drugs by 10 percent over two years and 25 percent over five years. These goals assume that lost ground can be regained in the fight against drugs by emphasizing a balance between supply and demand reduction efforts.⁸

The current NDCS, released in February 2003, establishes the President's priorities regarding all supply interdiction and demand reduction activities in the United States and further complements NDCS 2002. The NDCS was first released in 1989 and was thereafter produced annually until 1999. In 1999, General (Ret.) Barry McCaffrey, the Director of the ONDCP, changed the process. General McCaffrey and his staff produced the strategy, which aimed to provide the long-range goals of US Drug control through 2009, with a status report on

implementation annually. This strategy is critical to the military, including the National Guard, because all support provided by the military to DLEAs must directly support one of the five primary goals outlined in the NDCS.

The NDCS is the foundation upon which the many agencies of American political and social systems are joined in a common effort, with the goal of creating a drug-free America.

The strategy has five central goals:⁹

1. Educate and enable America's youth to reject illegal drugs as well as alcohol and tobacco.
2. Increase the safety of America's citizens by substantially reducing drug related crime and violence.
3. Reduce health and social costs to the public of illegal drug abuse.
4. Shield America's air, land and sea frontiers from the drug threat.
5. Break foreign and domestic drug sources of supply.

In support of goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 the National Guard shared between sixteen and nineteen percent of \$133 million for each goal. The funding was then broken down directly to the States and Territories to support their individual plans.¹⁰ Goal 3 is considered a private sector strategy, so minimal funds were allocated.

The central goals of this strategy make it absolutely clear that there is no single or easy solution to America's drug problem. Drug use and abuse present a challenge confronting all segments of society - young and old, rich and poor, as well as educated and under-privileged in urban and rural areas. Throughout America crime, health care costs, and the general demise of the nuclear family have caused despair and hopelessness that impact communities as a whole. These problems extend beyond America's borders and include most of the countries in Latin America. Many of the fledgling governments within this hemisphere run the risk of deteriorating into narco-democracies. In fact, the impacts of drug abuse have been felt throughout this hemisphere and the world.

Drug use in the United States also presents problems that could potentially destabilize

American society as well as the economy. Statistics indicate that one in nine Americans admit to using some form of illicit drug; the rate of increase in drug use by teenagers has more than doubled since 1994. Additionally, there are well-established links among drug use and crime and violence. The demand for drugs has created a climate of fear in many neighborhoods; drug-related crime and violence are not only prevalent in large cities, but have spread to small towns and rural areas as well. The social cost of combating drug-related crime is overtaxing both the criminal justice system and American jails.

The health care system is also in danger of being overburdened. Drug users share contaminated needles and thus spread the AIDS virus and other diseases. Those who seek medical and psychological rehabilitation to free themselves from drug addiction are draining assets that could be used to treat people with medical disorders unrelated to drugs.

ONDCP has conservatively estimated that the real costs to the American public can be measured through the billions of dollars spent annually for illegal drugs. Federal, state, and local governments collectively spend billions more in supply and demand reduction efforts, along with dealing in related problems stemming from drug use. The social cost was about \$160 billion in FY 2002 in terms of lost production and other costs associated with drug abuse and treatment.¹¹ Lastly, a quarter of a million U.S. citizens die drug-related deaths each year, and hundreds of thousands of infants are exposed to illicit drugs and drug-related diseases in the uterus.¹²

No nation, even one as strong as the United States, can afford to lose billions annually from its economy. Neither can it indefinitely absorb the level of damage drugs wreak on its social institutions as a direct result of the trafficking and use of illegal drugs. So it must be remembered that while the economic costs can be effectively calculated, no society can ever fully quantify the social hardships and suffering that drug abuse and drug trafficking causes.

The National Guard focuses on four out of five central goals of the NDCS. Counterdrugs

has become a military mission. The Guard conducts counterdrug operations in support of the NDCS at the most basic level when it tailors its state action plan. In an effort to reduce drug demand, the National Guard's State Demand Reduction Programs are a leading edge "force multiplier" focused on assisting schools, parents, and anti-drug, community-based organizations. Serving as drug-free role models, soldiers and airmen provide a positive influence on young Americans who increasingly face drugs, crime, and violence in our nation's school systems. In an effort to reduce drug supply within the continental United States, the National Guard supports various federal, state and local law enforcement agencies, task forces, and community-based prevention organizations. Law enforcement agencies greatly depend on the National Guard for specialized military equipment and highly trained soldiers and airmen, without which many interdiction operations would cease.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY AND ASSOCIATED MILITARY STRATEGIES

As outlined by President George W. Bush, the current National Security Strategy (NSS) specifies several goals the National Guard focuses on:

- Work with others to defuse regional conflicts
- Prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction¹³

The NSS core goal directs "Work with others to Defuse Regional Conflicts". Accordingly, President Bush states that the U.S. must work in the Western Hemisphere with countries that share U.S. priorities, particularly Mexico, Brazil, Canada, Chile, and Colombia to "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 working to reduce the demand for drugs in our own country.”¹⁴ The National Guard recognizes that the nation’s illicit drug crisis is not exclusively a problem of demand or supply, but stems from both. Because drug abuse continues to threaten the health of U.S. citizens as well as U.S. security, each Guardsman and woman knows that their neighborhoods and schools are battlefields where the struggle is waged one precious life at a time.

The second core goal “Prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends”, highlights the intertwined relationships between terrorism and drugs: “If you’re buying illegal drugs in America, it is likely that money is going to end up in the hands of terrorist organizations.” For example, the Taliban in Afghanistan trafficked 70 percent of the world’s opium trade, generating significant income for the Taliban and for the people that were harboring, feeding and hiding those who attacked and killed thousands of innocent Americans on September 11th. The Guard works the Supply and the Demand efforts under guidance from the DoD with approximately 2,300 soldiers and airmen (T-32). These Guardsmen have skills in foreign languages, intelligence analysis, map-making, communications, engineering, diving, marijuana eradication, transportation, logistics, cargo inspection, and surface and air reconnaissance and all were involved in counterdrug operations during previous fiscal years.

More than 280 metric tons of cocaine and 13 metric tons of heroin enter the U.S. each year. To keep drugs from reaching U.S. borders, the FY 2002 budget included nearly \$2.3 billion dollars for drug interdiction – an increase of over 10 percent from last year’s budget. Collaborative efforts to fight drug traffickers, whether they try to bring the drugs into this country by sea, by land, or by air will target the supply at the source.¹⁵ The National Guard supports national interdiction efforts alongside law enforcement agencies within their respective states.

Tom Ridge, Secretary of Homeland Security, will work closely with the U.S. southern and northern border patrols and the appropriate Guard units to identify ways we can improve the national border management system. Secretary Ridge’s efforts seek to achieve efficiency in

guarding our borders: Commerce must move, but the illegal flow of drugs must stop (SMART BORDERS).

In the Quadrennial Defense Review Report (QDR), dated September 30, 2001, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld stated that in order to build on the President's NSS, America's policy makers must deal with the increasing challenges and threats emanating from the territories of weak and failing states. Policy makers must also recognize that this absence of capable or responsible governments, particularly in the Western Hemisphere, creates a fertile ground for non-state actors engaging in drug trafficking, terrorism, and other worrisome activities that spread across borders.¹⁶

The QDR Paradigm Shift in Force Planning states that the highest priority of the U.S. military is to defend the nation from all enemies. The Defense Department will place new emphasis upon counterterrorism training for federal, state, and local first responders, drawing on the capabilities of the National Guard, to carry out this primary mission.¹⁷ Warfighting is the primary mission of the Guard. Guard counterdrug programs have revealed that these missions hone skills and gives back better quality soldiers and airmen, even as they stay qualified within their units to pass on these skills at all levels.

The National Military Strategy (NMS) 2002 specifies a National Military Objective: Defend the Homeland. The NMS observes that "existing military capabilities may have utility in a civil support role and those that are not otherwise committed to critical military missions (overseas – Active Component [AC]) can contribute to the interagency Homeland security effort...military forces will be prepared to assist civil authorities in managing crises and the consequences of any attack in the earliest possible stages".¹⁸ The National Guard will assume this mission to a greater degree as active units deploy. Guard units support planning and provide the best organic assets for military support to civil authorities. Yearly state exercises are conducted to flesh out the plans and improve existing partnerships in all fifty-four states and territories.

According to the NMS, the Guard is well positioned to meet this role. This is best illustrated annually when the Guard is called out for disaster relief whether it is for fire fighting, floods, or snowstorm. Civil support engages the Guard with the mission of fighting the enemy in any form.

THE LAW AND THE MILITARY

Certain U.S. laws prohibit the military from becoming directly involved in law enforcement activities. However, the military is permitted to provide support to federal, state, and local DLEAs. In accordance with Title 10, U.S. Code, Armed Forces, Chapter 18, Sections 371-381, "Military Support for Civilian Enforcement Agencies," Congress has permitted some latitude for military involvement.¹⁹ This legitimate involvement covers a myriad of roles for assisting in counterdrug programs to execute drug control policies. Since 1878, the Posse Comitatus Act (PCA) which means "the Power of the County", ended the practice of using federal troops to enforce civilian laws within the United States. As amended, the act reads, "Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."²⁰ In 1989, the Title 10, U.S. Code, Armed Forces, was further clarified by stating that military involvement "does not include or permit direct participation by a member of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Air Force in a search, seizure, arrest, or similar activity...unless otherwise authorized by law."²¹ Outside the U.S., the Mansfield Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act also prohibits DoD personnel from participating in arrests or police actions where hostilities are imminent.²² On U.S. soil, another legal constraint requires the military to get owners' permission before entry onto private land.²³

Congress has continued to scrutinize direct use of the military in counterdrug operations while allowing its support role to expand. The architects of PCA intended the law to serve as a barrier to the erosion of civil liberties. Lawmakers excluded the Guard to ensure that local

officials, including law enforcement authorities, had a reservoir of local manpower to tap in times of need. In event of such an emergency, Posse Comitatus provides a firewall against the pell-mell deployment of troops by the President against the American people. However, Governors can deploy the National Guard in full cooperation with federal authorities. Governors are free to recall their guardsmen should they feel that military actions are impinging on the rights of state citizens.

The Active Federal Forces are constrained by the provisions of PCA. State Governors have more discretion to authorize National Guard units to assist DLEAs in the war on drugs if those units remain under the control of the state government (Title 32). State-sponsored support may take place on U.S. soil and may be directed against citizens involved in criminal activities. As a result, the National Guard units have local flexibility, whereas federal forces do not. The DoD approves and funds Governors' State Plans for National Guard use. The states have decisive use of men and resources available and are unencumbered by PCA to support drug interdiction and other counternarcotics activities, as authorized by state laws.

THE MILITARY LINKAGE TO COUNTERDRUG OPERATIONS

Threats can be countered within U.S. borders using federal assets. Joint Task Force – 6 (JTF-6) is the federal support asset used and headquartered at Fort Bliss, Texas. The National Guard falls within JTF-6's purview by integrating under Title 32 in each border state to carry out missions. The Guard is the continuity that binds this program together locally, providing the cadre to DLEAs on a permanent basis. JTF-6 exists as a multi-service military oriented counterdrug organization. The Task Force's area of operations includes the four border states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California – a land area of more than 600,000 square miles.²⁴ JTF-6 was established in November 1989 at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. Its mission is to employ forces and conduct training in support of federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies throughout the southwestern border region in order to help counter the flow of illegal drugs into the United States. Under Operation Alliance, JTF-6 is a coordinating

agency manned by representatives of the various federal, state, and local drug enforcement agencies. The assistance process begins with a support request forwarded from the requesting DLEA to the Alliance. Operation Alliance reviews the request and forwards it to JTF-6. Before a mission is accepted for execution, it must provide mission essential task list training (METL) for the unit and provide a benefit to the nation's counterdrug effort. JTF-6 actively synchronizes and integrates DoD operational, technological, training and intelligence support to assist Domestic Law Enforcement Agencies in counterdrug efforts in the continental United States. The National Guard's role is key, providing needed troop strength and leadership on a continuing basis. Without Guard participation, CD programs would experience significant shortfalls based on the operational demands currently placed on the active forces.

SOME DIFFERENCES: NATIONAL GUARD FORCES VERSUS ACTIVE DUTY IN COUNTERDRUG OPERATIONS

The Governor, as the peacetime Commander in Chief of the state's National Guard units, controls the counterdrug program. For the counterdrug programs, the governors, along with their adjutants general (TAG) and the attorney generals, must read, approve, and sign the state plan. This document governs the use of counterdrug personnel and equipment in each state's program. After the governor approves and signs the document, it is returned to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) for approval. The Secretary of Defense and his staff review all the documents, make recommendations for changes, and eventually give approval for each state to conduct counterdrug operations. After OSD authorizes the states to conduct counterdrug operations, DoD releases the funds allowing the states to actually perform these missions.

There are some important differences in support provided by members of the National Guard with that provided by active and reserve members. Across the component lines some terms used to describe the types of missions are the same, whereas others, such as "demand reduction", have an entirely different meaning for active duty members and the National Guard. The description of the interdiction mission, "supply reduction", is the same for each component:

Both provide equipment, technology, and service members to provide DLEA support to stop the flow of drugs into the United States. Guardsmen are assigned to support DLEAs and Community Based Organizations (CBOs). When assigned, they are not limited to one hundred and eighty days of service (T-10 Guardsmen), as are service members assigned by the active component, as in the case of JTF-6. The National Guard provides continuity to the program, and its members are usually able to gain the trust and confidence of the DLEA officers they are supporting. Additionally, this mutual respect and healthy working relationship often proves invaluable. The National Guardsmen assigned to the counterdrug program perform this mission on a full-time basis (T-32), but they are not authorized absences from weekend drills or annual training periods with their assigned units. This preserves unit integrity and maintains combat readiness for warfighting, which remains the primary Guard role.

The “demand reduction” term means different things to the active and reserve components. Both reduce the demand for drugs, but the target audience of the demand differs. Active component leadership implements “demand reduction” by means of a urinalysis program (drug testing of soldiers and DoD civilians). This is beneficial to the Services, but has little effect outside the military community. In the National Guard, the term “demand reduction” refers to the outreach programs conducted in support of CBOs in local communities, as directed by the governor. The National Guard demand reduction program reached more than 18 million consumers in FY 2002.²⁵ Many of these outreach programs are similar to the activities conducted by police officers in the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), Drug Education For Youth (DEFY), Adopt-A-School, and Lunch-Buddy. These programs provide mentors, tutors, and role models to at-risk youth for the programs.²⁶ Results released in December 2002 from the annual “Monitoring the Future” survey, sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services, found significant national declines in youth drug use compared to 2001. The survey found use of any illicit drug in the past year decreased by a statistically significant amount from 2001 to 2002 among 8th and 10th graders. Among 10th graders, marijuana use in

the past year and past month decreased from 2001 to 2002, and daily use in the past month decreased as well. It amounts to this: 48 percent of youth who saw anti-drug ads frequently reported being less likely to try or use drugs, as opposed to 27 percent of youth who saw ads less than once a week.²⁷ The Guard is a part of this advertisement exposure through local contact in coalitions. The ability to put a soldier or airmen in the public eye that the community recognizes as one of their own helps bind many of these initiatives together. In this manner, the Guard is an obvious force multiplier.

THE NATIONAL GUARD ROLE

The National Guard has a continuing mission of defending America from the flow of illegal drugs and related security issues. The skill soldiers and airmen bring with them from their civilian jobs along with the military skills they use one weekend a month and two weeks during annual training, greatly foster relationships with the community. The National Guard Counterdrug Program (NG-CD) has members in most major communities. The Guard provides highly-skilled and quality personnel, specialized equipment, and facilities to support federal, state, and local drug LEAs as well as community-based organizations to reduce the demand for drugs. Within the NGB-CD Mission, National Guard Bureau (NGB) must ensure State Counterdrug Support programs obtain the funding and most effective training and equipment to meet Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) and Community-Based Organization counterdrug support needs. Further, NGB must ensure Unified Commands receive mission-ready individuals and units in support of U.S. Government counterdrug efforts OCONUS.

The National Guard Counterdrug Program (NGCDP) is a vital element of a coalition of National Guard members, law enforcement agencies (LEAs), and local communities involved in a multi-front battle against drugs and drug-related violence. The NGCDP consists of Army National Guard soldiers and Air National Guard members on full-time active duty status in accordance with Title 32, Section 112, United States Code. These soldiers and airmen come

from National Guard units throughout the states; they perform counterdrug (CD) duties in a support role.

In most states the NGCDP supports the Department of Public Safety (State Police), U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Postal Service, U.S. Customs Service, federal and state drug programs, county sheriffs' offices, and local police departments throughout the states. The activities of the NGCDP can be broken down into three major functional categories: demand reduction, supply reduction, and oversight of the National Guard substance abuse testing program. Specific program mission categories include support to community-based organizations and educational institutions, youth leadership development, coalition development and support, information dissemination, investigative case support, intelligence analysis, linguist support, photo development and interpretation, cargo/mail inspections, aviation support ground reconnaissance, and marijuana eradication. All of these programs are funded by a fiscal year 2002 and 2003 budget of approximately \$8.48M and 8.49M, respectively, under Defense-wide Programs.²⁸

The National Guard is versatile. For example, through the Governors' State Plans, the National Guard supports the National Interagency Counternarcotics Institute (NICI) at San Luis Obispo, CA by training managers and leaders in planning and coordination interagency counternarcotics operations. The Regional Counternarcotics Training Academy (RCTA), located at the Naval Air Station in Meridian, Mississippi, provides tactical/street level counternarcotics training. The Multi-Jurisdictional Counternarcotics Task Force Training program, located in St. Petersburg, Florida, provides interagency task force training and instruction on demand reduction issues. The Northeast Counternarcotics Training Center (NCTC), located at Ft. Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, provides training for law enforcement officers and demand reduction professionals. Over 45,000 personnel received counternarcotics training from these locations through the end of FY 2002.²⁹ The Guard has proven its effectiveness, continuity, and leadership in these cooperative programs. The relationships the

Guard builds extend beyond the period of instruction, and greatly enhance Guard ties to local communities.

During FY 2002, National Guard forces provided over 32,000 aviation flight hours, over 50 Engineer operations work-years, and over 700 work-years supporting intelligence requirements. National Guard forces also translated more than 120,000 pages of documents in support of the Drug enforcement Administration (DEA).³⁰ These efforts reveal the Guard's ability to impact as force multipliers where needed to support national counterdrug efforts.

The Army and Air National Guard assisted in over 100 seizures at U.S. ports of entry during FY 2002. National Guard efforts also aided in the seizure of over 6.5 metric tons of cocaine and over 62 metric tons of marijuana.³¹ While Guardsmen supplemented operational efforts through support roles, this allowed DLEAs to focus on their quarry and successfully apprehend illegal operatives with great success.

The National Guard missions complement and support the five presidential goals outlined in the NDCS. Its six primary mission categories are divided into subcategories. Category one is used to track management activities for the program, whereas mission categories two through six directly correlate to the NDCS. Missions two through five deal with supply-oriented operations, and category six applies to demand reduction operations. The authorized NG missions are displayed in Table 1.

Currently NGB-CD is configured into four regions: Northeast, Southeast, Northwest, and Southwest, as opposed to the three regions of the active component. The regions do not have an equal number of states assigned because the original configurations were based upon the common drug threats within the area. The Southeast region primarily deals with drugs flowing through the Caribbean, whereas the Southwest states chiefly deal with drugs entering the United States through Mexico. Monetary allocations are generally similar but not entirely equal.

The Southwest Region is the smallest, comprising only eight states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah. It has the fewest number of

states but the largest budget. The budget is based on the percentage of drugs that enter the country through transshipment across the 2000-mile border with Mexico. More than half of the cocaine on America's streets as well as large quantities of heroin, marijuana and methamphetamine - cross the southwest Border.³² OSD guidance states that the Southwest border, along with the other High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTAs), must receive 40-45 percent of the National Guard counterdrug budget.³³ HIDTAs are regions with critical drug-trafficking problems that harm or adversely affect other areas of the United States. The budgets for California and Texas are the two largest in the counterdrug program and both states are in this region. The Southwest region also includes two regional HIDTAs and two metropolitan HIDTAs. The Southwest border HIDTA encompasses Southern California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas; the Rocky Mountain HIDTA comprises Colorado and Utah. Los Angeles and Houston are the Metropolitan HIDTAs in this region.³⁴

The new "SMART BORDERS" program will encompass CD programs further in order to align relationships between Canada and Mexico as U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) defines missions, roles and plans in this area. The National Guard will integrate within this new structure, sharing its expertise with Canada and Mexico in the counterdrug fight and build upon its established relationships with DLEAs across both borders.

Table 1. Counterdrug Support Category Description³⁵

Category	Counterdrug Mission	Support Category Description
1	Program Management	Counterdrug Coordination, Liaison, & Management
2	Technical Support	
2a		Linguist Support/Translator Support
2b		Investigative Case and Analysis Support
2c		Deleted IAW OSD policy
2d		Communications Support
2e		Engineer Support
2f		Subsurface/Diver Support
3	General Support	
3a		Domestic Cannabis Suppression/Eradication Operations
3b		Transportation Support
3c		Maintenance/Logistical Support
3d		Cargo /Mail Inspection
4	Counterdrug Related Trn	Training LEA/Military Personnel
5	Recon/Observation	
5a		Surface Reconnaissance
		Unattended Sensor Support
		Visual Reconnaissance/Observation Mobil Patrols
		Listening Posts/Observation Posts (LPs/OPs)
		Ground Surveillance Radar (GSR)
5b		Aerial Reconnaissance
		Radars
		Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs)
		Aerial Visual Techniques, Including Infrared/Thermal Imagery, and Photographic Recon
		Photo Reconnaissance/Film Processing
6	Drug Demand Reduction	
6a		Community Based Demand Reduction Support
6b		Educational Institutional Demand Reduction Support
6c		Informational Demand Reduction Support
6d		Leadership Development
6e		Coalition Development

WAYS TO ENHANCE GUARD INVOLVEMENT IN THE COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM

The National Guard recognizes that the nation's illicit drug crisis is not exclusively a problem of demand or supply, but stems from both. Because drug abuse continues to threaten the health of the U.S., each Guardsman can participate to enhance programs in two roles. The first role has to do with the high visibility mission of the National Guard Demand Reduction (DDR) program, which is to organize and/or expand community efforts to form coordinated and complementary systems that reduce substance abuse in the States. Its focus is on community mobilization and assistance to neighborhood groups. Guardsman greatly assist with planning in these groups by setting goals and objectives that build neighborhood strength and resiliency that provide alternatives to drugs and drug-related crimes. The program sponsors a number of initiatives; it also provides resources augmenting current federal and state drug education and prevention programs. One southwest border state in fiscal year 2001 reached 30,060 people with a drug prevention message. Over 75 percent of them were children or teens.³⁶

A similar program is The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.³⁷ This campaign integrates the Guard into a high-impact advertising and public communications program which harnesses the power of the media to educate the nation's families, parents and youth about drug use and its consequences. The program is complemented by grass-roots public outreach to seek to reduce use through changes in youth perceptions of the dangers and negative personal and social consequences of using drugs. The campaign uses advertising, public communications, the internet, and print and broadcast media to influence youth attitudes and behavior. Uniformed Guardsmen are involved in this campaign; they portray leadership and values that greatly support this program.

Another venue is The Drug-Free Communities Program (DFCP),³⁸ which supports the development and expansion of community anti-drug coalitions throughout the United States. The program provides up to \$100,000 per year in grants that fund local anti-drug coalitions; local communities must match these grants. They are awarded through peer-reviewed annual

competitions. Community coalitions typically strive to increase community involvement and effectiveness in carrying out a wide array of drug prevention strategies, initiatives, and activities. Guard members, through their leadership and close community ties, have assisted in this program. Many of the governors' state plans include support for this program, further linking the Guard to the community as they search for ways to counter drug use.

Yet another National Guard Counterdrug program (NG-CD) develops leadership and team building. It offers two different activities: The first is the Ropes Challenge Course, an award-winning leadership and life-skills development program for youth. The course features 11 obstacles; ropes, cables and logs challenge the minds and bodies of the participants. This educational activity teaches young people to communicate, plan, think ahead, take responsibility for their actions as it helps them overcome their fears and prejudices. The program also offers a second state-of-the-art Leadership Reaction Course; its 12 obstacles take leadership and team development to the next level.³⁹ Through these programs, service members reach out to the young people in the community in hopes of mentoring and guiding youths to make healthy choices and remain drug free.

The NG-CD further connected with communities by developing the Methamphetamine Control Strategy in order to decrease the supply and demand for methamphetamine. The primary goal of this strategy is to increase public awareness of the harmful potential of this drug. The program strives to build networks across the states using conferences and presentations as a means to address the problems of methamphetamine use. The strategy includes an aggressive campaign of radio announcements, bumper stickers, television commercials, poster advertisements, billboards, literature, and a web site (www.antimeth.com).⁴⁰ NG-CD offers a methamphetamine touch screen kiosk that contains methamphetamine specific information; a computer and touch screen assist in the education of a targeted audience.⁴¹

Yet another program supported by the National Guard is The Youth Drug Prevention

Program, which increases a youth's ability to recognize and avoid the dangers of drugs and drug-related crimes. Anti-drug presentations in schools are a major element of this program. NG-CD members are trained to make presentations in schools from K-12 grades. The program also trains Army National Guard recruiters to make drug prevention presentations to high school students. Many of these school activities are conducted in partnership with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program.⁴²

NG-CD also conducts a Drug Education For Youth (DEFY) program in partnership with the U.S. Department of Justice. This program selects up to forty inner city children, ages nine to twelve, to attend a five-day residential summer camp, followed by a mentoring phase during the next school year.⁴³ This outreach program reveals the beauty of nature in the outdoors in a friendly environment not otherwise available to inner city youth. DEFY has succeeded using this fresh approach with nature as a backdrop and survival as a theme to assist high-risk youths.

A different outreach approach is The Freedom Academy Program funded primarily through the Governor's Division of Drug Policy, provided at no cost to students. The program is based on a multi-faceted curriculum that presents subjects such as self-esteem building, personal responsibility, leadership, cultural pride, awareness, and drug and gang education. These courses are presented over a long weekend at either military training sites or non-profit camps located throughout the states.⁴⁴ While many of these programs have demonstrated success, more engagement is required. The future of America and its children looks for leadership as they mature to adulthood. They need only to look to their parents and their neighbors, the members of the Army and Air National Guard, for role models.

Previous discussion has focused on demand reduction programs and Guard involvement. The second role involves Guard men and women in the mission of the National Guard Supply Reduction program. This effort effectively contributes to stem the flow of illegal

drugs into the United States. The program performs a variety of counterdrug missions in direct support of local, state, and federal law enforcement throughout the states. The Guard provides unique military-oriented skills, serving as a force-multiplier for LEAs. The types of support provided are diverse, focusing primarily on investigative and interdiction efforts. For fiscal year 2000, one such program, the New Mexico Counterdrug (NM-CD), was involved in locating and seizing 1,861 marijuana plants, 190,736 pounds of processed marijuana, 1,244 pounds of cocaine, 41 pounds of methamphetamine and other drugs – all with a total street value of over \$420M.⁴⁵

The Guard provides investigative support in several different categories. For example, program members perform translation of recorded interrogations/wire investigations. This support is cost-effective, and contributes to ongoing counterdrug efforts. Personnel are also assigned to provide operational case support and intelligence support, which significantly enhances the effectiveness of counterdrug investigations. Case support focuses primarily on case file documentation and management, while intelligence analysts utilize advanced skills to provide law enforcement with tactical interdiction and investigative options. Several program members are specifically trained in photo development and interpretation.⁴⁶

Supply interdiction efforts augment personnel and logistical resources of law enforcement agencies to assist them in reducing the drug threat. Program members work with U.S. Customs and the U.S. Postal Service to assist with cargo and mail inspections. Personnel are also used to man observation posts along the border, searching for drugs being brought into the country via backpack or mule. Finally, the program supports over 70 separate federal, state, local, and multi-jurisdictional law enforcement agencies in locating and eradicating marijuana under the Campaign Against Marijuana Planting (CAMP) program.⁴⁷

LEAs can also request technical support. To meet these demands, the program provides personnel trained to maintain communications equipment, ground sensors, and area

observation cameras.⁴⁸ This command and control ability further allows for economy of force ratios by controlling vast open spaces along U.S. borders where isolation can aid illicit drug runners in the transit zones. This allows law enforcement personnel to effectively surveil these open areas, minimizing any gaps that may occur.

As a part of supply reduction efforts, perhaps the most critical support the program provides LEAs is in the area of reconnaissance and observation. Surface and air reconnaissance support draws on unique military skills and equipment that law enforcement agencies do not possess. Specially trained reconnaissance personnel and aviators monitor activities in remote drug corridors. Helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft with thermal imaging provide invaluable information and support to LEAs.⁴⁹

The CD Program effectively uses several helicopters as part of its Reconnaissance and Aerial Interdiction Detachment (RAID). These helicopters are equipped with an infrared thermal imaging system, a daylight camera, a law enforcement compatible radio, and a Global Positioning System. They can be flown using Night Vision Goggles and they carry a 30 million candlepower Nitesun. In addition, they will soon be fitted with video downlink capability. They are used primarily for aerial reconnaissance and marijuana eradication operations.⁵⁰ These capabilities tip the scale in favor of LEAs when attempting to root out narcotraffickers.

In addition to the RAID vertical lift, NG-CD also employs a reconnaissance aircraft. Recent upgrades include a color TV imager with zoom and a state-of-the-art thermal imaging system offering remarkable clarity. Further, the aircraft features a moving map display and high-resolution digital and color photo capability. The fix-wing platform can stay airborne for several hours at a time, so it is ideally suited for covert aerial reconnaissance and observation. In times of national emergency, CD RAID and aircraft systems can provide invaluable command, control, and coordination to law enforcement and rescue recovery operations. Recent use has increased with the current world climate and emphasis on security. The Guard

is an integral part of all operations involving support of search, seizure and transport for law enforcement authorities in their efforts to apprehend smugglers or fugitives involved in illicit activity.

To further support drug interdiction activities, the NG-CD employs a variety of specialized equipment including a Light Armored Vehicle (LAV), night vision equipment, thermal vision equipment, an ion scanner, a Mobile Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (MVACIS), and various other technology to support counterdrug operations.⁵¹ The National Guard provides all these extremely valuable tools for the counterdrug fight without which LEAs would greatly be severely hampered.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENHANCE THE NATIONAL GUARD EFFECTIVENESS

The Department of Defense looks towards new concepts, roles and strategies for interagency integration and focus. The National Guard Bureau Counterdrug Program is the catalyst DoD can readily use to strengthen and maximize its role and focus in the new Homeland Security (HLS) environment. Pre-positioned in every state and seasoned for effective use, the NG-CD stands ready within the Unified Command Plan (UCP) at NORTHCOM. In addition, delegated operational control of the JTF-6 mission should go to the National Guard. The demonstrated effectiveness of the National Guard in the counterdrug mission would relieve the real world mission (OCONUS) to the active forces. Since funds are scarce, the mission to effectively blockade 12,000 miles of coastline, a 2000-mile border with Mexico, and 5,500-mile border with Canada is daunting. More funding rather than less must be applied effectively. The NG-CD State Plans provide the checks and balances to account for this much needed increase. The pro forma National Drug Control Budget reveals projected funding is not sufficient (see table 2). Increased reliance on National Guard capabilities in troop use and equipment implementation implies increased funding to support both.

The National Guard Bureau has collected plans tailored for each state and territory with balance, oversight, and an audit trail. The President's NDCS offers incentives that are controlled

at the state level. These incentives can effectively target success in interdiction coalitions as well as demand reduction coalitions as a one-two punch!

The National Guard is well suited for the Civil Support (CS) aspect of HLS and is well positioned doctrinally to support NORTHCOM to execute its HLS missions. TRADOC should conduct a full doctrinal review to ensure relevant publications are up to date and reflect the lessons learned from September 11, 2001 to the present. Fifty-four states and territories historically have fulfilled this role and empowerment of the National Guard in this regard is overdue.

The Army should anticipate and begin planning bilateral HLS conferences, seminars, and exercises with its Canadian and Mexican counterparts as soon as possible. The National Guard already engages in information-sharing and coalition building on a strategic level with DLEAs in this venue. The National Guard should lead and be integrated into this initiative to a greater degree.

Senior executive level military training should be provided to key personnel in the lead DLEAs that DoD supports. The National Guard already provides such courses to DLEAs through the National Interagency Civil-Military Institute (NICI), the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy (RCTA), the Northeast Counterdrug Training Center (NCTC), and the Multi-Jurisdictional Counterdrug Task Force Training program (MCTFT). These efforts must be strengthened.

Increased funding for demand reduction offers the most feasible solution in the war on drugs. If the insatiable demand for drugs can be reduced, the need for interdiction will diminish accordingly. The National Guard has proven effectiveness with heavy emphasis of “demand-side” programs in local communities. Guard support reaches even further, because it is enacted in communities across the nation. The Guard supports the demand reduction mission in each city where an armory or Air Base is located, and where Guard members live.

The National Guard must selectively support coalitions based on their effectiveness. Coalitions are great assets because they bring together many sectors of the community and focus them in a community-wide prevention effort. Allocations must be increased to civilian demand reduction efforts such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters for their work in the local community. Organizations such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Pounders, and Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) offer outstanding programs that are making strides in demand reduction. However, many of the great strides in these programs are possible in part because of the support provided by the National Guard.

CONCLUSIONS:

The war against drugs must be balanced on both fronts. The United States cannot focus entirely on interdiction and neglect demand reduction, nor can it focus entirely on demand reduction and leave its borders wide open. The solution to winning the war on drugs is a balanced approach between both fronts. The National Guard maintains a visible, viable, and versatile locally-aligned resource that is airborne and ground surveillance capable. The Guard is unique and has the flexibility to tailor this mission to local problems, unencumbered by PCA yet controlled by States under Title 32. Further, it has a proven track record with consistency, which has won the trust at all levels with DLEAs. It provides needed skills, equipment, and logistics along with the continuity to carry on these programs. National Guard Demand programs have proven results measured by youth drug use reduction. America's children, the lifeblood of the future, see guardsmen at their best. Guardsmen are the catalysts engaged with youth in leadership, mentorship and empowerment by uplifting them with a positive reinforcement of values. Demand and supply programs require more funding not less. Budgetary shortages demand that leaders scrutinize whether programs that the President's messages allude to, that is to effectively deal with the fight against drugs. The National Guard has these programs already in place. They must be monitored and the National Guard's CD

programs meet DoD's seal of approval on all levels. The NSS, NDCS, and the NMS all delineate the process by which the fight must continue. The National Guard's programs are a proven success. The program effectively illustrates the future ends, ways and means to reduce drug use, eliminate supply flow and free up troop units for worldwide contingency shortfalls. The National Guard makes a solid contribution to national counterdrug efforts illustrating that there is no single solution or one-size-fits all approach. These efforts must continue at a greater pace.

WORD COUNT = 8089

Table 2. **Pro Forma Proposed National Drug Control Budget**
(Budget Authority in Millions)⁵²

Agency/Account	FY01	FY02	FY03	Change Fy02-03
Defense	970.0	847.6	848.9	1.3
Education (Safe & Drug Free Schools)	644.3	679.3	644.3	(35.0)
Health & Human Services				
Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Admin	2,175.0	2,305.8	2,371.0	65.2
National Institute on Drug Abuse	783.6	890.9	948.5	57.6
Justice				
Drug Enforcement Admin	1,480.4	1,605.4	1,698.5	93.1
Interagency Crime & Enforcement	325.2	338.6	362.1	23.5
Immigration & Naturalization Service	201.7	210.1	328.5	118.4
Office of Justice Programs	214.8	255.5	240.2	(15.3)
Office of National Drug Control Policy	502.1	533.3	523.1	(10.2)
State	279.3	859.0	883.2	24.2
Transportation (USCG)	745.4	540.4	629.2	88.8
Treasury				
Customs Service	714.7	1,004.0	1,004.4	0.4
Interagency Crime & Drug enforcement	103.2	107.6	107.6	0.0
Veterans Affairs	680.9	709.4	741.8	32.4
Other Presidential Initiatives*	3.5	53.0	58.0	5.0
Total, Federal Drug Control Budget	9,824.6	10,939.9	11,389.3	449.4

ENDNOTES

¹ David Slocum, New York Counterdrug State Plan, (Washington, D.C.: National Guard Bureau, 2001), 4.

² Russell Malesky, Texas State Counterdrug Plan, (Washington, D.C.: National Guard Bureau, 2001), 4.

³ Andrew Salas, New Mexico Counterdrug State Plan, (Washington, D.C.: National Guard Bureau, 2001), 4.

⁴ Michael McDonald, Virgin Islands Counterdrug State Plan, (Washington, D.C.: National Guard Bureau, 2001), 4.

⁵ Max S. Beebe, Wyoming Counterdrug State Plan, (Washington, D.C.: National Guard Bureau, 2001), 4.

⁶ Steven Wisotsky, Breaking the Impasse in the War on Drugs, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1986), 3.

⁷ Department of Justice, Drugs, Crimes, and the Justice System, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998), 78.

⁸ U.S. Government, The National Drug Control Strategy, (Washington, D.C.: The White House, February 2002), [Journal on-line]; available from <http: www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/20020212-2.html>; internet accessed 23 September 2002.

⁹ U.S. Government, National Drug Control Strategy, (Washington, D.C.: The White House, 2000), 5-6.

¹⁰ U.S. Government, National Guard Counterdrug Program, "FY 2001 Annual Performance Report." Chap 7, 45.

¹¹ U.S. Government, Office of National Drug Control Strategy, 'Facts and Figures.' 1999; available from http://whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/drugfact/f_and_f/contents.htm; Internet; accessed 1 February 2003.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ U.S. Government, The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002), 1-2.

¹⁴ Ibid., 10.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Donald H. Rumsfeld and Henry H. Shelton, Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review, (Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Defense, September 30, 2001), 5

¹⁷ Ibid., 19

¹⁸ Richard B. Myers, National Military Strategy of the United States of America, (Washington, D.C.: Dept of Defense, September 19, 2002), 15.

¹⁹ Military Support for Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies, U.S. Code, title 10, chapter 18, sec. 371-379 (1999).

²⁰ Use of Army and Air Force as Posse Comitatus, U.S. Code, vol. 9 title 18, sec. 1385 (1995).

²¹ Military Support for Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies, U.S. Code, title 10, chapter 18, sec. 375 (1994).

²² Thomas Tudor and Mark E. Garrard, "The Military and the War on Drugs," The Air Force Law Review (Washington, D.C.: U.S. government Printing Office, Vol37, 1994), 277.

²³ Dale E. Brown, "Drugs on the Border: Role of the Military," Parameters 21 (Winter 1991-92): 57.

²⁴ George A. Woodbury, "JTF-6 and the War on Drugs." Engineers (April 1992): Vol. 22 Issue 2, Pg55, 2p [database on-line]; available on EBSCO Host. Accessed on 23 September 2002.

²⁵ U.S. Government, Office of the National Drug Control Strategy, FY 2004 Budget Summary, (The White House, February 2003), 15.

²⁶ DARE America, D.A.R.E. Is Community Policing (Los Angeles: D.A.R.E. America, no date provided): <http://www.dare.com/index2.html>; accessed 8 February 2003.

²⁷ Ibid., FY 2004 Budget Summary, 81

²⁸ Institute of Land Warfare, "Fiscal Year 2003 Army Budget" (Arlington, Virginia: AUSA, June 2002), 24.

²⁹ Ibid., FY 2004 Budget Summary, 16.

³⁰ Ibid., 16.

³¹ Ibid., 16.

³² U.S. Government, Office of National Drug Control Policy, The National Drug Control Strategy, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002), 73.

³³ Deborah G. Rosenblum, "Preparation of Fiscal Year 2002/2003 National Guard Counterdrug Governors' State Plans and Other National Guard Counterdrug Programs," memorandum, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C., 2002.

³⁴ Richard Y. Yamamoto, "High Intensity Drug Trafficking areas Program, Fiscal Year 1997," memorandum, Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Washington, D.C., November 1996, 2.

³⁵ Departments of the Army and Air Force, Emergency Employment of the Army and Other Resources national Guard Counterdrug Support, Army National Guard Regulation (NGR) 500-2/Air National Guard Instruction (ANGI) 10-801 (Washington, D.C.: Departments of the Army and Air Force, 2001), 8.

³⁶ James Tipmongkol, "New Mexico National Guard Counterdrug Program", Information Paper, 8 January 2002.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 79.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 79.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 2

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 2

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 2

⁴² *Ibid.*, 2

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 2

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 3

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 4

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 4

⁵² Office of the National Drug Control Policy, Pro Forma Proposed National Drug Control Budget Fiscal Year 2003 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002) [database

online]: http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/pbublications/policy/03ndcs/appendix_b.htm;
accessed 5 February 2003.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Dale E. "Drugs on the Border: The Role of the Military." Parameters 21 (Winter 1991-92): 50-59.
- Bush, George W., "Domestic Use of Military Grabs Nation's Attention." National Guard (August 2002): 12-16. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 23 September 2002.
- Carden, Dana E. The War On Drugs: What Role Should The National Guard Play? Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 3 March 1998.
- Collins, Jack The 1999 National Drug Control Strategy: Time to Reduce the Demand for Illegal Drugs. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 10 April 2000.
- DARE America, "D.A.R.E. Is Community Policing", (Los Angeles: D.A.R.E. America, no date provided); <http://www.dare.com/index2.html>; accessed 8 February 2003.
- Institute of Land Warfare. Fiscal Year 2003 Army Budget. Arlington, Virginia: Association of the United States Army, June 2002.
- Jehl, Douglas. "Military Delayed Raid on Border Drug Tunnel." The Los Angeles Times (June 20, 1990): 1. Database on-line. Available on ProQuest. Accessed 23 September 2002.
- McCaffrey, Barry R. "The Wrong Way to Fight Drug War." Boston Globe (March 10, 1999): A23. Database on-line. Available on ProQuest. Accessed on 23 September 2002.
- Military Support for Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies. Title 10, U.S. Code. Chapter 18, sec.371-379 (1999).
- "Misusing the Military." The New York Times (July 24, 2002): 18. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 23 September 2002.
- Ridge, Tom. "Modifying Posse Comitatus Puts Americans In Danger." Washington Times (September 2, 2002): 45. Database on-line. Available on ProQuest. Accessed on 23 September 2002.
- Rosenblum, Deborah G., "Preparation of Fiscal Year 2002/2003 National Guard Counterdrug Governors' State Plans and Other National Guard Counterdrug Programs." Memorandum for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Washington, D.C., 2002.
- Salcedo, Sylvester L. "A Veteran of the Drug War Fires at U. S. Policy." The Washington Post (February 6, 2000): B.5. Database on-line. Available on ProQuest. Accessed on 23 September 2002.
- Shaffer, David W. An Analysis Of The Military's Role In America's Counterdrug Operations. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 10 April 2000.
- Stanton, John J. "War on Drugs: U. S. Has No Exit Strategy." National Defense Industrial Association, 1 May 2001. sec. No. 570, Vol. 85; Pg. 18; (2827 words) [database on-line]; available from Lexis-Nexis; Accessed 23 September 2002.

- The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002.
- The President's National Drug Control Strategy, Washington, D.C.: The White House, February 2002.
- Tipmongkol, James. "New Mexico National Guard Counterdrug Program", Information Paper, 8 January 2002.
- Tutor, Thomas and Mark E. Garrard. "The Military and the War on Drugs." The Air Force law Review Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Vol 37, 1994.
- U.S. Departments of the Army and Air Force. Emergency Employment of the Army and Other Resources National Guard Counterdrug Support. Army National Guard Regulation (NGR) 550-2/Air National Guard Instruction (ANGI) 10-801. Washington, D.C.: Departments of the Army and Air Force, 2001.
- U. S. Government, Department of Justice, "National Drug Intelligence Center." New Mexico Drug Threat Assessment, (April 2002): 1-25. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 23 September 2002.
- U.S. Government, Joint Interagency Task Force East, "Mission Statement", 1 September 2000: available from <http://www.jiatfe.org/index.html>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2003
- U.S. Government, Joint Task Force Six, "Counterdrug Support", 29 September 2000: available from <http://www-jtf6.bliss.army.mil/html/missiom.html>; Internet accessed 6 February 2003.
- U.S. Government, National Drug Control Strategy. Washington, D.C.: The White House, 2000.
- U.S. Government, National Drug Control Strategy. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002.
- U.S. Government, Office of National Drug Control Strategy, "Facts and Figures." 1999. Available from http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/drugfact/f_and_f/contents.html Internet: accessed 1 February 2003.
- U.S. Government, Office of National Drug Control Strategy, "Fact Sheet for Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center (CTAC)." February 6, 1997. Available from <http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/scimed/factsht.html> Internet; accessed 23 September 2002.
- U.S. Government, Office of National Drug Control Policy, "Pro Forma Proposed National Drug Control Budget 2003." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. Available from <http://www.whitehousepolicy.gov/publications/policy/03ndcs/appendix-b.html>. Internet; accessed 5 February 2003.
- U.S. Government, USCINCPAC, "United States Pacific Command Facts", 14 December 2000. Available from <http://www.pacom.mil/about/pacom/html>. Internet; accessed 6 February 2003.
- Use of Army and Air Force as Posse Comitatus. U.S. Code. Vol. 9, title 18, sec. 1385 (1995).

- Wilbanks, Larry W., The Use of National Guard Assets for Counterdrug Operations in the War on Drugs, Masters Project. Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 2002.
- Woodbury, George A. "JTF-6 And the War On Drugs." Engineer (April 1992): Vol. 22 Issue 2, Pg. 55, 2p. Database on-line. Available on EBSCO Host. Accessed on 23 September 2002.
- Yamamoto, Richard Y. "High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, Fiscal Year 1997." Memorandum for Executive Office of the President, Office of the National Drug Control Policy. Washington, D.C., November 1996.
- Zeliff, Bill and Jack X. Dempsey "Military Seeks Balance in Delicate Mission: The Drug War; As Involvement Expands, Law and History Are Basic Guides." The Washington Post (November 29, 1996): A.01. Database on-line. Available on ProQuest. Accessed on 23 September 2002.