

094039

B-164031(2)

ENCLOSURE C



Drug Abuse Control Program
Activities In The Philippines B 164031(2)

Department of Defense

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

~~71193~~

094039

AUG 11, 1972

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER	
1 PHILIPPINE ISLANDS	1
General information	1
Navy	1
Air Force	2
2 AIR FORCE	3
Law enforcement and drug suppression	3
Educational programs	4
Identification of drug users	8
Amnesty, Limited Privileged Communication, and Exemption Programs	9
Drug problems in Dependents Schools	12
Observations	15
3 NAVY	17
Law enforcement and drug suppression	17
Educational programs	20
Identification of drug users	25
Amnesty, Limited Privileged Communication, and Exemption Programs	26
Observations	29
APPENDIX	
I Activities visited on the Philippines during GAO study, July through November 1971	31
II Principal officials of the Department of Defense and the military departments responsible for activities discussed in this report	32

ABBREVIATIONS

NIS	Naval Investigative Service
SCOPE	Suffolk County Organization for the Promotion of Education

CHAPTER 1

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Two major concentrations of American military personnel, civilian employees, and dependents of both groups are present in the Philippine Islands. Navy activities center around the U.S. Naval Base in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area, Air Force activities center around Clark Air Base. That portion of the study of drug abuse control program activities affecting military personnel discussed in this enclosure to the General Accounting Office report¹ was performed at selected Navy activities in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area and Air Force activities at Clark Air Base. The information in this enclosure was obtained by interviewing program management and service personnel participating in the programs. Additional information was obtained from departmental records

The Philippine laws require a permit and tax certificate for a doctor to dispense heroin and opium; however, enforcement of this requirement is reported to have been relatively lax. The local Philippine Constabularies have had little success in curtailing the activities of identified drug sources in the local economy. A new Philippine antidrug law which was awaiting approval by the Philippine Senate holds promise of a more aggressive program to combat the growing local drug problem.

NAVY

The Subic Bay Naval Base provides direct support to the U.S. 7th Fleet in Southeast Asia operations through 3,300 military personnel assigned to the major commands, detachments, and units located in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area. Most of these personnel were under 25 years of age. In addition to this military population, about 450 American civilian employees and about 3,800 dependents of both groups were in

¹"Drug Abuse Control Activities Affecting Military Personnel, Department of Defense" (B-164031(2), July 1972.

the area. In recent years approximately 2 million military personnel annually have passed through the Subic Bay area on liberty.

All forms of illegal drugs were readily available to military personnel in the Subic Bay area. Marihuana was grown locally, and amphetamines, as well as some LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide)--a hallucinogenic drug--were being produced in a few nearby areas. Heroin is believed to be finding its way to Subic Bay by merchant ships making routine port calls and by aircraft arriving from Hong Kong.

The Subic Drug Abuse Suppression Program was formalized by instruction 6710.4, dated July 28, 1971. All commanding officers were to be responsible for developing an effective program to prevent and eliminate drug abuse within their commands. A naval base drug abuse team, which met weekly, held its first meeting on July 7, 1971. The team was set up to assist commanding officers in preventing and eliminating drug abuse within their commands.

AIR FORCE

In August 1971 about 11,300 military personnel were assigned to Clark Air Base, about 50 percent of whom were less than 25 years of age. The base had 785 American civilian employees and 16,000 dependents of military and civilian personnel. It had served as a temporary stopping-off place for over 18,000 transient personnel in recent years.

We were informed that the local community adjacent to Clark Air Base had a serious drug problem. Dangerous drugs and narcotics were sold in just about every drugstore without prescription. Barbiturates and amphetamines could be purchased at neighborhood grocery stores.

Only limited information was available about the extent of the drug problem among Air Force personnel at Clark Air Base. The Department of Defense's worldwide, servicewide drug use survey, conducted under contract by the Human Resources Research Organization, included in its sample 935 Clark Air Base personnel, however, only 590 of those personnel completed their questionnaires. A separate drug survey was initiated by the Air Force in September 1971. A drug abuse council was established at Clark Air Base in July 1971 to coordinate efforts to combat drug abuse.

CHAPTER 2

AIR FORCE

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND DRUG SUPPRESSION

The Clark Air Base Security Police, the Office of Special Investigation, and the Staff Judge Advocate were responsible for law enforcement efforts. All investigations related to drugs were being handled by the Office of Special Investigation.

Security police

The Clark Air Base Security Police inspection team--consisting of 17 security policemen and four marijuana dogs--inspected incoming aircraft for drugs. From June 1971 the team inspected all aircraft and baggage arriving from Southeast Asia and 20 percent of the aircraft arriving from other parts of the world. The team did not find any significant amount of drugs.

Office of Special Investigation

The Air Force Office of Special Investigation had about 60 agents in the Philippines, of whom six were working full time on drug abuse investigations involving Air Force personnel and dependents. The Office of Special Investigation coordinated its efforts with the Philippine Constabulary and the security police. The number of such investigations jumped sharply between 1969 and 1971.

Staff Judge Advocate

Between January 1, 1970, and June 30, 1971, there were five general courts-martial for possession of drugs. Of these, four resulted in bad conduct discharges and one in acquittal. There were six special courts-martial for drug possession, which resulted in three acquittals and three guilty verdicts with punishments of fines, confinements, and rank reductions. Between January 1, 1970, and June 30, 1971, 46 of the 1,506 nonjudicial punishment cases under article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice were for possession or use of drugs. Of the 46 cases, 32 involved marijuana.

and 14 involved dangerous drugs, 42 resulted in fines, reductions in rank, and/or confinements and four resulted in suspended reductions in rank

Local civil courts

During the period January 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971, 17 U S military personnel were charged in civil courts on drug charges. Nine cases were dismissed, and jurisdiction was waived in two cases, one case resulted in a conviction, and five cases were pending. The convicted airman was sentenced to a 3-month confinement in a Philippine correctional institution.

Effectiveness of law enforcement

No studies were made on the effectiveness of law enforcement efforts in preventing drug abuse. Of the 25 Air Force personnel we interviewed by questionnaire, 13 felt that strict law enforcement was not very effective in preventing drug abuse but nine felt that strict law enforcement was effective.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Air Force installation commanders were responsible for developing and conducting education programs for military personnel. The 10-man council on drug education established by the Clark Air Base commander was tasked with developing an education program for base personnel and met for the first time on July 22, 1971. The council was not intended as a replacement for existing efforts but as a means of coordinating and disseminating information about drugs. A Drug Education and Control Office also was established in July 1971 to coordinate all drug programs. No standardized drug abuse education program had been established at the time of our visit to the base, however, in October 1971 the council was developing presentations for a base lecture team. Prior to that time education about drugs was given at the squadron level and was not standardized in the different units.

Units have used several sources of material for drug education. The Office of Special Investigation gave 28 briefings to 1,796 personnel during calendar year 1971. The base

audiovisual library had 13 films available on drugs and drug abuse. The base publications distribution office made posters and publications available to unit commanders on request.

We reviewed the education activities of three units at Clark: the 6200th Security Police Squadron, the 605th Tactical Control Squadron, and the 405th Field Maintenance Squadron.

6200th Security Police Squadron

The Security Police Squadron was giving a drug orientation briefing to all newly assigned squadron personnel within 7 days of arrival. The briefing was designed to enable security police to identify the drugs that were abused in the local area and to highlight the legal and medical consequences of drug abuse. The same briefing was being given to all squadron personnel every quarter.

405th Field Maintenance Squadron

From January 1971 the 405th Field Maintenance Squadron was holding orientation briefings every Tuesday. The briefings, given by the squadron commander, were about the local drug scene. In addition to holding the orientation briefings, the squadron commander devoted one of his monthly squadron briefings each quarter to drug abuse. A guest speaker who was an expert on some aspect of the drug problem was invited to lecture. During calendar year 1971 the guest speakers were an Office of Special Investigation agent who talked about the drug scene around Clark, a doctor who spoke about the medical problems resulting from drug use, and a security policeman who discussed drugs and how to identify them. The talks lasted about 1 hour each. The squadron also distributed pamphlets and posters when they were available.

605th Tactical Control Squadron

The 605th Tactical Control Squadron was not able to develop a regularly scheduled drug education program because many of its personnel were deployed away from Clark. Two orientation programs a year were planned. The first, given in July 1971, was a 1-hour briefing by an Office of Special Investigation agent about the drug problem at Clark and in

Southeast Asia That briefing was given to officers and senior noncommissioned officers An initial briefing for all squadron personnel was to be given in November 1971 by an Office of Special Investigation speaker

During 1971, the squadron showed two movies and the commander briefed the unit three times The commander also emphasized the Limited Privileged Communication Program at monthly briefings All men granted access to classified material were briefed individually about drug abuse by the squadron security officer

The officer in charge of the squadron's drug education program felt that it was modest but adequate He felt that too much education might be detrimental rather than helpful in combating drug abuse None of the squadron personnel or wing commanders whom we talked to knew of any basewide education program

Radio, TV, and newspaper messages

With the exception of a special antidrug campaign in January 1971, there were few drug programs or spot announcements until August 15, 1971

The Philippine Flyer, the Clark Air Base newspaper, published several articles on drugs during the past year, however, personnel responsible for the newspaper felt that too many articles on the issue might be more harmful than too few articles

Air Force Drug Abuse Education Team

The Air Force's Traveling Drug Abuse Education Team, consisting of five officers (a chaplain, a psychiatrist, a personnel officer, a legal officer, and an information officer), conducted discussions and presentations from October 27 to October 30, 1971, for Clark Air Base personnel involved with the drug program education activities

Effectiveness of education programs

The effectiveness of drug education was not evaluated We interviewed 25 individuals--airmen and officers through

Lieutenant Colonel--to determine the extent and effectiveness of the drug education program. Of the 24, who acknowledged having had some drug education, 20 felt the education was factual and credible, three said they had not paid attention or had not had enough education to comment, and one said the education was not credible.

The personnel we interviewed did not agree on what was effective about the education. Five felt movies were effective, two felt Office of Special Investigation agents' lectures were effective, and four felt nothing was effective. Others felt that exhibits of drug paraphernalia and drugs, lectures by former addicts, lectures emphasizing penalties, and Stars and Stripes newspaper articles were effective.

Whereas 17 of the individuals interviewed felt that their views were representative of their peers, five did not and three did not know.

IDENTIFICATION OF DRUG USERS

The 13th Air Force Drug Abuse Counter Offensive Program for Taiwan and the Philippines required that personnel stationed in the Philippines, except those on temporary duty for less than 30 days, not be permitted to depart unless they had urine tests with confirmed negative results. Personnel with confirmed positive results were being detained pending detoxification and retesting. Refusal to provide a urine sample could be considered a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. However, 13th Air Force program instructions did provide that personnel identified as drug users through urinalysis testing not be subject to courts-martial or article 15 proceedings under the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

From the start of testing on August 17, 1971, through October 21, 1971, 2,383 urine samples were tested, 13 of which were positive.

We visited the Clark Air Base collection facility which was, at that time, staffed by a hospital administrative clerk and a security policeman. The controls at the facility were weak, and they did not insure that the identities of the personnel providing the urine specimens were correct. The personnel monitoring collection of the specimens were not located so that they could observe the collection. Some personnel who reported for their urine tests said they could not void their samples and were allowed to leave the collection facility. According to a hospital clerk some personnel returned as many as four times before furnishing samples.

All personnel on duty in the urine collection facility or detoxification ward were required to have urine tests every 30 days, however, only nine of 19 security policemen assigned to the detoxification ward and the urine collection facility had been tested. No control list of those authorized and tested for duty in the detoxification ward or urine collection facility was maintained at the hospital.

At the time of our review in October 1971, the urine-testing laboratory was testing only for narcotics. Testing for barbiturates and amphetamines was scheduled to begin on or about November 15, 1971.

One Clark Air Base medical official stated that he did not think urine tests were accurate. He said that he had a patient who admitted taking drugs and who had withdrawal symptoms but that results from the urine test were negative. An official at the urine-testing facility said the test would be 100 percent accurate once all the equipment was in operation.

Resources for detoxification ward
and urinalysis-testing laboratory

The Clark Air Base civil engineer expended about \$2,100 to renovate existing facilities for use as a detoxification ward and urinalysis-testing laboratory. The urinalysis-testing laboratory received about \$62,700 worth of testing equipment from Brooke Air Force Base, Texas. The hospital was given approval for 34 additional authorized personnel positions, of which 20 were for the urine-testing laboratory and 14 were for the detoxification center.

AMNESTY, LIMITED PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION,
AND EXEMPTION PROGRAMS

The Drug Education and Control Officer was in charge of the Limited Privileged Communication and rehabilitation programs at Clark Air Base. His duties included monitoring the education and rehabilitation programs. The programs were being administered according to the guidelines provided in a March 1971 message from the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Air Force, which cited the establishment of the Air Force's Limited Privileged Communication Program.

Air Force personnel at Clark Air Base had various views on the Limited Privileged Communication Program. The Staff Judge Advocate believed that the program was merely a vehicle for drug abusers to avoid prosecution and furthermore was directed only to helping the hard-drug user. The base vice commander felt that the Air Force was not the proper place for rehabilitating drug users. The Drug Education and Control Officer informed us that the program was good but that more trained psychologists and psychiatrists were needed to effectively rehabilitate drug users.

All 25 Air Force personnel whom we interviewed by questionnaire said they had heard of the Air Force program, however, eight individuals did not know the program's important provisions. Squadron commanders informed us that the program was still being emphasized at Commander's Call briefings.¹ Six individuals felt that the program was not trusted by younger airmen. Several individuals indicated that mistrust of the program resulted from the young airmen's general distrust of older people and the military. Several individuals thought that rehabilitation and exemption from punishment were the most important provisions of the program.

As of October 30, 1971, 49 Air Force personnel had volunteered to be helped under the program. To ascertain the views of those personnel who had entered the program, we interviewed eight of the 14 who were still located at Clark Air Base. Five felt that the troops did not trust the program, they said that most personnel felt it would backfire on them and that they were waiting to see what would happen to the personnel already in the program.

None felt they had been harrassed in any way after entering the program. One individual said he had been placed on a control roster which prohibited him from being promoted for 1 year and felt that this was unjust punishment. Air Force officials, on the other hand, felt that it was justified administrative action. Two individuals had their human reliability status removed and several had their security clearances suspended, but none expressed the view that this was unjust.

The personnel who entered the program did so for various reasons, some of which were to get out of the Air Force, to get off and stay off heroin, and to stop using other drugs.

The rehabilitation program at Clark included discussions with a psychiatrist, group sessions, and individual

¹Commander's Call is a regularly scheduled meeting conducted by a unit commander to present information to personnel under his command.

"rap" or counseling sessions with a lawyer, a doctor, a chaplain, and a unit commander. Two individuals in the program said that the group sessions were not beneficial. They said that the group included alcoholics and personnel with mental problems who did not understand drug-related problems. The individual sessions began September 29, 1971, and only three individuals had attended at the time of our review. One individual who had attended felt that the sessions were good and that they enabled him to discuss his problems freely. One individual who had dropped out of group therapy said he had not heard of the individual counseling sessions, neither had his first sergeant.

Pay and entitlement practices
for drug abusers

Military personnel assigned to Clark Air Base and identified as drug users were receiving their regular pay unless medical personnel determined that they were not physically capable of performing their duties and "line-of-duty--no" determinations were processed. Participants in the Limited Privileged Communication Program were not exempt from the line-of-duty determination.

We found that one line-of-duty--no determination had been made for an individual admitted to the detoxification ward, however, it was still being processed and no pay had been withheld from the individual. All personnel in the rehabilitation program received their basic pay. We found no case where pay had been withheld because of an alcohol problem.

DRUG PROBLEMS IN DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Programs to provide instruction and counseling to dependents in the Dependents Schools of the Pacific area were (1) the School Health Education Study, an overall health education program, (2) the Dope Stop Teen Counseling Program which used volunteer high school students to counsel middle-grade students about narcotics, and (3) the Suffolk County Organization for the Promotion of Education (SCOPE) which developed audiovisual material on drug abuse.

School Health Education Study

The School Health Education Study program was established on August 6, 1970, as the official health education program for all Air Force-operated Department of Defense schools in the Pacific area. It was developed by the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company and deals, in part, with mood- and behavior-modifying substances.

Although adopted in 1970, the program was not implemented during school year 1970-71, apparently because of budgetary limitations. In July 1971 the Pacific Air Force required that each school or district implement, at a minimum, that portion of the program related to mood- and behavior-modifying substances for school year 1971-72 and the complete program by school year 1972-73.

A Hawaii State Department of Education official who was familiar with the program told us that most teachers approved of this program and felt the method or approach used was very good.

Dope Stop Teen Counseling Program

The Dope Stop Teen Counseling Program, first tried in Phoenix, Arizona, has received considerable attention. In February 1971 the Chief of Staff, U S Air Force, directed that the program be implemented in Air Force-operated schools, worldwide. The Pacific Air Force established a target date of January 1972 for starting the program in all Pacific secondary schools.

Wagner High School at Clark was selected as the pilot school for this program. Five students and two administrators were selected to go to Phoenix in February 1971 for a 5-day training course as counselors. Upon their return they began training others as counselors. From April 27 to April 30, 1971, five students and two faculty members from the Subic Bay Naval Station attended a training session at Clark. In the middle of October, a training session was held for representatives from one school in Japan, one in Okinawa, one in Korea, and the Manila International School.

The suggested program, which was at that time being presented at Clark Air Base, consisted of eight 30- to 55-minute visits by the commander to middle-grade schools to conduct rap and discussion sessions on various aspects of drug use. These sessions were scheduled once a month from October through May. The program in the Pacific schools has been modified from the Phoenix design. It was called the Teen Involvement Program, and teen counselors discussed not only drug and drug-related problems but also any other topics which the students wanted to discuss. Officials involved in the program stated that this made the session more beneficial for the students and created more interest among counselors.

Suffolk County Organization for the Promotion of Education

SCOPE, established in 1964, is a nonprofit education service center which has developed a number of audiovisual materials for use in drug abuse education. These include cassette tapes which are placed in school libraries to be used by students at their discretion. We were told that these materials would be obtained by the schools as funds permitted. The Clark Air Base Schools did not obtain any material from SCOPE but did have 11 movies, 10 sound film strips, and five cassettes about drugs.

Medical treatment and disciplinary action

The schools were providing no medical treatment to student drug abusers other than that which could be given by a school nurse when a student was found to be under the influence of drugs. The school system took no disciplinary

action against a student unless other matters were involved, such as a student suspected of being a pusher or known to be a general troublemaker. The schools notified the parents when students were found using drugs, however, if the student required medical attention at a dispensary or hospital, the schools were required to report this to law enforcement authorities. When this happened, disciplinary action varied as determined by the military commanders.

Drug abuse incidents

Statistics on the actual extent of drug use among students were not readily available. However, some data was available on the number of students found using drugs while in school.

During the school year 1970-71, a total of 14 incidents were reported, as shown below.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Incidents</u>	<u>Drugs</u>
Japan	6	Marihuana, volatiles, pills, and unidentified drugs
Philippines	5	Marihuana, pills, and unidentified drugs
Korea	<u>3</u>	Marihuana and pills
	<u>14</u>	

There were about 60 incidents in the previous school year.

Two individuals at Clark Air Base indicated that the drug problem among dependents was severe. The Judge Advocate's office indicated that as many as 107 students had been named in connection with drugs.

Amnesty and rehabilitation program

The Clark Air Base commander established an amnesty program called "One Chance to Get Straight." Under the program dependents were given one chance to be cured by voluntary

treatment and detoxification, education, and followup rehabilitation. No punitive or administrative action was taken the first time dependents volunteered for help. Since September 24, 1971, 12 dependents entered the program, were detoxified, counseled, and released from the hospital, and underwent followup treatment at the school guidance clinic.

OBSERVATIONS

A formal comprehensive drug abuse education program was not yet established at Clark Air Base. Educational efforts were being made by the various squadrons but were not standardized in the different units. A Council on Drug Education, formed in July 1971 to coordinate and disseminate information about drugs, was developing presentations for a base lecture team, however, the presentations had not yet been completed at the time of our review in October 1971.

The Limited Privileged Communication Program, established in March 1971, had limited success at Clark Air Base. As of October 30, 1971, only 49 individuals had volunteered for the program. Personnel interviewed felt that younger Air Force personnel did not trust the program and that adverse actions might result from volunteering for the program. The Staff Judge Advocate believed that the program was merely a vehicle for drug abusers to avoid prosecution and was directed only to help hard-drug users. Only three individuals took part in the rehabilitation program, which included discussions with a psychiatrist, group sessions, and individual rap or counseling sessions with a lawyer, a doctor, a chaplain, and a unit commander. The Drug Education and Control Officer felt that more trained psychologists and psychiatrists were needed to effectively rehabilitate drug users.

Law enforcement was expected to continue to deter the drug experimenter or the individual who had not tried drugs. However, more than half of the personnel interviewed by questionnaire felt that law enforcement was not effective in preventing drug abuse. Since June 1971 all aircraft and baggage arriving from Southeast Asia was inspected, but no significant quantities of drugs were found.

The urinalysis-testing program to identify drug users was started at Clark Air Base on August 17, 1971. Available statistics showed that only 13 samples of 2,383 tested were positive. Controls at the collection facility were weak. The identities of the personnel providing the specimens were not verified in all cases, and personnel monitoring collection of the specimens were not positioned so they could observe personnel furnishing the specimens.

Two of the three basic programs to provide instruction and counseling to dependents in the Dependents Schools located at Clark Air Base were implemented as planned. The audiovisual materials for use in drug abuse education developed by SCOPE were not yet obtained but were to be obtained by the schools as funds permitted. There were indications that a severe drug problem existed among dependents. As many as 107 students were named as possible drug users. The base commander established a special Amnesty Program for dependents which provided the dependents with one chance to be cured by voluntary treatment-detoxification, education, and followup rehabilitation, 12 dependents entered this program.

Military personnel identified as drug users continued to receive their regular pay unless medical personnel determined that they were not physically capable of performing their duties and line-of-duty--no determinations were processed. All personnel in the rehabilitation program were receiving their basic pay.

CHAPTER 3

NAVY

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND DRUG SUPPRESSION

Law enforcement in the Subic Bay area was undertaken by the Philippines Naval Investigative Service (NIS), the Area Provost Marshal, the Legal Affairs Staff, and the individual commanders.

Naval Investigative Service

NIS, which had about 22 agents, was primarily responsible for law enforcement in connection with drugs in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area. Its primary function was to provide professional investigative services to all commands when individual commanders requested them. During calendar year 1970, 740 cases involving drugs were reported, of which six involved heroin. From January through June 1971, 344 cases involving drugs were reported, of which 39 involved heroin.

NIS personnel worked with local Philippine police and law enforcement agencies to stem the flow of drugs in towns adjacent to the base. Olongapo City, which has a population of about 150,000, is directly adjacent to the Subic Bay Naval Base. Pushers working out of local nightclubs were apprehended, and charges were filed against them.

When requested, NIS also searched Navy vessels. Limited quantities of marihuana were seized during these searches. NIS seized \$580 worth of marihuana on one ship-board search involving 17 individuals. A search of 22 crewmembers aboard another vessel disclosed that eight of the suspects possessed marihuana worth \$28.75

Area Provost Marshal

The Area Provost Marshal was primarily involved in searching personnel and vehicles exiting or entering the main gate. Normally five guards were stationed at the main gate, and sometimes a marihuana dog was used. Inspections

were random because between 50,000 and 80,000 entries and exits were made daily. Approximately eight to 10 individuals an hour were inspected.

U.S.S. Enterprise

In July 1971 a program was initiated on the U.S.S. Enterprise whereby 5 percent of the personnel and their berthing spaces were inspected each week. All working and shop areas were checked weekly. Although personnel boarding the ship were not inspected, all packages brought aboard at Subic Bay were inspected. For the period January 1 through July 12, 1971, 60 cases of drug possession or use on the ship were reported, of which 55 involved marihuana, 37 LSD, 19 hashish, and six heroin. In these cases, 47 individuals were processed for general discharges, nine were transferred with recommendations for retention in the Navy, and four were given captain's mast hearings.

Legal Affairs Staff

The primary objective of the Legal Affairs Staff in drug-related cases was to furnish legal counsel, both defense and prosecution, for courts-martial and defense counsel for nonjudicial or article 15 cases. It was estimated that this required the equivalent of three full-time personnel.

During fiscal year 1971, the staff was involved in 27 drug cases tried in Philippine courts. Of these cases, 24 were acquitted and three were convicted. In addition, 26 cases involving drugs were tried in the military courts at Subic Bay. Of these cases, 21 were convicted and five were acquitted, 12 were special court-martial cases which resulted in four acquittals and eight guilty verdicts with no punishments or punishments of fines, confinements, restrictions, or rank reductions. The remaining 14 cases were summary court-martial cases, one of which resulted in acquittal and 13 in guilty verdicts with punishments of fines, confinements, restrictions, or rank reductions. Information was not available on the number of, and actions taken on, nonjudicial or article 15 cases that were reviewed.

Administrative discharges

For fiscal years 1969 through 1971, the following number of Navy personnel in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area were administratively discharged for drug abuse.

<u>Type of discharge</u>	<u>Fiscal year</u>		
	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Honorable	-	-	-
General	-	6	34
Undesirable	-	9	157

Detailed information on the above discharges was not available at Subic Bay

Effectiveness of law enforcement

Available statistics showed that increasing numbers of drug abuse cases were being investigated and that abusers were being discharged, restricted, fined, reduced in rank, or placed in confinement. Drug cases involving heroin also increased markedly.

We obtained opinions on law enforcement from 26 individuals. Of the 26, 18 felt that law enforcement was not effective in preventing drug abuse and three felt that law enforcement had some effect in preventing drug abuse. Some individuals expressed the view that law enforcement makes users more careful in their use of drugs and tends to drive users underground. The view was also expressed that, if marijuana were legalized, most people would discontinue using other drugs.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

On July 8, 1971, the Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Philippines-Commander, Subic Bay Naval Base, organized the drug abuse team to assist commanding officers in developing an effective program to prevent and eliminate drug abuse. Installation commanders were responsible for developing and conducting education programs for military personnel. The team also was to act in an advisory capacity to the commander concerning all matters pertaining to drug abuse.

Definitive information on the extent of the drug abuse problem at Subic Bay was not available. We were informed that the Navy was attempting to accumulate such information and that, hopefully by the end of calendar year 1971, the information would be sufficient to identify the extent of the drug abuse problem.

A questionnaire survey completed by NIS personnel in May 1971 showed a definite lack of knowledge by enlisted personnel on drug matters. However, the results of this survey were not considered by local authorities to be completely valid, because of the limited expertise in testing and interpreting test results of the personnel who conducted the survey.

Drug abuse team lectures

In June 1971 the drug abuse team personnel started giving 1- to 2-hour lectures entitled "Drug Abuse and You" to inform personnel about drugs and drug problems. These lectures were given as requested by the various commands, to assist the individual commanders in drug education and suppression within their commands. During the period June 16 through September 7, 1971, 76 lectures were given, which were attended by 1,991 personnel. The drug abuse specialist, who arrived at Subic in June 1971 and who became a member of the drug abuse team, gave presentations on drug abuse to local commands.

Drug lectures were being given to enlisted and officer personnel, as well as to such organizations as the Officers Women's Club and the Parent Teacher Association. No record had been kept of the number of lectures or the number of personnel who attended.

We attended one lecture given for officers and one for younger enlisted personnel. The objective of the lecture given for officers was to develop an awareness of the drug problem with the 18- to 25-year age group and to stress the need for middle management to attempt to rehabilitate the drug user. The objective of the lecture given to younger enlisted personnel was to inform them of the various drugs available and of the effects and symptoms of using marijuana, LSD, amphetamines, barbiturates, and heroin.

We interviewed 18 individuals ranging from seaman to lieutenant commander who had attended lectures given by the drug abuse team. Most of them thought the lectures were credible and the information presented was factual.

We were informed that no resources had been received from the Navy for drug abuse education. As of September 8, 1971, it was estimated that about \$8,000 had been expended on drug abuse education, by using current resources and by voluntary efforts of interested personnel.

Cubi Point Naval Air Station

The education program consisted of (1) an indoctrination lecture given to all newly arriving personnel, which included general information on drug abuse, (2) a General Military Training Program which included some training on drug abuse, (3) lectures by the drug abuse team, (4) monthly or bimonthly "all hands" meetings at which drug abuse and other problems were discussed, (5) posters on drug-related articles displayed in prominent places, and (6) seminars conducted by medical personnel and chaplains. The air station also was exploring the possibility of establishing an organization similar to Alcoholics Anonymous for drug users.

Subic Bay Naval Station

Education at the naval station consisted primarily of the lectures given by the drug abuse team. The lectures supplemented articles on drug abuse which were placed in the base newspaper and posters which were displayed in prominent places. In addition, the doctor at the naval base dispensary gave lectures and conducted small seminars on drugs.

Subic Bay Naval Supply Depot

On July 1, 1971, the naval supply depot organized a Drug Education Program Committee to (1) create an awareness of the drug problem in senior petty officers and officers and (2) arm potential drug users and current users or experimenters with the facts and consequences of drug abuse.

The committee spent about 1 month educating itself on drug abuse and formulating a presentation for naval supply depot personnel. As of August 25, 1971, 87 percent of the officers, 71 percent of the chiefs and first-class petty officers, and 66 percent of the second-class petty officers and below had attended drug abuse education programs.

Young service personnel stationed at the naval supply depot were being invited to officers' homes, family barbecues, beach parties, and sailing, to get to know them better.

Naval supply depot personnel prepared guidelines for establishing a command drug awareness program for circulation to other commands in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area, to give them the benefit of information and experiences in establishing a program.

Subic Bay Ship Repair Facility

The drug abuse education program at the ship repair facility was in the planning stage and was not yet fully functional in August 1971. The informal education program consisted of lectures sponsored by the General Military Training Office and use of posters and handout materials. The assistance of the drug abuse team was solicited to familiarize all division officers and senior petty officers with the drug abuse problem.

Subic Bay Naval Magazine

The drug education program at the naval magazine consisted primarily of classroom presentations by the drug abuse team. Attendance was to be mandatory for all enlisted personnel. Earlier educational efforts consisted of an indoctrination lecture, including a section on drug abuse, and articles on drug abuse that appeared in the base newspaper.

U.S.S. Enterprise

We found that 80 percent of the ship's personnel had attended a drug presentation on March 24 and 25, 1971, given by a drug awareness specialist while the ship was in port. A video tape was made of the presentation, and this tape was shown periodically over the ship's closed-circuit television system. The seriousness of drug abuse was included in the orientation and indoctrination presentation for all newly reporting personnel.

U.S.S. Enterprise officials also were encouraging articles on drug abuse in the ship's newspaper and in the Plan of the Day. Literature on drugs was distributed to all department offices, and drug abuse posters were displayed throughout the ship. The chaplains provided individual counseling and held group discussions relating to drugs. Spot announcements on drug abuse and the availability of drug abuse literature were made on the ship's radio and on the closed-circuit television system.

7th Fleet Drug Abuse Team

Beginning in January 1971, a two-man drug abuse team began visiting ships of the 7th Fleet, making onboard presentations on drug abuse prevention. From January through August 1971, presentations were given aboard 63 ships. The team estimated that 80 percent of the personnel aboard the 63 ships were present at those presentations. This program was initiated to provide additional information and guidance on drug abuse, rather than to replace any existing programs initiated by ship personnel.

Effectiveness of education program

The effectiveness of drug education had not been evaluated. We interviewed 26 individuals to determine the extent and effectiveness of drug education received. They said they had received little or no drug education prior to that given by the drug abuse team since June 1971. Only five of the individuals received any drug abuse education during boot camp, and 18 attended the lectures given by the drug abuse team. All personnel felt that the instruction received was credible and that the instructional data was factual.

We also interviewed nine individuals who had entered the Exemption Program. (See pp. 26 to 28.) Five received drug abuse education prior to using drugs and four had not. The nine individuals stated they had started using drugs between the ages of 15 and 19. Their consensus was that the drug education received was not factual, that scare techniques were used, and that some of the instructors were not familiar with the subject. They also felt that drug education instruction could be improved by using instructors who had used drugs.

IDENTIFICATION OF DRUG USERS

The urinalysis-testing program to identify drug users was started by the Navy in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area on August 16, 1971. Samples were being taken at the dispensary at Subic Bay and Cubi Point. During the first 4 days of the testing program, 24 samples were taken at the Subic Bay dispensary, and during the first week 15 samples were taken at the Cubi Point dispensary. These samples were sent to the Oakland Naval Base, California, for analysis. No statistics were available on the results of the urinalysis-testing program.

Controls over handling and shipping the samples appeared to be adequate. However, control over taking the samples did not insure that the identities of the personnel providing the samples were correct, and we advised the Navy personnel of this. Navy officials informed us that procedures were being revised so that three individuals would witness collection of the samples.

In June 1971 two Navy personnel were sent to Vietnam on a fact-finding tour of drug education and rehabilitation programs in Vietnam. They concluded that stringent controls were necessary to insure the reliability of the urinalysis test. Some of the methods cited by these two Navy personnel which may be used to defeat or compromise the urinalysis test for opiates were to

1. Substitute barbiturates, alcohol, and marijuana in varying amounts 5 to 7 days prior to the urine collection.
2. Interchange bottles of urine with nonopiate users. The nonopiate users show positive results, however, followup tests will prove negative.
3. Dip urine from the commode or urinal.
4. Dilute urine with water as urinal is flushed.
5. Conceal bottles of urine from nonopiate users on person and interchange bottles while in collection booth.

- 6 Obtain legitimate prescriptions for drugs with opiate derivatives by simulating such illnesses as cramps, cough, cold, or diarrhea
- 7 Interchange identification cards between users and nonusers of opiate to create situation as in 2 above

The fact-finding team reported that the reasons personnel desired to pass the urinalysis test were they (1) had no wish to withdraw from the use of opiates, (2) had no wish to remain in Vietnam while in a rehabilitation program, (3) believed they could "cold turkey" upon arrival in the United States, or (4) lacked trust in and feared the rehabilitation program

Drug users also were being identified by the Exemption Program and by investigations

AMNESTY, LIMITED PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION, AND EXEMPTION PROGRAMS

During July and August 1971, 24 individuals from the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area requested admission to the Navy's Exemption Program. Of these, 17 were determined to be physically addicted to drugs and, after detoxification at the hospital, were transferred to the Navy's rehabilitation center at Miramar, California. Hospital and command personnel were not aware of the details of the facilities or program for rehabilitation at the Miramar center.

The Chief of the Department of Psychiatry, Naval Hospital, Subic Bay, informed us that the psychiatric staff, which consisted of two psychiatrists, did not have the time, facilities, or necessary supporting staff to meet or treat every drug user. To improve rehabilitation capabilities, weekly seminars were held at the Naval Hospital for drug program personnel. The purpose of these seminars was to discuss problems that the personnel were unable to resolve. It was hoped that drug users who were not physically or psychologically addicted and who desired rehabilitation could be screened and treated by the dispensary medical officer or by command drug personnel.

The Chief of the Department of Psychiatry expressed doubt about whether the drug abuse rehabilitation program would be very successful. He stated that the rehabilitation program faced the following problems

- 1 Most commanding officers and supervisory personnel did not desire to have former drug users or rehabilitated personnel returned to their commands
- 2 No information had been received regarding personnel admitted to the rehabilitation center at Miramar. Therefore, Subic Bay personnel were unable to advise personnel requesting exemptions of what could be expected at Miramar
- 3 An education program was needed to teach petty officers, chief petty officers, and officers means of communicating with and understanding younger servicemen

We interviewed seven drug users who were confined to the brig, five of whom were participants in the Exemption Program. Four of the participants had requested exemption after being confined to the brig for other than drug offenses and therefore were not considered to be typical participants of the Exemption Program.

The other confined participant felt that the program was a "let down". He was 17 years old and had been in the service for 10 months. He informed us he had started using drugs at age 13, had used marijuana, LSD, hashish, cocaine, and heroin, and had sniffed glue. At the time he requested exemption, he was using heroin daily. He stated that, when he was in the hospital being detoxified, the shots he received did not relieve the withdrawal pains. Therefore, after the first day at the hospital, he illegally obtained heroin. It was discovered 5 days later that he was smoking heroin at the hospital, so he was transferred to the brig. When we interviewed him, he was awaiting a special court-martial.

Mixed reactions were obtained from those participants in the Exemption Program who had been returned to their

respective commands. Five of the nine individuals interviewed informed us that they did not feel they had been subjected to any harrassment by superior officers and that they were performing the same duties as they had prior to identifying themselves as drug users and asking admission to the Exemption Program. One individual was detailed to office work, and none had security clearances.

Two individuals interviewed were jet mechanics. One informed us that his security clearance had been removed and that he was no longer working as a mechanic. Instead, he is doing odd jobs for an officer. He had requested a 2-month extension of his tour so that he could be assigned to shore duty, but the request was denied by his commanding officer who stated he did not want him in the service any longer than necessary. The second jet mechanic stated that he was doing the same work he had been doing prior to participation in the Exemption Program and that he had encountered no problems on his return to his regular assignment.

Subic Bay received no special resources from the Navy for the Exemption and rehabilitation programs. As of September 8, 1971, it was estimated that \$12,800 had been expended for this program. Of this amount, about \$10,000 was for hospital expenses for treating patients in the Exemption Program.

OBSERVATIONS

All forms of illegal drugs were readily available within the Subic Bay area. Law enforcement was identifying an increasing number of drug users, and drug cases involving heroin had increased markedly. Personnel interviewed were generally of the opinion that law enforcement was not effective in preventing drug abuse.

When our review began in August 1971, the concentrated effort on drug abuse education in the Subic Bay-Cubi Point area had just recently been formalized. Some of the commands were still planning the education program. Therefore evaluations at this time of the effectiveness of the education program would be premature. Efforts in drug abuse education did appear to have been hampered by the fact that the Navy had provided no additional resources for the program. Because each command independently was organizing an education program, many personnel were involved in the same task without the benefit of each other's knowledge and experience, so it was difficult to insure uniformity and high quality of the education programs and probably resulted in duplication of effort.

In addition to lacking resources to conduct an education program and duplicating efforts in formulating the program, the services lacked knowledge on the extent and nature of the drug abuse problem. Without a good definition of the drug abuse problem, moneys spent on education may be misdirected and the educational efforts not responsive to the need.

The response by Navy personnel to the Exemption Program was extremely limited in the Subic Bay Area. The program appeared to be directed primarily toward helping the hard drug users. Marihuana users saw little or no advantage to entering the program. Commanding officers and supervisory personnel were reluctant to have former drug users or rehabilitated personnel returned to their commands. A successful program needs a more concerted effort on training and education of personnel in supervisory positions so that they will be able to understand the problems of, and help, former drug users.

The urinalysis-testing program to identify drug users was started August 16, 1971. No statistics were available on the results of the program; however, observations made by Navy personnel in Vietnam disclosed that stringent controls were necessary to insure the reliability of the test.

The success of rehabilitation also depends, in large measure, on the attitude and desires of the drug user. Unless the individual sincerely desires to be helped, very little can be accomplished. Facilities and resources for adequately treating and rehabilitating personnel physically addicted to drugs were not available at Subic Bay. Therefore, after being detoxified, personnel so identified were being sent to Miramar. No information was available at Subic Bay on rehabilitation success or failure of those who had been returned to Miramar.

ACTIVITIES VISITED ON THE PHILIPPINES

DURING GAO STUDY

AUGUST THROUGH NOVEMBER 1971

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Location</u>
Air Force	
13th Air Force, Headquarters	Clark Air Base
6200th Air Base Wing	Clark Air Base
Office of Special Investigation	Clark Air Base
6200th Security Police Squadron	Clark Air Base
Clark Air Force Hospital	Clark Air Base
405th Fighter Wing	Clark Air Base
605th Tactical Control Squadron	Clark Air Base
463d Tactical Airlift Wing	Clark Air Base
Overseas Dependent Schools	Clark Air Base
Navy	
Naval Station	Subic Bay
Naval Supply Depot	Subic Bay
Ship Repair Facility	Subic Bay
Naval Magazine	Subic Bay
Naval Air Station	Cubi Point
Medical Dispensary	Subic Bay
Medical Dispensary	Cubi Point

APPENDIX II

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF
 THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND
 THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
 RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTIVITIES
 DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	<u>Tenure of office</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
<u>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</u>		
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.		
Melvin R. Laird	Jan 1969	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS):		
Roger T. Kelley	Feb. 1969	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT)		
(note a):		
Dr. Richard S. Wilbur	Aug. 1971	Present
Dr. Louis H. Rousselot	Jan. 1968	July 1971
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY (DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE).		
Brig. Gen. John K Singlaub	Sept. 1971	Present
<u>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</u>		
SECRETARY OF THE ARMY		
Robert F Froehlke	July 1971	Present
Stanley R. Resor	July 1965	June 1971
THE SURGEON GENERAL:		
Lt. Gen. H B Jennings, Jr.	Oct 1969	Present

<u>Tenure of office</u>	
<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (continued)OFFICE OF DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF,
PERSONNEL (DIRECTOR OF DISCIPLINE AND DRUG POLICIES)

Brig Gen. Robert G Gard, Jr	May 1971	Present
-----------------------------	----------	---------

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY:

John W Warner	May 1972	Present
---------------	----------	---------

John H Chafee	Jan 1969	May 1972
---------------	----------	----------

SURGEON GENERAL OF THE NAVY:

Vice Adm. George M Davis	Feb. 1969	Present
--------------------------	-----------	---------

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL
OPERATIONS (HUMAN RELATIONS
PROJECT MANAGER)

Rear Adm. C.F Rauch, Jr.	Apr 1971	Present
--------------------------	----------	---------

MARINE CORPS, U.S HEADQUARTERS,
DEPUTY ASSISTANT CHIEF OF
STAFF G-1:

Brig. Gen. R.B Carney	May 1970	Present
-----------------------	----------	---------

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Robert C. Seamans, Jr.	Jan. 1969	Present
------------------------	-----------	---------

SURGEON GENERAL:

Lt Gen. Alonzo A Towner	May 1970	Present
-------------------------	----------	---------

Lt. Gen K E. Pletcher	Dec 1967	Apr. 1970
-----------------------	----------	-----------

APPENDIX II

<u>Tenure of office</u>	
<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE (continued)

OFFICE OF DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF,
PERSONNEL (DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL
PLANS)

Maj Gen. J.W. Roberts	Jan 1971	Present
-----------------------	----------	---------

^aThis position was formerly entitled "Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical)" under the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) The change was effective in June 1970
Dr Rousselot occupied the position under both titles

Copies of this report are available from the
U S General Accounting Office Room 6417
441 G Street N W Washington D C 20548

Copies are provided without charge to Mem-
bers of Congress congressional committee
staff members Government officials members
of the press college libraries faculty mem-
bers and students The price to the general
public is \$1 00 a copy Orders should be ac-
companied by cash or check