

Public Services Summit 2009
Stockholm, Sweden
10 December 2009
Statement by R. Gil Kerlikowske
Director, White House Office of National Drug Control Policy
[As Delivered]

Let me begin by thanking Bruce Klein, Jeff Frazier, and Simon Wills.

In the time I've been given, I want to address three areas of public policy that pose significant challenges for American law enforcement and that have significant ramifications for our global partners.

These are:

- Changes in policing in the United States in a post-9-11 environment
- Incarceration and paths to reentry, and
- The need to address drug control from a new perspective

I will also discuss the role that technology can play in these arenas during this time of shrinking fiscal resources.

I will argue that the current direction of public policy in these areas should be a primary concern of not only law enforcement and criminal justice leaders, but other policy makers and elected officials. This is because the current policies not only place disproportionate responsibilities on law enforcement in a negative way, but also weaken the vitality and resolve of our communities, and I mean communities in a global sense. Moreover, the dangers posed by poor policies or a lack of policies are more calculable, more likely, and more destructive over the long run than those posited for more extreme, though less-likely threats, to which our country is committing enormous sums of money, for sometimes incremental, public safety benefits.

Since I am very new to the position I now hold, I want to give you some idea about what changed for the Seattle Police Department where I served as chief for nine years and the City of Seattle in the wake of September 11th. I would offer that many other big cities in America have similar experiences. In Seattle, we watched - along with the rest of the world- as the events of that day unfolded. We saw incredible acts of bravery and compassion on the part of first

responders; and we marveled at the consummate professionalism that kept a city intact at its core, in the midst of crisis. Our pain and pride were also mixed with frustration, knowing there was nothing, at those immediate moments, we could do to help as well as with uncertainty, wondering if we might also be targeted.

The Seattle Police Department moved quickly to activate the City's Emergency Operations Center, to evacuate potential target structures, and to secure critical infrastructure. We also reached out to the Middle Eastern and Muslim communities, providing protection to mosques and community centers and asking their assistance in identifying potential problems. This was a group of people who were afraid to leave their residences, to shop, or to send their children to school. In the ensuing weeks, we bolstered staffing at community and athletic events and revisited and improved our command and control and incident command models and protocols. In the meantime, our surveillance of critical infrastructure and potential targets continued. But as time has evolved, outside of NYC and Washington, D.C., and our airports, the country is still much like September 10th.

Seattle approached its security and preparedness needs from an all-hazards perspective, with a terrorism nexus, and sought equipment and other support within that framework. In seeking improvements in interoperable communications or protective equipment for officers and firefighters, the City recognized that these enhanced capabilities would serve us whether we were responding to an earthquake (very likely for Seattle, Washington), a terrorist attack, or (heaven forbid) another World Trade Organization meeting in 1999, which caused significant property damage and disruption. In other words, we sought a balanced approach to the problem.

Local and state law enforcement in the U.S. now have a homeland security mission that, when added to other public safety responsibilities, and today's economy, has stretched thin the staffing resources of law enforcement. Which brings us to the central theme of this lecture, and that is that a new and balanced approach and broader and more holistic understanding must be developed and brought forth by law enforcement executives at every level to address the issues of crime, the changing nature of incarceration, and the problem of drugs.

Technology plays a vital role in this post-9-11 public safety era. Law enforcement must share more information across all of our jurisdictions. In the U.S., we have about 17,000 law enforcement agencies, most have five officers or so, a very different perspective from policing around the world where large national and municipal forces exist. That is the legacy of the federalist democratic system in the U.S. It makes information sharing a particularly difficult enterprise. Couple that with privacy and civil liberty concerns, different data systems, and turf or protectionism among these different political jurisdictions, and you begin to understand the problem. So in an era of shrinking labor resources, increased work and responsibility, the technological fixes for sharing information are critical.

A second phase of the need to share information is beyond our own U.S. borders and the sharing of information with our foreign counterparts. Over the last several years, Interpol has engaged more large U.S. municipal jurisdictions as points of contact rather than just from one capital to another.

In addition, how data within a jurisdiction are captured, synthesized, and analyzed in near real time is another issue. That information that can lead to solving a crime, or more importantly; preventing a crime and the direction that information provides to deploying scarce personnel is a factor.

Offender re-entry

America's hometowns are facing another danger that is the result of a series of short-sighted public policy decisions. I am speaking of the significant cohort of ex-inmates now completing their sentences and returning to their communities, this includes those who have been convicted of drug offenses. The number of persons involved is well over 600,000 per year re-entering mostly urban neighborhoods across the country. If those released from local jails are added, the number of people being recycled into hometowns, large and small, after periods of incarceration, becomes much higher.

An estimate by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 2002 indicated that 1 in every 143 U.S. residents was in a Federal, state, or local corrections facility. A 2003 estimate included jails and community supervision arrangements and placed the number of confined at 1 in every 32 residents.

Over the last two decades, legislative enthusiasm for harsher and longer sentences for many crimes, generally enacted without adequate research and evaluation, has fiscally handcuffed some states and caused adjudication costs at the state and local level to soar. And the sobering consequences of these public policy decisions are about to reach their denouement as those incarcerated under these provisions begin returning home.

Part of the reason for the bleak conditions in many correctional facilities has been the ever-increasing costs of institutionalizing so many offenders for long periods of time. Faced with high costs, a number of states are beginning to re-think their sentencing schemes and to consider diversion programs to treat mentally ill and substance abusing offenders.

In light of their experiences while incarcerated, it will come as little surprise that both state and Federal releasees have relatively high levels of recidivism (typically 50 percent to 60 percent). Analyses indicate that arrest rates for ex-prisoners are 30 to 45 times higher than for the general population and 7 to 29 times greater than those of demographically comparable sectors of the community, depending on the nature of the crime.

Here also the consequences for lack of educational success are linked to incarceration. A Texas study found that one third of inmates released from prison there in 2002 were functionally illiterate and the recidivism rates for non-readers greatly exceeded those of readers. The portion of the study focusing on juveniles found that 62 percent of those displaying a second grade reading level were re-arrested upon release from detention facilities as opposed to 36 percent of those with an eleventh grade reading level.

The problems are also acute when it comes to youth and what is available for them in the places they live. Poor neighborhoods without Boys and Girls Clubs or similar after school

programs experience 50 percent more vandalism and 37 percent more teen drug use than do similar neighborhoods with such clubs and after school activities.

There have been some promising initiatives that, in time, could evolve into a new approach for re-entry, one that not only prevents recidivism, but also actively assists individuals to transition to productive lives outside the prison walls. For example, in Hawaii an innovative Judge, Steven Alm, has found success in reforming probation for drug and other offenders through Project HOPE. Judge Alm reorganized probation so that offenders were most closely monitored through drug tests and the application of swift, certain, but modest sanctions. Under this system 80 percent of those with a history of methamphetamine abuse stopped using drugs, a remarkable result.

Intensified supervision can be greatly facilitated by technology. It is very difficult for probation officers, especially those with large caseloads of offenders to monitor, to keep close tabs on individuals. We know that supervision and reporting by those persons on parole is critical. GPS monitoring to ensure that individuals are not in locations that they have been banned from is one way. Another is to make available on-line systems that help in providing information for those seeking employment, enhanced educational opportunities, and life skills can help people get what they need to put their lives back on track.

Drugs

In 1971, one year before I began my law enforcement career, then-President Nixon held a press conference declaring drugs “public enemy number one.” That statement marked the beginning of a government-led “War on Drugs” that would last most of the next four decades.

Over the course of my career I learned a lot about the damage drug abuse does to the fabric of our society, and about the terrible toll it takes on individuals, families, and communities. But law enforcement didn’t teach me everything there was to know about drugs. I still thought, like a lot of other people, that drug addiction was primarily a moral failing and that the cure was simple matter of willpower. In other words, the addict simply needed to find the resolve to stop using drugs.

Over the years, my thinking about drug addiction began to change. Not overnight, but gradually, as I listened to researchers and physicians steeped in the latest science, I began to learn about addiction as disease - a chronic, recurring disease. I learned that prevention works and that if you aren't an addict by the time you celebrate your 21st birthday, you will likely never become one. It's a process of education that continues to this day - for all of us.

Today we know that this disease is treatable, even with the most addictive drugs. Methamphetamine addiction was once thought to be incurable – but we now know that recovery rates for methamphetamine users who enter treatment are comparable to those of other drugs. That is why calling this a war does not work.

Well if we are not calling it a war, what are we doing? That is the hard part. We know deaths from drug overdoses, particularly prescription drugs, surpassed gunshot wounds as the number two cause of accidental deaths. The number one cause is motor vehicles, yet in sixteen states, according to the Center for Disease Control, drug-related deaths outnumber those from motor vehicle accidents.

A recent national roadside survey for the first time measured the prevalence of drugged driving. The study found that among nighttime weekend drivers, more than 16 percent tested positive for illegal or prescription drugs or over-the-counter medications. Of this group, more than 14 percent were found to have consumed drugs within four hours of being tested. More than 8 percent tested positive for marijuana.

It is time to rethink our strategy. We must be smarter about our Nation's drug problem. It's time to recognize drug abuse and addiction for what it is-not just a criminal justice issue, but also a very complex and dynamic public health challenge, one that demands a systematic, comprehensive, and evidence-led approach if we are going to be equal to the task.

As part of my office's role to set and coordinate all aspects of national drug control policy, we coordinate the budgets with the 15 different Federal agencies that have drug control as part of their mission, from prevention and treatment initiatives within the Department of Health and Human Services, to domestic law enforcement efforts with the Department of Justice, to

border and international security with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense.

And this is even more important when we consider the global perspective. (Yesterday's discussion included a list of risks; drugs should have been included.) Countries world-wide are openly discussing their growing addict and drug-using population and what can be done to deal with them. Cartels in Mexico certainly sell and distribute their product as willingly to people within the country as they do to those in other countries. Once distributors began paying their hired help in product rather than cash, new markets were developed. We will need to not only improve upon and expand our multi-national efforts at dealing with drug-focused criminal enterprises, we will need to openly share and advocate for quality prevention and treatment for those who are addicted.

What role does technology play as we address these issues? Clearly, information sharing across systems is critical. And that sharing must be done in a way that respects civil liberties and civil rights yet allows those with access to gain the valuable knowledge needed to keep our communities safe and to provide help to those that need it.

What are talking about? For example, electronic health records must provide medical personnel with information about a patient's substance issues. I heard of an instance where a patient being treated for an addiction problem to opioid painkillers through his insurance provider. He went to a dentist covered under the same provider. After the dental procedure, he was prescribed the very painkillers that he was being treated for. It is also important for medical personnel to use and understand the information to which they have access.

Another individual who has been in recovery for many years and has had the same physician for several decades was prescribed painkillers for an injury. He had to remind his physician about his history and to not prescribe those substances.

Prescription drug monitoring programs and electronic systems designed to allow medical personnel, health authorities, and in some instances law enforcement to share information among

about physicians who may be overprescribing or patients who may be doctor shopping is another technological fix.

In the U.S., technology is being used to enhance the delivery and efficiency of drug treatment and recovery services. Electronic voucher systems to expedite and track the delivery of clinical treatment and recovery support services are in use.

When it comes to drugged driving, we will need systems that better detect drugs in those suspected of operating a vehicle under the influence. And will we be able to develop a system, similar to the ignition interlock that will prevent a driver from starting a car if they are under the influence of a substance other than alcohol?

Closing

The United States is undergoing seismic shifts in the way law enforcement services are provided to our hometowns. The expanded role that state and local agencies play in national and global terrorism investigations, the development of systems and responses to protect infrastructure, and the training and equipment needed to respond to a terrorist threat or incident come with an albeit necessary but heavy price tag.

In the meantime, large number of individuals are being released from our prison system and back into communities. Too often they have not had the rehabilitative services necessary to prepare them to be productive and lawful citizens. And lastly, we are engaging in a new and different way of understanding and dealing with our drug problem. Using almost solely a criminal justice focus on what is truly a public health and a public safety problem has not produced the results we want.

The speed with which new technology is playing a role is significant. I have cited a variety of examples in each of the categories I discussed where technology is not just value-added but is crucial to being successful in protecting communities. Understanding and availing ourselves of these technological enhancements is extremely important.

Now what is clearly important in this dynamic and rapidly changing environment is that leaders and policy makers engage in open discussion not around individual or specific issues but that they do this in a way that leads to holistic solutions to these problems. We must engage in a broader and more widely-focused discussion at the highest levels of government. The Prime Minister of Finland mentioned the rules of dealing with a crisis. One is that a crisis is the right time for change, and I agree.

In this way, we will engage our diverse resources in a manner that brings them fully to bear in dealing with these issues. As we exchange and share information we can gain from each other's successes and understand the lessons from and the meaning of our failures.

Exactly what the future holds for us in the public policy area of drugs and crime, I can't forecast. President Clinton once said, "You haven't seen anything yet," but I do suggest you fasten your seatbelt!