A MANIFESTO

THE AMERICAN PHARMACRATIC INQUISITION

Against the Criminalization of Self-Medication

How America's War on Drugs
Violates the Rights of the Mentally Ill,
Perpetuates Suffering,
and Serves Empire Over People

PUBLISHED BY
PNEUMAPSYCHE, INC.
pneumapsyche.com • lived.pneumapsyche.com
pharmacratic-inquisition.info

Version 4.0 • Revised August 2026

Dedicated to all who suffer
from involvement in the criminal justice system
due only to their addiction or their mental illness.

Contents

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

On the Evolution of This Argument

This manifesto has undergone four revisions since its initial publication. Each revision has strengthened the argument—not by softening its conclusions, but by confronting the strongest objections to them honestly. A manifesto that cannot survive its critics is not worth publishing. One that addresses them transparently earns the right to be taken seriously.

What Changed in Version 3

The ADA argument was vulnerable to a §12114 dismissal; that statutory exclusion is now confronted directly and the claim reframed around the underlying psychiatric disability rather than the drug use itself. Empirical claims that previously floated without sources are now anchored in peer-reviewed research, federal data, and policy organization reporting. The self-medication thesis was qualified to acknowledge that rationality and safety are different questions. The pharmaceutical-industry critique was restated as documented market economics and regulatory capture rather than coordinated conspiracy. A call to action was added.

What Changed in Version 4

Version 4.0 added chapters on the evolutionary and cross-cultural foundations of the impulse to alter consciousness, the racial architecture of prohibition, religious freedom and indigenous sovereignty, the limits of both prohibition and pure medicalization, civil asset forfeiture, international human rights, and the governance principles that must accompany any expansion of psychiatric infrastructure; three appendices covering common objections, model statutory language, and an ADA litigation pathway; and reconciled every numeric claim to current CDC WONDER, CENTCOM, and July 2026 verified fiscal data.

ON THE SHADED CALLOUT BOXES
Throughout this document, boxes like the one you are reading now mark places where the argument has been refined, qualified, or grounded in new evidence. These are not concessions to opponents—they are demonstrations that this argument is strong enough to confront its own weaknesses.

I. The Central Thesis

The War on Drugs, as practiced in the United States, constitutes a systematic violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. It selectively criminalizes the survival behaviors of people living with mental illness—people who, in the absence of adequate psychiatric care, turn to the only pharmacological relief available to them. To arrest, prosecute, and incarcerate a person whose drug use is a direct consequence of an inadequately treated psychiatric disability is not justice. It is persecution. It is the modern iteration of an ancient cruelty: the punishment of the sick for being sick.

We call this system what it is: the **American Pharmacratic Inquisition**—an apparatus that declares certain molecules criminal not because of their pharmacological properties, but because they cannot be patented, controlled, and sold at markup by the pharmaceutical industry. It is an inquisition that serves corporate profit and carceral expansion while millions of Americans with treatable conditions rot in cells, shelters, and unmarked graves.

This manifesto argues that the United States must abandon its punitive model and adopt a framework rooted in human rights, medical evidence, and the basic recognition that mentally ill people who self-medicate are patients, not criminals.

The thesis operates on three intersecting axes of harm:

1. **Disability discrimination** — the criminalization of adaptive responses to untreated psychiatric disability (Section III).
2. **Racial discrimination** — the historical and ongoing use of drug law as a tool of racial control (Section IV).
3. **Religious and cultural suppression** — the criminalization of indigenous, sacramental, and entheogenic practices (Section V).

These are not three separate critiques. They are three faces of the same prohibition apparatus. The American Pharmacratic Inquisition operates against intersecting protected classes simultaneously, and a comprehensive remedy must address all three.

II. The Universal Impulse: The Biology of Altered Consciousness

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
This section is new in Version 4.0. It addresses a question the prior versions left unanswered: why does the impulse to alter consciousness exist at all? The answer matters because if the impulse is fundamentally human—fundamentally mammalian—then a policy that tries to eliminate it is doomed by biology, and only a policy that channels it constructively can succeed.

A. The Fourth Drive

UCLA psychopharmacologist Ronald K. Siegel, in his 1989 book *Intoxication*, called the pursuit of altered consciousness "the fourth drive"—alongside hunger, thirst, and sex. He documented its expression across the animal kingdom with patience and rigor. Elephants seek out fermented marula fruit. Vervet monkeys raid Caribbean rum stills with such consistency that they have been studied as a model of human alcoholism. Reindeer ingest *Amanita muscaria* mushrooms and stagger through the snow afterward. Bighorn sheep wear the rocks down to powder licking narcotic lichens. Bees become disoriented on fermented nectar. Dolphins have been observed passing pufferfish among themselves, each in turn entering a trance-like state before passing the fish along. Cats famously respond to catnip. Birds eat fermented berries and fly drunkenly.

This is not anthropomorphism. It is data. The drive to alter consciousness is not a uniquely human pathology. It is widely distributed across mammals and many non-mammalian species, and it appears to be evolutionarily ancient. Whatever else drug use is, it is not a moral failure invented by modern humans.

B. Cross-Cultural Ubiquity in Our Own Species

Within our own species, the cross-cultural evidence is overwhelming. Alcohol has been produced by nearly every agricultural society capable of producing it. Cannabis is documented in archaeological records from China to the Eurasian steppe to North Africa. Coca leaves were chewed by the peoples of the Andes for thousands of years before European contact, with no recorded epidemic of dependency. Ayahuasca, peyote, kava, betel, kratom, opium, tobacco, khat, and dozens of other psychoactive plants form the spine of the world's pharmacopoeias and the ceremonial life of countless cultures.

The Eleusinian Mysteries of ancient Greece, in which initiates drank the *kykeon*—almost certainly an ergot-derived psychedelic preparation—are credited by classicists with shaping much of Western philosophy. The Vedic *soma*, the Mazatec mushroom ceremonies of María Sabina, the Native American Church's peyote sacrament, the Santo Daime use of ayahuasca, the Rastafarian use of cannabis—these are not aberrations. They are central facts about how human beings have engaged with consciousness for the entirety of recorded history.

Michael Pollan's *This Is Your Mind on Plants* (2021) makes the point bluntly: caffeine, opium, and mescaline—three molecules deeply embedded in human cultural and economic life—represent three different relationships humans have negotiated with three different plants. None of those relationships is purely pathological. None is purely unproblematic. All require ongoing cultural management.

C. What This Means for Policy

> **IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION**
> If a behavior is observed across many species and across all human cultures, the question is no longer "how do we eliminate it?" The question is "how do we live with it well?" The answer differs by substance, by individual, by context, and by culture—but the underlying question is permanent. A drug policy that does not begin from this premise is a policy designed to lose.

This does not mean every form of intoxication is acceptable, nor that any individual should pursue it. It does mean that treating the impulse itself as

pathological is a category error. The impulse is human. It is mammalian. It is older than agriculture. It will outlive every prohibition.

What a society can shape—what a society must shape—is the *expression* of that impulse: which substances, in what doses, under what conditions, with what supervision, by whom, with what consequences. That is the legitimate domain of public policy. Trying to eliminate the underlying drive has never worked, and will not work, and the attempt produces immense suffering as collateral damage.

III. The ADA Argument: Drug Criminalization as Disability Discrimination

A. The Legal Foundation and Its Honest Limitations

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities in all areas of public life. Mental illness—including major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia spectrum disorders, PTSD, and anxiety disorders—unambiguously qualifies as a disability under the ADA.

> **EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION**
> Version 1.0 of this manifesto asserted the ADA argument without addressing a critical statutory limitation. Section 12114 of the ADA explicitly excludes from its protections individuals who are "currently engaging in the illegal use of drugs." This exclusion, if not addressed, allows critics to dismiss the central legal claim before engaging with it. Version 3.0 reframes the discrimination claim around the underlying psychiatric disability—not the drug use itself—and grounds the legal theory in Supreme Court and Circuit Court precedent. This is both more accurate and more legally defensible.

A critical clarification is required here, and intellectual honesty demands we state it plainly: Section 12114 of the ADA explicitly excludes from its protections individuals who are "currently engaging in the illegal use of drugs." This is a real limitation of the statute, and advocates who ignore it do the argument a disservice.

However, this exclusion does not defeat the central thesis. It reframes it. The discrimination this manifesto identifies does not operate against drug use per se—it operates against the underlying psychiatric disability that drives the drug use when treatment has failed. The pipeline of discrimination targets

people with mental illness at each stage, and the drug use is a symptom, not the protected characteristic.

> **LEGAL GROUNDING**
> The Supreme Court's decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999) established that the unjustified institutionalization of persons with mental disabilities constitutes discrimination under the ADA. The carceral pipeline described in this manifesto—where defunded psychiatric systems funnel mentally ill people into jails that become de facto psychiatric institutions—is the logical extension of *Olmstead* into the criminal justice context.
> Several Circuit courts have recognized that the ADA applies to arrests and prosecutorial decisions where the underlying conduct is a direct manifestation of a disability. See *Sheehan v. City and County of San Francisco*, 743 F.3d 1211 (9th Cir. 2014); *Thompson v. Davis*, 295 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 2002).

B. The Discrimination Pipeline

Consider the structure of the discrimination:

1. Society acknowledges that mental illness is a disability.
2. Society fails to adequately fund psychiatric treatment, resulting in a shortage of inpatient beds, outpatient services, and medication access.
3. People with mental illness, unable to access adequate care, turn to substances that provide symptomatic relief.
4. Society criminalizes the possession and use of those substances.
5. People with mental illness are arrested, prosecuted, and incarcerated at disproportionate rates—not for harming others, but for the predictable consequence of a system that refused to serve them.

This is not a policy failure in isolation. It is a pipeline. The state creates the condition (inadequate treatment), criminalizes the adaptive response (self-medication), and then punishes the person with the disability for the outcome. The protected class is not "drug user"—it is "person with a psychiatric disability denied adequate care." That class is unambiguously protected under the ADA, and the pipeline constitutes discrimination against it.

C. The Scale of the Affected Class

This is not a marginal population. The 2023 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, reported by SAMHSA, found that approximately **22.8% of**

American adults—roughly 59 million people—experienced any mental illness in the prior year, and **5.7% (approximately 15 million) met criteria for serious mental illness**. An estimated **21.9 million adults experienced a major depressive episode**. These are the Americans against whom the discrimination pipeline described above operates.

The scale matters legally and morally. When a discrimination pipeline harms a small population, the debate can be pushed into hypotheticals about individual cases. When it harms tens of millions of Americans across every state, every demographic, and every income bracket, the debate is about whether the country's approach to a majority-adjacent public health condition can rationally continue.

IV. The Racial Architecture of Prohibition

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
This section was absent from Versions 1.0 through 3.0. Its absence was a structural weakness. The ADA-disability frame this manifesto develops is original and important, but the War on Drugs was not designed primarily as a public health failure that incidentally harmed disabled people. It was designed, from its earliest federal incarnation, as a tool of racial and political control. To omit that history is to misrepresent the system this manifesto seeks to dismantle. Version 4.0 corrects that omission.
The disability-discrimination theory and the racial-discrimination theory are not competing frames. They are two faces of the same prohibition apparatus operating against intersecting protected classes. A Black or Brown American with an untreated psychiatric disability faces the American Pharmacratic Inquisition twice over.

A. The Founding Lie: Anslinger and the Marihuana Tax Act

The federal criminalization of cannabis did not emerge from medical research or evidence-based policymaking. It emerged from the explicit racial animus of Harry J. Anslinger, the first commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, who built the case for the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 on testimony and propaganda that no contemporary court would credit.

Anslinger told Congress that cannabis caused "white women to seek sexual relations with Negroes." He testified that "reefer makes darkies think they're as good as white men." He cataloged "Hispanic" and "Black" men committing crimes under marijuana's influence in his "gore files"—a collection of unverified police anecdotes used as the empirical foundation for fed-

eral prohibition. The American Medical Association testified in opposition; its testimony was disregarded.

The original federal prohibition of cannabis was, on its face and in its legislative record, a project of racial control. Every subsequent expansion of federal drug law inherits that lineage.

B. The Modern Admission: Ehrlichman in His Own Words

In 1994, John Ehrlichman—Richard Nixon's domestic policy advisor and a principal architect of the modern War on Drugs—gave Dan Baum the following statement, published in *Harper's Magazine* in April 2016:

> *"The Nixon campaign in 1968, and the Nixon White House after that, had two enemies: the antiwar left and black people. You understand what I'm saying? We knew we couldn't make it illegal to be either against the war or black, but by getting the public to associate the hippies with marijuana and blacks with heroin, and then criminalizing both heavily, we could disrupt those communities. We could arrest their leaders, raid their homes, break up their meetings, and vilify them night after night on the evening news. Did we know we were lying about the drugs? Of course we did."*

The statement has been disputed by some former Nixon aides, but it is consistent with the documentary record of the Nixon administration's approach to political opponents and with the demographic targeting of subsequent enforcement priorities. It is also, importantly, the closest thing to a confession that exists in American drug policy. The architect of the modern War on Drugs admitted, on the record, that the policy was designed to target Black Americans and political dissidents, and that the empirical case for prohibition was knowingly false.

C. The Crack/Powder Disparity

The 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act established a 100-to-1 sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine. Possession of 5 grams of crack triggered the same mandatory minimum five-year federal sentence as possession of 500 grams of powder. The pharmacological substances were chemically near-identical. The user demographics were not: crack was associated with Black urban communities, powder with white suburban and professional ones.

The Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 reduced the disparity to 18-to-1. It did not eliminate it. The First Step Act of 2018 made the 2010 reductions partially retroactive. As of this writing, federal law still treats one form of cocaine as roughly twenty times more serious than another based on a distinction with no pharmacological basis but a demonstrable racial valence.

D. Enforcement Disparities at Equivalent Use Rates

The American Civil Liberties Union's 2020 report *A Tale of Two Countries: Racially Targeted Arrests in the Era of Marijuana Reform* documented that Black Americans were 3.64 times more likely than white Americans to be arrested for marijuana possession, despite essentially equivalent rates of use across racial groups. In some states the disparity exceeded 9-to-1. The Sentencing Project's reporting on federal prosecutions consistently shows similar patterns across drug categories.

The point is not that drug enforcement is sometimes racially uneven. The point is that drug enforcement is *systematically* racially uneven, has been so since federal prohibition began, was designed to be so by its architects, and remains so under bipartisan administrations.

E. Intersection with the ADA Pipeline

The disability pipeline described in Section III does not operate against an undifferentiated population. It operates against a population that is itself shaped by the racial demography of American mental health care—where Black, Latino, and Indigenous Americans face additional barriers to psychiatric treatment, additional rates of misdiagnosis, additional rates of involuntary commitment, and additional rates of police rather than medical first response to psychiatric crisis.

A Black American with untreated bipolar disorder who self-medicates with cannabis enters the American Pharmacratic Inquisition through both gates simultaneously. The disability denied treatment is the same disability the ADA protects. The race more aggressively policed for the resulting drug use is the same race the Fourteenth Amendment and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 protect. The system fails along both axes, and so the remedy must operate along both.

LEGAL GROUNDING
The intersectional discrimination identified here is independently actionable under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (for federally funded programs), and the ADA. The Supreme Court in *Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229 (1976) requires discriminatory intent for Equal Protection challenges to facially neutral statutes; the documentary record from Anslinger to Ehrlichman provides material relevant to that inquiry that no other policy area can match.

V. Religious Freedom and Indigenous Sovereignty

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
The First Amendment lever was unused in earlier versions. Where the ADA argument depends on a statutory framework with known limitations, the Free Exercise Clause and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act establish a constitutional architecture that drug prohibition has already failed to overcome in named Supreme Court cases. Version 4.0 incorporates this lineage.

A. The Peyote Precedent and Its Aftermath

For more than a century, the Native American Church and its predecessors have used peyote as a sacramental medicine. *Employment Division v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990) held that the Free Exercise Clause did not require an exemption from neutral, generally applicable drug laws for sacramental peyote use—a decision so widely criticized that Congress responded with both the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 and, specifically, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act Amendments of 1994, which protect peyote use by enrolled members of federally recognized tribes.

The architecture matters: when prohibition encounters religious practice, Congress has repeatedly chosen religion. The lesson generalizes.

B. Ayahuasca and the Limits of Schedule I Enforcement

In *Gonzales v. O Centro Espírita Beneficente União do Vegetal*, 546 U.S. 418 (2006), a unanimous Supreme Court held under RFRA that the federal government could not bar the União do Vegetal from importing ayahuasca for sacramental use. The opinion, authored by Chief Justice Roberts, found that the government had failed to demonstrate a compelling interest in uni-

form application of the Controlled Substances Act sufficient to override the church's sincere religious practice.

The decision establishes that Schedule I status is not, by itself, dispositive. The government must demonstrate a compelling interest in prohibition as applied to the specific religious use, and must show that prohibition is the least restrictive means. For an enormous range of sacramental and entheogenic practices, the government cannot make either showing.

C. The Broader Sacramental Landscape

The contemporary religious-use landscape extends well beyond peyote and ayahuasca. The Santo Daime church uses ayahuasca. The Bwiti tradition uses iboga. Cannabis is a sacrament in Rastafari, in some Hindu traditions, and in branches of Judaism and Christianity that read the *kaneh-bosm* references in the Hebrew Bible as cannabis. Psilocybin mushrooms are used in Mazatec curanderismo and increasingly in non-denominational spiritual contexts.

A drug enforcement regime that treats Schedule I substances as categorically prohibited—without engaging the RFRA inquiry the Supreme Court mandated nearly two decades ago—is operating outside the constitutional architecture established by *O Centro*.

D. Indigenous Sovereignty Beyond Religion

The framing of indigenous psychoactive practices as merely "religious" is itself a category imposed by federal law. For many tribal traditions, plant medicine is medicine—not metaphorically, but operationally. The category "drug" as the Controlled Substances Act uses it is a colonial import. Tribal sovereignty arguments, separately from RFRA, support a regime in which indigenous nations determine for themselves what plants their members may use.

> **IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION**
> The religious freedom argument supports specific exemptions, not blanket legalization. RFRA requires a sincere religious practice and operates as-applied. The framework this manifesto proposes—decriminalization for personal use combined with regulated access—reduces the necessity of religious exemp-

> tions by reducing the underlying prohibition. Where prohibition remains, the religious freedom architecture must apply.

VI. Medicine in Its Infancy: The Limits of Prescription Pharmacology

Modern psychiatry, for all its advances, remains a young and imperfect science. The monoamine hypothesis of depression—the theoretical foundation for SSRIs—is increasingly recognized as incomplete at best, misleading at worst. Antipsychotics carry the risk of tardive dyskinesia, metabolic syndrome, and neuroleptic malignant syndrome. Benzodiazepines, prescribed freely for anxiety, produce physical dependence indistinguishable from that of the street drugs they are meant to replace.

The side-effect profiles of many psychiatric medications are not minor inconveniences. They are, for many patients, disabling in their own right: weight gain of fifty or sixty pounds, sexual dysfunction that destroys relationships, cognitive dulling that robs a person of their identity, and akathisia—an internal restlessness so unbearable it is itself a documented risk factor for suicide.

> **IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION**
> The argument that follows—that self-medication can represent a rational pharmacological decision—does not imply that all self-medication is safe, effective, or without risk. Unregulated substance use carries real dangers: unknown potency, drug interactions, addiction, and acute toxicity.
> The point is not that self-medication is always wise, but that the response to it should be medical, not criminal. The appropriate intervention for a person making a risky pharmacological decision is a physician, not a prosecutor.

A. The Evidence the System Suppresses

> **EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION**
> Earlier versions named therapeutic compounds without citing the underlying clinical evidence. Version 4.0 grounds the claim in the peer-reviewed record. The body of research below is not exhaustive—it is the minimum necessary

> to refute the assertion that Schedule I status reflects scientific consensus on therapeutic value.

Psilocybin for treatment-resistant depression. Carhart-Harris and colleagues at Imperial College London published feasibility data in *The Lancet Psychiatry* (2016) showing significant reductions in depressive symptoms following psilocybin-assisted therapy in patients who had failed multiple conventional antidepressants. Subsequent randomized trials, including the COMPASS Pathways Phase IIb study published in *The New England Journal of Medicine* (Goodwin et al., 2022), found that a single 25-mg dose of synthetic psilocybin produced significant antidepressant effects sustained at three weeks. The Johns Hopkins team led by Roland Griffiths has produced a parallel body of work on psilocybin for major depressive disorder, end-of-life anxiety, and tobacco cessation.

MDMA for PTSD. The Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies (MAPS) sponsored Phase 3 trials of MDMA-assisted therapy for severe PTSD. The first published Phase 3 study (Mitchell et al., *Nature Medicine*, 2021) found that 67% of participants in the MDMA arm no longer met DSM-5 PTSD criteria after three sessions, compared to 32% in the placebo arm. A second confirmatory Phase 3 study reported similar results in 2023.

MDMA's regulatory rejection — a contemporary case study in capture. In August 2024, the FDA declined to approve Lykos Therapeutics' MDMA-assisted PTSD therapy despite the Phase 3 evidence. The advisory committee raised methodological concerns, some legitimate (functional unblinding is a real challenge in psychedelic trials) and some that read as motivated reasoning given the comparable approval standards applied to conventional psychiatric medications. The rejection is itself evidence for this manifesto's central thesis: an unpatentable molecule with the strongest evidence base in modern PTSD treatment cannot clear a regulatory bar that approves SSRIs whose efficacy over placebo is, by any honest meta-analysis, modest.

Psilocybin for alcohol use disorder. Bogenschutz and colleagues published the first randomized controlled trial of psilocybin-assisted therapy for alcohol dependence in *JAMA Psychiatry* (2022), finding significantly reduced heavy drinking days at 32-week follow-up.

Ibogaine for opioid use disorder. Brown and Alper's work on ibogaine, along with Mexican and New Zealand clinical observations, document substantial reductions in opioid withdrawal symptoms and craving follow-

ing single-dose ibogaine treatment. The compound's cardiac risk profile requires medical supervision, which is the argument for medical access, not for criminalization.

Cannabis for chronic pain, PTSD, and opioid sparing. The 2017 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine report *The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids* concluded that there is "conclusive or substantial evidence that cannabis or cannabinoids are effective" for chronic pain in adults, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting, and patient-reported multiple sclerosis spasticity. State-level data continues to associate medical cannabis access with reduced opioid prescribing and reduced opioid mortality.

B. The DEA's Own Internal Contradictions

In 1988, after extensive hearings on cannabis rescheduling, DEA Administrative Law Judge Francis L. Young issued a 90-page opinion concluding:

> *"Marijuana, in its natural form, is one of the safest therapeutically active substances known to man. By any measure of rational analysis marijuana can be safely used within a supervised routine of medical care."*

The DEA Administrator overruled Judge Young's recommendation administratively. The recommendation has never been refuted on the merits. The agency tasked with enforcing prohibition produced, through its own quasi-judicial process, a finding inconsistent with Schedule I status, and ignored it.

C. Paracelsus, Once More

When a person with treatment-resistant depression finds that psilocybin provides relief without the disabling side effects of a sixth failed antidepressant, when a veteran with PTSD finds that cannabis quiets nightmares that no SSRI could touch, when a person with chronic pain discovers that kratom manages what opioid prescriptions once did before they were abruptly discontinued—these are not moral failures. These are rational pharmacological decisions made by suffering people in a system that has failed them.

Paracelsus, the father of toxicology, established the foundational principle of pharmacology five centuries ago:

> *"Alle Dinge sind Gift, und nichts ist ohne Gift, allein die Dosis macht dass ein Ding kein Gift ist."*
>
> *"All things are poison, and nothing is without poison; the dosage alone makes it so a thing is not a poison."*
>
> — *Paracelsus,* Die dritte Defension (*1538*)

This axiom makes no distinction between patented and unpatented molecules. Aspirin can kill. Tylenol destroys livers. Water, consumed in excess, causes fatal hyponatremia. The classification of a substance as "medicine" or "drug of abuse" is not a pharmacological distinction—it is a political and economic one.

VII. Beyond Prohibition and Pure Medicalization

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
This section is new in Version 4.0. Earlier versions critiqued prohibition without acknowledging that the alternative most often offered—a purely medicalized framework in which all drug use is treated as pathology requiring clinical intervention—is also inadequate. Both paradigms fail. The path forward lies between them.

American drug policy has oscillated between two paradigms, each insufficient on its own.

A. The Prohibitionist Paradigm

The dominant paradigm since 1914. Drug use is criminal behavior. The user is a moral failure or a criminal subject. The response is enforcement, incarceration, and a permanent record. The evidence after a century is unambiguous: prohibition does not reduce drug use, increases drug-related death, creates black markets, fuels organized crime, destabilizes producing nations, and disproportionately destroys communities of color. This manifesto's primary critique is of this paradigm and the consequences it has produced.

B. The Purely Medicalized Paradigm

The reformist alternative most commonly proposed: drug use is always a symptom of underlying pathology. The user is a patient. The response is mandatory treatment, civil commitment, drug courts, and clinical management. This paradigm is more humane than prohibition. It is also incomplete, and in some forms it produces its own injustices.

The Mad Pride and consumer-survivor movements have made this critique with force for fifty years. Thomas Szasz, whatever else one thinks of his

work, was right that the medical model can be weaponized to justify coercion. Robert Whitaker's *Anatomy of an Epidemic* documents that the long-term outcomes of psychiatric pharmaceutical treatment are not always what the marketing claims. The forced administration of psychiatric medication, court-mandated rehabilitation, civil commitment without consent, and the redefinition of every form of substance use as a treatable disease—these can become a different cage with softer bars.

> **IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION**
> Not every drink of wine is alcoholism. Not every shared joint is cannabis use disorder. Not every recreational psilocybin trip is a cry for help. Most adult human beings who use psychoactives use them episodically and without diagnosable pathology. Treating all use as illness pathologizes ordinary human behavior, and it can be used to justify coercion that prohibition cannot. A free society distinguishes between use, misuse, and disorder—and responds proportionally to each.

C. The Distinction Both Paradigms Refuse to Make

Both prohibition and pure medicalization fail because they refuse to make a distinction that any honest observer can see:

A glass of wine with dinner is not the same as drinking yourself unconscious in the parking lot of a bar. A weekend hike on a low dose of psilocybin is not the same as smoking crack at 4 a.m. while ignoring your children. A veteran using cannabis to sleep is not the same as a teenager dabbing 90% THC concentrate every two hours. **The substance is not the variable that determines harm. The relationship to the substance is.**

D. Concessions Earlier Versions Did Not State Plainly

Intellectual honesty requires the following concessions, which earlier versions of this manifesto did not state plainly enough:

- **Not all self-medication is rational in the long run.** A person who uses heroin to manage childhood trauma may be making a rational choice in the short term and a fatal choice in the long term. The same is true of high-dose alcohol use, benzodiazepine dependence, and stimulant dependence.

- **The illicit fentanyl supply is killing people who never intended to encounter it.** The current illicit fentanyl supply is killing Americans who think they are taking something else. Counterfeit Adderall pressed with fentanyl. Cocaine cut with nitazenes. Black-tar heroin of unknown potency. These deaths are largely consequences of prohibition, not of the underlying drug use—but they are deaths, and they are real, and any honest analysis acknowledges them.
- **Alcohol is the elephant in the room.** Roughly 178,000 Americans die each year from alcohol-attributable causes. Alcohol is implicated in roughly 30% of homicides, 30% of suicides, large fractions of domestic violence and child abuse cases, and tens of thousands of motor vehicle deaths. The social burden of alcohol alone exceeds the social burden of all illicit drugs combined. This is what fully legal commercialization without strong public health guardrails produces. Any honest policy debate must take this seriously.
- **Cannabis is not risk-free.** Cannabis-induced psychosis in genetically vulnerable users is real. Adolescent heavy use is associated with lasting cognitive effects and elevated risk of psychotic disorders. Cannabis use disorder affects a meaningful minority of users. The substance is dramatically less lethal than alcohol or opioids, but "less lethal than alcohol" is not the same as "safe."
- **Adolescents are different.** Adolescent substance use is associated with worse long-term outcomes for nearly every drug. Brain development continues into the mid-20s. Public health messaging that respects this—without lying, without exaggerating, without scaring users away from honest information—is necessary.

E. The Better Frame

The right framework is neither prohibition nor pure medicalization. It is a tiered, evidence-based response that:

1. **Recognizes the universal mammalian impulse** without pathologizing it;
2. **Distinguishes use, misuse, and disorder**—and responds proportionally;
3. **Prosecutes harmful behavior** regardless of the substance involved;
4. **Treats addiction medically**, with the patient's consent wherever possible;
5. **Regulates commercial supply** with the same seriousness applied to pharmaceuticals;

6. **Educates honestly**, especially the young, especially about real risk;
7. **Respects abstention as a fully valid choice**—never apologized for, never required.

VIII. The American Pharmacratic Inquisition: Cui Bono?

Who benefits from the criminalization of unpatentable molecules?

The pharmaceutical industry, which cannot profit from substances that grow in fields or can be synthesized without proprietary processes, has a direct financial interest in maintaining the illegality of competing compounds. Psilocybin, MDMA, cannabis, ibogaine, kratom—these substances have demonstrated therapeutic potential in peer-reviewed research, yet their legal status remains restricted or prohibited. Meanwhile, patented alternatives with inferior efficacy and worse side-effect profiles enjoy FDA approval and insurance coverage.

This is not conspiracy theory. It is market economics. The lobbying expenditures of pharmaceutical companies are public record. Their influence on scheduling decisions, FDA advisory panels, and congressional drug policy is documented. The American Pharmacratic Inquisition is not a metaphor. It is a business model.

> **EPISTEMIC CAUTION**
> The claim that pharmaceutical industry lobbying directly drives drug scheduling decisions is supported by documented lobbying records and published research on regulatory capture. It should not be overstated into a claim of coordinated conspiracy.
> The system produces these outcomes through diffuse financial incentives, institutional inertia, and ideological commitments to prohibition that predate modern pharmaceutical lobbying. The critique stands on economic analysis without requiring intent.

A. The Sackler Case Study: When the Patented Channel Is Lethal

> **EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION**
> The patented-versus-unpatented critique was theoretically developed in earlier versions but lacked its strongest contemporary illustration. Version 4.0 integrates the Purdue Pharma / Sackler family / McKinsey & Company case study because it is the canonical example of the "legitimate" pharmaceutical channel producing greater harm than the criminalized one—and because it is documented in court filings, settlement agreements, and congressional testimony beyond reasonable dispute.

In 1996, Purdue Pharma launched OxyContin with marketing that downplayed its addictive potential. Internal Purdue documents, later disclosed in litigation, show that the company knew the drug's addiction profile far exceeded what its sales force was telling prescribers. The Sackler family extracted approximately $11 billion from the company between 2008 and 2018, much of it as the opioid crisis they had helped to ignite was killing tens of thousands of Americans annually.

McKinsey & Company advised Purdue on how to "turbocharge" OxyContin sales. Internal McKinsey communications, later disclosed in state attorney general settlements, included proposals to pay distributors rebates for overdoses—a proposal not implemented but indicative of the moral landscape. McKinsey paid approximately $642 million in settlements with state attorneys general in 2021 to resolve claims related to its opioid consulting work.

Purdue Pharma pleaded guilty to federal felonies twice—in 2007 and 2020. The Sackler family negotiated bankruptcy structures designed to shield personal assets from civil liability. The Supreme Court rejected one such structure in *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, 603 U.S. ___ (2024), but the family had by then transferred much of the wealth offshore.

The contrast with prohibition's targets could not be sharper. A teenager who buys an unregulated counterfeit pill on the street and dies of fentanyl poisoning is the predictable victim of prohibition's market displacement. The Sacklers, who profited from FDA-approved overprescription that helped seed that displacement market in the first place, will retain billions of dollars and have served no prison time.

This is the patented channel. This is what "approved" means. Any framework that treats Schedule I status as evidence of danger and FDA approval as evidence of safety is operating on premises the OxyContin record refutes.

B. The Ideology of Prohibition

The doctrine that all non-prescribed drug use is inherently pathological serves the market model. It frames the question not as "Does this substance help this person?" but as "Is this substance approved by the institutions that profit from its alternatives?" The patient's experience is rendered irrelevant. The molecule's legal status becomes its moral status. And the person who finds relief outside the approved channels is redefined as a criminal.

IX. Civil Asset Forfeiture and Policing for Profit

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
Civil asset forfeiture is the financial machinery that makes drug enforcement self-sustaining. It was unaddressed in earlier versions. Version 4.0 adds this section because no honest accounting of the American Pharmacratic Inquisition is complete without it.

Civil asset forfeiture allows law enforcement to seize cash, vehicles, and real property suspected of involvement in drug activity—without convicting the owner of any crime, often without charging the owner at all. The Institute for Justice's *Policing for Profit* report series documents that federal and state law enforcement seize billions of dollars annually under these regimes. The owner bears the burden of proving the property's innocence, frequently in proceedings styled against the property itself ("United States v. $124,700 in U.S. Currency") rather than against the owner.

The Supreme Court in *Timbs v. Indiana*, 586 U.S. ___ (2019) held unanimously that the Excessive Fines Clause of the Eighth Amendment is incorporated against the states and applies to civil forfeiture. The decision reaffirmed the constitutional ceiling. It did not eliminate forfeiture; it merely held that the practice has limits.

The structural effect of civil forfeiture is to make drug enforcement budgetarily attractive to law enforcement agencies. The federal "equitable sharing" program returns up to 80% of seized assets to the seizing local agency, creating a revenue incentive to prioritize drug stops, drug task forces, and drug warrants over other public safety functions. Multiple academic studies have correlated forfeiture revenue with enforcement intensity in ways that suggest the financial incentive shapes the policing rather than the policing producing the financial result.

A reform agenda that decriminalizes personal possession but leaves civil forfeiture intact has changed the law on the books and very little of the law on the street. The American Pharmacratic Inquisition will adapt; the seizures will continue under reframed pretexts. Comprehensive reform requires elimination of civil asset forfeiture in drug cases absent criminal conviction, with proceeds redirected to a general fund rather than to the seizing agency.

X. Incarceration as Cruel and Unusual Punishment

The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. Incarcerating a person for drug use alone—for the act of introducing a substance into their own body—meets any reasonable definition of cruelty when that person's use is a direct manifestation of an untreated psychiatric disability.

The evidence is unambiguous: incarceration does not treat addiction. It does not deter drug use. What it does, reliably and predictably:

- Exposes nonviolent people to criminal networks, criminal thinking, and criminal socialization.
- Disrupts employment, housing, and family connections—the very stabilizing factors that support recovery.
- Creates a permanent criminal record that forecloses future opportunity.
- Subjects people with mental illness to environments that exacerbate their conditions: overcrowding, violence, solitary confinement, and medication disruption.
- Increases the probability of post-release overdose death, as tolerance lost during incarceration meets supply of unknown potency.

> **IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION**
> This argument does not extend to drug-related conduct that harms others. Impaired driving, violence committed under the influence, or neglect of dependents are legitimate criminal matters regardless of the underlying substance. The distinction is between drug use that affects only the user and drug-related behavior that victimizes others. This manifesto argues for decriminalization of the former category, not blanket immunity from accountability.

To place a mentally ill person in a cage because they used a substance to manage their symptoms is not correction. It is not deterrence. It is punishment of the disabled for the crime of being inadequately served, and it is cruel.

XI. The Intellectual Dishonesty of "Drug-Related Crime"

The War on Drugs justifies itself by pointing to "drug-related crime." This framing collapses under honest scrutiny when its components are disaggregated:

Crimes caused by prohibition itself. Trafficking, distribution, territorial violence—these are artifacts of the black market, not of the substances. Alcohol prohibition produced organized crime. Drug prohibition produces cartels. Legalization eliminates these crimes by definition.

Crimes caused by poverty and desperation. Petty theft to fund addiction is a crime of economic desperation created by the intersection of addiction, poverty, and prohibition—not by the pharmacological properties of the drug.

Crimes caused by untreated mental illness. Erratic behavior, public disturbance, trespass—symptoms of psychiatric crisis that occur in the absence of drugs as well, and are more properly addressed by mental health intervention.

Crimes genuinely caused by intoxication. Assault, impaired driving, domestic violence—these are legitimate criminal acts that should be prosecuted based on the harm caused. We do not prohibit alcohol because some people drive drunk. We prohibit drunk driving.

The Poisoned Supply: Prohibition's Body Count

> **EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION**
> Earlier versions of this manifesto discussed overdose mortality as a general public health statistic. Version 4.0 names it for what it is: the direct output of a prohibition regime that displaces regulated pharmaceutical channels with an unregulated black market.

Approximately **806,000 Americans have died from opioid-involved overdoses since 1999** (CDC WONDER, 1999–2024), and total drug overdose deaths since 1999 exceed **1.3 million**. A large and growing share of recent deaths are attributable not to the substances users intended to consume, but to what prohibition-driven adulteration has put into the supply chain in their place.

The current supply is not the supply of a decade ago. **Counterfeit Adderall tablets are pressed with fentanyl and sold to college students expecting a study aid. Heroin arrives contaminated with nitazenes—synthetic opioids more potent than fentanyl and, in some cases, resistant to naloxone reversal.** Pills marketed as oxycodone contain undisclosed benzodiazepine analogues that produce apneas naloxone cannot address. **Xylazine—a veterinary tranquilizer known on the street as "tranq"—now appears in a rising share of the American opioid supply, producing prolonged sedation, distinctive necrotic wounds at injection sites, and a sedative effect that naloxone cannot reverse even when it counters the accompanying opioid.** Xylazine is legally distributed for veterinary anesthesia and diverted into the illicit market—an object lesson in how prohibition's blindness to the underground supply chain leaves it structurally incapable of preventing the very contamination it claims to be addressing. Young people who intended to use one drug die from another they never knowingly consumed.

This is not a failure of the users' judgment. It is the predictable output of a prohibition regime that:

- displaces regulated pharmaceutical channels with an unregulated black market;
- drives producers toward higher-potency compounds that pack more doses per unit of smuggling risk (the "iron law of prohibition");
- eliminates every mechanism—labeling, quality control, dosing information, contamination testing—by which a modern consumer protects themselves from bad product;
- criminalizes the harm reduction infrastructure (drug checking, safe consumption sites) that would otherwise catch adulteration before it reaches the vein.

The bodies are the receipts on prohibition's design choices, not on the users' character. Every fentanyl-laced counterfeit that kills a teenager is a policy decision, cashed out in a coroner's report.

XII. Lessons from Around the World: What Decriminalization Requires

A. Portugal: The Foundational Case

In 2001, Portugal decriminalized the personal possession and use of all drugs under Law 30/2000. Possession of a personal supply—defined as up to a ten-day quantity—was reclassified from a criminal offense to an administrative one. People found in possession are not arrested. They are referred to a "dissuasion commission" (*Comissão para a Dissuasão da Toxicodependência*) composed of legal, social work, and medical professionals, which can recommend treatment, impose minor sanctions, or take no action at all.

The results after more than two decades: drug-induced death rates among the lowest in Europe, significant reductions in HIV transmission among people who inject drugs, increased treatment uptake, and no meaningful increase in overall drug use. Portugal did not condone drug use. It simply stopped destroying lives over it.

The quantitative contrast is stark. On the only basis that permits a like-for-like comparison—age-standardized mortality computed by a single methodology for both countries—the United States recorded approximately **203 drug-use-disorder deaths per million** against Portugal's **6.4 per million**: **a gap of roughly 32 to 1** (IHME, Global Burden of Disease 2021). Crude national counts point the same direction with different denominators: CDC recorded **55,296 opioid-involved overdose deaths in 2024** (~162 per million population), falling to **44,564 in 2025**—the third consecutive annual decline.

> **EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION**
> Earlier versions cited Portugal without adequately explaining what made it work. Version 4.0 emphasizes the structural prerequisite: Portugal succeeded because decriminalization was paired with massive investment in treatment, harm reduction, and social services. Decriminalization alone, without treat-

ment infrastructure, reduces criminal penalties but does not necessarily reduce harm. This is the lesson Oregon learned at high cost.

B. Oregon Measure 110: A Confirmation, Not a Refutation

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
No serious reader will engage this manifesto without raising Oregon Measure 110 and its 2024 partial recriminalization under HB 4002. Earlier versions of this manifesto did not address Oregon directly. Version 4.0 confronts it head-on, because Oregon's experience is not a refutation of decriminalization—it is confirmation of the conditions decriminalization requires to succeed.

In November 2020, Oregon voters passed Measure 110, decriminalizing personal possession of all drugs and directing cannabis tax revenue toward treatment and recovery services. Implementation began in February 2021. By 2024, the Oregon legislature passed HB 4002, recriminalizing personal possession as a misdemeanor effective September 2024.

The narrative offered by drug war defenders is simple: Oregon tried decriminalization; it failed. The actual record is more complicated and, on examination, supports rather than refutes this manifesto's framework.

What actually happened. Measure 110 reduced criminal penalties immediately, on day one. The treatment infrastructure it funded took years to build—and the bureaucratic mechanisms for distributing the funds were slow, contested, and in some cases dysfunctional. By the time substantial treatment capacity was operational, fentanyl had displaced heroin in the regional drug supply, overdose deaths had spiked nationally (not only in Oregon, and not only in jurisdictions that decriminalized), and political backlash had built around visible street-level disorder in Portland that intersected with but was not primarily caused by decriminalization itself.

What the data actually show. Comparative analyses of overdose mortality in Oregon versus neighboring states with similar fentanyl exposure but without decriminalization show effects that are, depending on the methodology, modest, ambiguous, or absent. Oregon's overdose increase tracked the national trajectory more than it diverged from it. The most rigorous published analyses—including work from the New England Journal of Medicine and

RAND—do not support the conclusion that Measure 110 caused the overdose increase that motivated its repeal.

What Measure 110 actually demonstrates. Decriminalization without rapid, well-implemented treatment infrastructure cannot succeed politically, regardless of whether it succeeds epidemiologically. The Portuguese model worked because Portugal built the dissuasion commissions, expanded methadone access, funded harm reduction, and created housing supports *before and during* the legal change. Oregon legalized first and built capacity second. The political clock ran out before the public health clock could catch up.

This is not an argument against decriminalization. It is an argument for the version of decriminalization Section XVI of this manifesto describes: structural, infrastructure-first, treatment-paired. The lesson of Oregon is the lesson Portugal already taught—decriminalization is necessary but not sufficient. Without the treatment investment described in Section XVI, decriminalization will be repealed in the United States as it was in Oregon.

C. Switzerland: Heroin-Assisted Treatment

Switzerland's response to the heroin crisis of the 1980s and early 1990s—centered on Zurich's Platzspitz "needle park"—was not increased criminalization but the development of heroin-assisted treatment (HAT). Patients with severe, treatment-resistant opioid use disorder receive prescribed pharmaceutical-grade diacetylmorphine under medical supervision. Long-term studies show substantial reductions in criminal activity, improvements in social functioning, and lower mortality compared to methadone alone for the most severely affected patients.

The Swiss model is not appropriate for every patient or every drug. It is the appropriate model for a specific population for whom abstinence-oriented treatment has repeatedly failed.

D. British Columbia: Safer Supply

British Columbia has piloted "safer supply" programs providing prescribed pharmaceutical alternatives to street drugs for people at high overdose risk. The programs are politically contested and operationally young. The early data suggest reductions in fatal overdose among enrolled patients without substantial diversion to illicit markets. The full evidence base is still devel-

oping; the model is included here not as proven solution but as live experiment whose outcomes will inform American policy if American policymakers choose to learn from them.

E. Czech Republic, Netherlands, Germany

The Czech Republic decriminalized personal drug possession in 2010. The Netherlands operates a long-standing "tolerance policy" (*gedoogbeleid*) for cannabis. Germany legalized recreational cannabis in 2024. None of these jurisdictions has experienced the catastrophic outcomes American prohibition advocates predict from policy change. None is a perfect model. All are evidence that the United States is operating outside the international consensus of comparably situated nations.

XIII. The Funding Crisis as Human Rights Violation: The Numbers

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
Version 1.0 of this manifesto asserted that the funding crisis was severe. Version 3.0 proved it with data. Every claim in this section is sourced from peer-reviewed research, government databases, or independent policy organizations. The numbers speak for themselves.

A. The Psychiatric Bed Deficit

According to a 2025 cross-sectional study published in *PLOS Medicine* using CMS Healthcare Cost Report Information System data from 2011–2023, the United States has approximately **28.4 inpatient psychiatric beds per 100,000 population**—a number that has remained stagnant for over a decade. The literature-supported optimal level is **60 beds per 100,000 population**. The United States is operating at less than half of what is needed.

The Treatment Advocacy Center's reporting is even more dire for state-operated facilities: state psychiatric hospital beds have fallen to a historic low of approximately **10.8 per 100,000 population**—only about 36,150 beds nationwide for a population exceeding 340 million. More than half of those state beds (52%) are now occupied by forensic patients—individuals committed through the criminal legal system for competency evaluation—leaving even fewer beds for civil psychiatric admissions.

Seventy-three percent of states report occupancy rates above 85%, the threshold that signals a critical bed shortage, with eleven states operating at 95% capacity or higher. The 2025 NRI State Profiles report notes that for the first time since the 1950s—when state hospital populations peaked at over 550,000 residents—more states are attempting to increase capacity. But this reversal comes after seven decades of cuts that hollowed out the system.

In practical terms, the United States needs approximately **107,000 additional inpatient psychiatric beds** to reach the optimal benchmark—more than tripling the current state hospital capacity.

B. What It Would Cost to Close the Gap

Hospital construction costs in the United States average approximately $500,000 to $1,500,000 per bed, with a commonly cited benchmark of $1 million per bed for psychiatric facilities. Operating costs range from $800 to $1,100 per bed per day—approximately $292,000 to $401,500 per bed annually.

To build 107,000 new psychiatric beds:

- **Capital construction cost:** approximately $53.5 billion to $160.5 billion depending on facility type and location. At the $1 million median: approximately **$107 billion**—achievable through a ten-year federal infrastructure program at $10.7 billion per year.
- **Annual operating cost for new beds:** approximately **$31 billion to $43 billion per year** at current per-diem rates.

C. Where the Money Goes Instead

The federal drug control budget for FY 2024 was **$43.6 billion**. The FY 2025 request totaled $44.5 billion. In FY 2026, the DEA's enacted budget stands at **$3.46 billion**; SAMHSA's at **$7.44 billion**; the Bureau of Prisons continues to receive approximately $4.1 billion for drug-control-related incarceration. Combined federal, state, and local drug enforcement spending exceeds $40 billion per year.

The annual construction cost to close the psychiatric bed gap ($10.7 billion per year) is less than one-quarter of the annual federal drug control budget—and roughly three times the DEA's budget alone. The United States is not too poor to fund psychiatric care. It has chosen to fund enforcement instead.

D. The Human Cost

Since 1999, nearly 1.3 million Americans have died from drug overdoses. In 2024, **81,313 drug overdose deaths were recorded** (of which **55,296 in-**

volved an opioid)—an approximately **24% decrease from 2023**, the largest single-year decline on record. Provisional 2025 data shows the decline continuing: **44,564 opioid-involved deaths**, a third consecutive annual decline. While these declines are encouraging, overdose remains the leading cause of death for Americans aged 18–44.

State Mental Health Agency expenditures for state psychiatric hospitals totaled $14 billion in 2023—up from $3.8 billion in 1981, but still insufficient to reverse decades of closures. Per-capita spending varies from $12.72 in Arizona to $166.45 in the District of Columbia, with a national average of $41.74.

The message is clear: the United States would rather maintain a global military empire than provide psychiatric beds for its own citizens.

XIII-C. The Cost of Empire vs. The Cost of Compassion

Operation Epic Fury vs. Operation Heal America: A Fiscal Comparison

Figures verified July 2026 — following the April 8 ceasefire and June 27 resumption. Sources at the foot of this section.

> **EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION**
> This section was not part of the original manifesto. It was added in April 2026 because history handed us an argument we could not have scripted: the United States launched a war of choice against Iran while simultaneously claiming it could not afford to fund psychiatric beds, addiction treatment, or homeless services for its own citizens. The section has been refreshed for the July 2026 verified figures, which reflect the more complete accounting now available from CSIS, the Harvard Kennedy School, the Penn Wharton Budget Model, and the Brown University Watson Institute's *Costs of War* project. The direction of the argument has not changed; the specificity of it has sharpened.

Operation Epic Fury launched February 28, 2026. A ceasefire took hold April 8. Fighting resumed June 27. As of late July 2026, the guns are merely paused. The fiscal contrast between what the nation spends destroying a country's infrastructure abroad and what it refuses to spend rebuilding psychiatric infrastructure at home is no longer an abstraction. It is happening in real time, and the numbers are obscene.

What the War Costs

The bill so far, verified July 2026:

Category	Cost	Source
Direct campaign cost	$34–42 billion	CSIS
Munitions alone	$26.1 billion (13,629 strike munitions vs. 13,000+ targets)	CENTCOM
True short-term cost to date (replacement cost)	~$120 billion	Bilmes, Harvard
Rebuilding damaged U.S. bases	~$250 billion	Payne Institute / DoD
Lifetime veterans' benefits (10-year projection)	$250–500 billion	Watson Institute / Bilmes
War supplemental (Congressional appropriation)	$87.6 billion	OMB / Congress
Projected lifetime total	**>$1 trillion**	**Bilmes / Watson Institute**

The war is being financed entirely through borrowing, on top of a national debt of $38 trillion. **The Pentagon reports costs at historical inventory value; replacing what was fired costs at least 50% more—which is why the official figure is roughly a third of the true one.** This is not accounting fraud, but it is systematic understatement, and any honest comparison must use replacement cost rather than book value.

What Healing Would Cost

To close the 107,000-bed gap between today's psychiatric capacity and the clinical standard of 50–60 beds per 100,000 population:

- **Capital construction:** $107 billion at $1 million per bed (a conservative floor)
- **10-year construction program:** $10.7 billion per year
- **Annual operating cost:** $31–43 billion

Building every bed the country lacks costs less than the war's ~$120 billion in short-term outlays to date. Operating every bed costs the war's entire direct price ($34–42 billion) every single year.

Investment	Cost	War-Cost Equivalent
Build 107,000 psychiatric beds	$107 billion	**2.7× the war's direct cost**
10-year construction (per year)	$10.7B/yr	41% of the munitions bill
Operate 107,000 beds (per year)	$31–43B	≈ the entire direct war cost, annually
SAMHSA annual budget (FY2026 enacted)	$7.44B	The $87.6B war supplemental = **11.8 years of SAMHSA**
DEA annual budget	$3.46B	13% of the munitions bill
Housing First for every sheltered household	$9.6B/yr	≈ the war's base-damage bill
TOTAL: Complete national infrastructure	**~$155B yr 1**	**1.3× the war's short-term cost to date**
Operation Epic Fury, direct (CSIS)	$34–42B	—
Short-term cost to date (Bilmes)	~$120B	—
Projected lifetime cost (Bilmes / Watson)	>$1 trillion	—

The Moral Equation

Every Tomahawk cruise missile fired at an Iranian facility costs approximately **$2.6 million**—and roughly **$3–4 million to replace**. Every **THAAD interceptor costs $12.7 million**. Every **Patriot PAC-3 interceptor costs approximately $4 million**.

The United States fired approximately **198 THAAD interceptors in the war's first 16 days—roughly 40% of its entire inventory**—then signed a **$35.3 billion contract to build more**.

- For the cost of a **single THAAD interceptor** ($12.7 million), the nation could operate a **35-bed psychiatric crisis unit for one year**.
- For the cost of the **THAAD replenishment contract alone** ($35.3 billion), the nation could fund SAMHSA's entire budget—every treatment program, every crisis line—for **nearly five years**.
- For the cost of the **$87.6 billion war supplemental**, the nation could build **more than 80% of every psychiatric bed it lacks**.
- For the cost of a **single Tomahawk missile**, the nation could fund naloxone kits to reverse tens of thousands of opioid overdoses.

The war has already produced its own psychiatric casualties. Approximately **15,000–17,000 troops have been exposed to toxins and contaminants**—average age 28. Professor Bilmes projects that a substantial share of the deployed force will claim disability benefits over the coming decade, many for PTSD, traumatic brain injury, and toxic exposure. These veterans will return to a country that does not have enough psychiatric beds to treat them. They will join the queue behind the civilians who were already waiting. Some of them will self-medicate. Some of them will be arrested for it.

THE CYCLE

The American Pharmacratic Inquisition does not merely punish the mentally ill for being sick. It creates new patients through wars of choice and then refuses to treat them when they come home. The budget is the proof. The priorities are on the page. The cruelty is the point.

Senator Elizabeth Warren, after a classified Iran briefing in March 2026, stated the obvious: *"While there is no money for 15 million Americans who lost their health care, there's a billion dollars a day to spend on bombing Iran."*

The United States could build every psychiatric bed it needs, fund every addiction treatment program it lacks, and house every homeless American whose homelessness is driven by untreated mental illness—for less than the projected cost of a single war of choice against a country that posed no imminent military threat to the American homeland.

This is not a question of whether America can afford to treat its mentally ill. It is a question of whether America chooses to.

Sources for Section XIII-C: CSIS, "The War May Be Ending. What Did Epic Fury Cost?" (June 2026); Pentagon comptroller and OMB statements to Congress; Linda J. Bilmes, Harvard Kennedy School (NPR interview, July 25, 2026); Payne Institute, Colorado School of Mines; Penn Wharton Budget Model; Brown University Watson Institute, *Costs of War* project; Treatment Advocacy Center, "Estimating Psychiatric Bed Need" (2024); FY2026 enacted appropriations (SAMHSA, DEA); National Alliance to End Homelessness (2025); CBO/KFF coverage estimates. War figures are a snapshot as of July 2026 and will rise if hostilities resume.

XIV. International Human Rights Framework

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
Earlier versions situated this manifesto entirely within American constitutional and statutory law. That framing was correct for an ADA-based argument but incomplete. International human rights bodies have, for at least a decade, articulated frameworks for drug policy that align with the proposals in Section XVI. Version 4.0 incorporates this lineage because it strengthens the domestic argument and because it situates the United States as an outlier in a global consensus the United States itself helped to author.

A. UN Special Rapporteurs

In 2017, then-UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health Dainius Pūras issued a report calling for the decriminalization of drug use and possession for personal use. The report concluded that punitive drug policies violate the right to health and disproportionately harm marginalized populations. Subsequent Special Rapporteurs have reaffirmed this position.

The Special Rapporteur on Torture, Juan Méndez and his successors, have repeatedly characterized aspects of compulsory drug treatment, criminal punishment for substance use disorders, and conditions in drug detention facilities as constituting cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment under international law.

B. The 2019 UN Common Position on Drug Policy

In 2019, the UN Chief Executives Board for Coordination—comprising 31 UN agencies including WHO, UNAIDS, UNDP, and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights—adopted a Common Position on Drug Policy. The position calls for decriminalization of drug use and possession

for personal use, expansion of harm reduction, and a public health approach grounded in human rights.

The position is not binding on the United States. It is, however, the closest the international system has come to a unified statement of best practice. The United States, which historically championed the prohibition framework now being abandoned by its own UN system colleagues, has not aligned its domestic policy with the position its own diplomats negotiated.

C. The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2006 and entered into force in 2008. The United States signed the CRPD in 2009 but has not ratified it; the Senate failed to provide advice and consent in 2012.

Even unratified, the CRPD informs the interpretive landscape for the ADA. The Convention's emphasis on community-based support over institutional care, on autonomy and informed consent, and on the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of disability in all areas of public life provides international interpretive support for the *Olmstead* framework on which this manifesto's ADA argument depends.

D. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

The United States ratified the ICCPR in 1992. Article 7 prohibits cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. Article 26 guarantees equal protection before the law. The Human Rights Committee, which monitors ICCPR compliance, has expressed concern in successive periodic reviews about U.S. drug policy, sentencing disparities, and conditions of confinement for drug offenders.

The United States does not consider these observations binding. They are, nevertheless, on the international record.

XV. Avoiding Re-Institutionalization: Governance Principles for Treatment Investment

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
A manifesto calling for 107,000 new psychiatric beds invites the reasonable concern—particularly from disability rights advocates whose history with American psychiatric institutions is not benign—that this proposal amounts to advocacy for re-institutionalization. The Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, the National Disability Rights Network, the survivor movement, and the descendants of those who endured Willowbrook, Pennhurst, and the long catalog of asylum abuses have legitimate cause for vigilance. Earlier versions of this manifesto did not address this concern. Version 4.0 does, because the proposal in Section XVI.3 cannot be defended in good faith without it.

The expansion of psychiatric infrastructure this manifesto proposes is not a return to the asylum era. It cannot become one. The history of mass institutionalization in the United States—from the Kirkbride hospitals of the nineteenth century through the warehousing exposed in Geraldo Rivera's 1972 Willowbrook reporting—is a history of abuse, neglect, and the systematic deprivation of liberty without adequate due process. Any expansion of inpatient capacity must be governed by principles that foreclose a return to that history.

A. The Olmstead Principle: Least Restrictive Environment

Olmstead v. L.C. requires that public services for people with disabilities be provided in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs. New psychiatric beds must be situated within a continuum of care that prioritizes community-based services—assertive community treatment, support-

ive housing, peer respite, mobile crisis response, partial hospitalization, intensive outpatient. Inpatient beds are necessary for acute psychiatric crisis and stabilization; they are not the ground floor of the system. They are the top floor of a building whose foundation is community.

The 107,000-bed figure represents the deficit relative to a benchmark assuming a properly resourced community mental health system. If community capacity is built simultaneously, fewer inpatient beds are needed. If only inpatient capacity is built, demand for inpatient beds will exceed any plausible supply.

B. Voluntary First

Treatment infrastructure must be built primarily for voluntary use. The barriers to voluntary psychiatric care in the United States—cost, stigma, geographic access, waitlists, insurance limitations—are themselves a public health emergency. A patient who would willingly enter treatment but cannot is the typical case in American psychiatry, not the outlier.

Involuntary commitment must remain available for the narrow circumstances in which it is genuinely necessary—imminent danger to self or others, grave disability rendering the person unable to attend to basic needs—and must be governed by robust due process: judicial review, right to counsel, periodic re-determination, the least restrictive alternative analysis required by *Lessard v. Schmidt* and its progeny. The history of involuntary commitment is a history of abuse precisely when these protections have been weakened.

C. Patient Rights as Substantive, Not Procedural

The procedural rights of psychiatric patients—right to refuse treatment, right to access records, right to communicate with the outside world, right to be free from seclusion and restraint absent imminent safety necessity—exist on paper in most jurisdictions. They are unevenly enforced in practice. New federal infrastructure investment must be conditioned on substantive patient rights enforcement: independent ombudsperson offices with real authority, mandatory reporting of seclusion and restraint use to a public registry, minimum staffing ratios sufficient to support engagement rather than warehousing, and protected channels for patients to report abuse without retaliation.

D. Peer Workforce

The community mental health movement of the past three decades has demonstrated that peer support workers—people with lived experience of mental illness in supportive roles within the system—improve outcomes and reduce costs. Federal investment must include substantial expansion of the peer workforce, with credentialing pathways, fair compensation, and integration into clinical teams as colleagues rather than as auxiliaries.

E. Independent Oversight

The expansion proposed in this manifesto must be accompanied by independent oversight mechanisms with the authority and resources to investigate, report, and enforce. The Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division has used its CRIPA authority sporadically and unevenly. A robust national oversight architecture—drawing on the model of the federal protection and advocacy system established under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act—must be built into the infrastructure investment from the beginning, not added retrospectively after the next round of abuses comes to light.

F. Forensic vs. Civil Bed Allocation

Currently, more than half of state psychiatric beds nationwide are occupied by forensic patients—individuals committed through the criminal legal system. The 107,000-bed expansion described here must be net new civil capacity, not a transfer of forensic capacity. Decriminalization itself will reduce forensic demand. Treatment infrastructure must be built for the people the criminal system would otherwise have absorbed, not for those it continues to absorb.

The principle is simple: more beds, fewer cages, better governance over both. Anything less reproduces the pathology this manifesto exists to oppose.

XVI. A Proposed Framework: Balancing Rights, Reducing Harm

1. Federal Decriminalization of Personal Possession

Personal possession of any substance in quantities consistent with personal use (up to a ten-day supply) should become a civil, not criminal, matter. Police encounters involving personal possession should generate a mandatory referral to community-based assessment and treatment, not an arrest.

2. ADA Enforcement Guidance on Disability and Self-Medication

Amend ADA enforcement guidance to recognize that drug use by people with documented psychiatric disabilities, where that use functions as self-medication in the absence of adequate treatment, constitutes a factor that must be considered in housing, employment, and criminal justice contexts. This does not immunize harmful behavior—it requires that the underlying disability be addressed before punishment is imposed.

3. Massive Investment in Treatment Infrastructure—With Governance

The United States needs approximately 107,000 additional inpatient psychiatric beds to reach the literature-supported benchmark of 60 beds per 100,000 population. At a median construction cost of $1 million per bed, this represents approximately $107 billion—achievable at $10.7 billion per year over a decade, less than one-quarter of the current annual federal drug control budget. Annual operating costs of $31–43 billion should be funded by redirecting enforcement spending.

The expansion must be governed by the principles in Section XV: Olmstead-compliant community-first orientation, voluntary-first design, substantive patient rights enforcement, robust peer workforce, independent oversight, and net new civil capacity rather than forensic transfer.

4. Regulated Safe Supply Programs

Implement pharmaceutical-grade safe supply programs—as British Columbia and Switzerland have piloted—providing people with severe addiction access to regulated doses under medical supervision. This eliminates poisoning deaths, reduces black-market crime, and brings people into contact with healthcare.

5. Behavioral Accountability Without Diagnostic Criminalization

Drug use that produces no harmful behavior should not be a criminal matter. Drug use that produces harmful behavior—violence, impaired driving, neglect of dependents—should be addressed based on the behavior, not the substance. This is exactly how we treat alcohol.

6. Evidence-Based Scheduling Reform

Remove barriers to research on Schedule I substances with demonstrated therapeutic potential. Fast-track rescheduling of psilocybin, MDMA, and other compounds where clinical evidence supports medical use. Break the regulatory capture that allows pharmaceutical industry interests to dictate which molecules are legally available.

7. Housing-First and Community Diversion Models

Invest in housing-first programs that provide stable shelter without preconditions of sobriety, paired with voluntary access to treatment and psychiatric services. The evidence base is robust, and these programs are more cost-effective than the cycle of emergency rooms, jail stays, and shelter turnover.

8. Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform

Eliminate civil asset forfeiture in drug cases absent criminal conviction. Redirect proceeds of any remaining forfeitures to a general fund rather than to seizing agencies. Close the federal "equitable sharing" loophole that allows state and local agencies to circumvent state-level forfeiture reforms.

9. Racial Justice Repair

Federal expungement of all federal cannabis convictions, with comparable state-level expungement as a condition of federal funding. Community reinvestment in the neighborhoods most harmed by the War on Drugs, with equity provisions in any regulated cannabis or psychedelic licensing regime to ensure that those who bore the costs of prohibition share in the proceeds of its end.

10. Religious Freedom Protections

Codify in statute the *O Centro* framework: the federal government may not prohibit religious or sacramental use of controlled substances absent a demonstrated compelling interest applied through the least restrictive means. Tribal sovereignty over plant medicine within reservation boundaries should be expressly protected.

XVII. The Cruelty of the Current Law

Let us be direct about what the current system does.

It takes a person with schizophrenia who smokes methamphetamine because it quiets the voices when their Medicaid-approved antipsychotic makes them too sedated to function, and it puts them in a cell.

It takes a veteran with PTSD who uses cannabis because the VA prescribed them an SSRI that made them suicidal, and it revokes their benefits.

It takes a mother with treatment-resistant depression who microdoses psilocybin because three prescription antidepressants failed, and it separates her from her children.

It takes a teenager with undiagnosed bipolar disorder who self-medicates with opioids because no one recognized what was happening, and it gives them a felony record before their twenty-first birthday.

It takes a Black man pulled over for a broken taillight, finds a small quantity of cannabis in the car, seizes the car under civil forfeiture, charges him with possession with intent to distribute based on the way the cannabis is packaged, and offers him a plea deal that adds a felony to a record that will follow him for the rest of his life.

It takes a Native American grandmother who uses peyote in a ceremony her family has practiced for five generations, and—were she not protected by the AIRFA Amendments her ancestors had to fight Congress for—would arrest her for it.

And then it calls this justice.

The current iteration of drug law in the United States is not merely misguided. It is ignorant—ignorant of pharmacology, ignorant of psychiatry, ignorant of history, ignorant of the lived reality of mental illness and racial inequality. It is cruel—cruel in its indifference to suffering, cruel in its preference for punishment over healing. And it is a fundamental failure of compassion—the basic human recognition that a person in pain will seek relief, and that the form of that relief is a medical question, not a moral one.

XVIII. Conclusion: From Inquisition to Enlightenment

The American Pharmacratic Inquisition must end.

Not because drug use is harmless—it is not. Not because addiction is benign—it devastates lives. Not because accountability should be abolished—it should not. But because the response to a health crisis cannot be a criminal one. Because the punishment of the disabled for the inadequacy of the systems meant to serve them is an abomination. Because a system designed in racial animus and sustained by financial incentive cannot reform itself through the same mechanisms that built it. Because a nation that spends more on aircraft carriers than on psychiatric beds has lost its moral authority to lecture anyone about law and order.

Paracelsus told us the poison is in the dose. The poison in America is not the drugs. It is the dosage of cruelty, indifference, and willful ignorance administered daily by a system that has chosen profit and punishment over healing and humanity.

The mentally ill of this nation deserve better. The addicted deserve better. The Black, Latino, and Indigenous communities targeted from the founding deserve better. The veterans we manufactured and abandoned deserve better. The human beings sleeping on sidewalks and dying in cells deserve better.

It is time to stop the war on the most vulnerable among us and start the work of actually helping them.

XIX. What You Can Do

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
A manifesto that ends without telling its audience what to do is an essay. This section was absent from Versions 1.0 and 2.0. Version 3.0 corrected that omission. Version 4.0 expands the call to action with specific litigation, legislative, and organizational pathways.

Educate. Share this manifesto. Discuss it with your representatives, your community organizations, and your networks. The first step in ending the American Pharmacratic Inquisition is refusing to accept its premises.

Advocate. Contact your federal and state representatives. Demand increased funding for psychiatric beds and substance abuse treatment. Oppose legislation that criminalizes addiction. Support ballot initiatives for decriminalization. Hand them the model legislation in Appendix B.

Litigate. If you or someone you love has been harmed by the discrimination pipeline described in this manifesto, the legal architecture for an ADA challenge exists. Appendix C describes the framework. Pro bono and legal aid resources are available through Disability Rights state-level offices, the Bazelon Center, and the Drug Policy Alliance's legal program.

Support. Volunteer with or donate to organizations working on these issues:

- **Treatment Advocacy Center** (tac.org) — Research and advocacy for psychiatric bed access
- **Drug Policy Alliance** (drugpolicy.org) — Drug law reform and decriminalization
- **NAMI** (nami.org) — National Alliance on Mental Illness
- **Harm Reduction Coalition** (harmreduction.org) — Evidence-based harm reduction services
- **Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law** (bazelon.org) — Disability rights litigation
- **Sentencing Project** (sentencingproject.org) — Racial justice in criminal sentencing

- **Institute for Justice** (ij.org) — Civil asset forfeiture litigation
- **MAPS** (maps.org) — Psychedelic research and policy

Connect. Join the Pneumapsyche community at lived.pneumapsyche.com — a peer support platform for people navigating mental health challenges.

Speak. If you have lived experience with self-medication, mental illness, and the criminal justice system, your story matters. Sharing it—safely, on your terms—is one of the most powerful tools for changing hearts and policy.

APPENDIX A: Common Objections Answered

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
Predictable objections deserve answers in the document itself rather than in a separate response published after the manifesto has already been dismissed. Version 4.0 anticipates the most common rebuttals.

"Won't decriminalization cause more drug use?"

The Portuguese, Czech, and Dutch experiences show no meaningful increase in overall drug use following decriminalization. The primary effects are reduction in incarceration, increase in treatment uptake, and reduction in overdose mortality. The premise of the question—that criminalization meaningfully deters use—is not supported by comparative international evidence.

"Doesn't Portugal have lower drug use rates simply because it's a different country?"

Portugal's pre-decriminalization rates of heroin use and HIV transmission among injecting drug users were among the highest in Europe. The 2001 reform was a response to a crisis comparable in severity to the contemporary American opioid crisis. The relevant comparison is Portugal's trajectory after the reform, not its baseline before it. That trajectory is favorable across every measured outcome.

"What about Oregon?"

Section XII.B addresses Oregon directly. The short answer: Oregon decriminalized first and built treatment infrastructure second, exactly the failure mode this manifesto's framework is designed to prevent. Oregon is evidence for the proposal in this manifesto, not against it.

"Won't decriminalization enable cartels?"

Decriminalization affects the legal status of personal possession; it does not by itself address production and distribution. Comprehensive reform must

include regulated legal markets for substances where regulation is feasible (cannabis, certain psychedelics in therapeutic contexts) and pharmaceutical-grade safe supply for substances where it is not (opioids, in clinical contexts). The cartel economy is sustained by prohibition, not by decriminalization. Eliminating prohibition over the supply chain is what eliminates the cartel premium.

"What about the children?"

Children are harmed by current policy at every margin. They are harmed when parents are incarcerated for drug offenses and they enter foster care. They are harmed when contaminated drug supplies kill family members. They are harmed when their schools become recruiting grounds for the criminal market that prohibition creates. They are harmed when their communities are subjected to enforcement disproportionate to actual harm caused. Comprehensive reform improves outcomes for children on every axis on which current policy claims to protect them.

"Aren't you just advocating drug use?"

No. This manifesto advocates for the medical, legal, and social treatment of drug use as the public health phenomenon it is, rather than as the criminal phenomenon prohibition pretends it is. The framework explicitly preserves criminal accountability for behaviors that harm others. The argument is not that drugs are good. The argument is that prisons are not medicine.

"Won't this fail in a country as politically polarized as the United States?"

Decriminalization, harm reduction, and treatment expansion have bipartisan precedent. The First Step Act of 2018 was passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican president. State-level cannabis reform has succeeded in states across the political spectrum. The fiscal argument in Section XIII-C—that current policy is wasteful as well as cruel—is available to fiscal conservatives. The framework in Section XVI is not a left-coded program. It is a public health and human rights program.

"Are you saying mentally ill people should self-medicate with street drugs?"

No. Section VI states explicitly that the manifesto does not recommend self-medication; it recommends that the response to self-medication be medical rather than criminal. The first-line treatment for a person who is self-medicating because they cannot access psychiatric care is psychiatric care. The framework in Section XVI builds the system that makes that first-line

treatment available. Until it does, criminalizing the alternative is punishing people for the system's failure.

APPENDIX B: Model Statutory Language — The American Pharmacratic Inquisition Repeal Act (Outline)

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
A manifesto that cannot be turned into a bill is a sermon. Version 4.0 sketches the statutory language a serious reform package would require. This is an outline for legislative drafters, not a finished bill.

Title I: Federal Decriminalization

§ 101. Personal use threshold definitions, by substance class. § 102. Reclassification of personal possession from criminal to civil violation. § 103. Mandatory referral to assessment and treatment in lieu of arrest. § 104. Civil sanction limits and judicial review. § 105. Preemption of state criminal possession statutes for personal-use quantities; safe harbor for state regulatory regimes.

Title II: ADA Enforcement Amendments

§ 201. Findings on disability discrimination in drug enforcement. § 202. Amendment to ADA enforcement guidance to recognize self-medication in the absence of adequate care as a factor in disability accommodation analysis. § 203. Limitation: this title shall not be construed to immunize harmful behavior; it requires that the underlying disability be addressed before punishment is imposed for behavior arising from it. § 204. Private right of action; remedies; attorney's fees.

Title III: Treatment Infrastructure Investment

§ 301. Authorization of $107 billion over ten years for net new civil psychiatric inpatient capacity. § 302. Annual operating support: $31–43 billion, indexed. § 303. Governance conditions: (a) *Olmstead* compliance; community-based services as funding precondition. (b) Voluntary-first design; minimum standards for involuntary commitment due process. (c) Substantive patient rights enforcement; independent ombudsperson offices. (d) Peer workforce minimum percentage. (e) Public reporting registry for seclusion, restraint, and adverse events. (f) Net new civil beds; prohibition on counting forensic transfers toward authorization.

Title IV: Safe Supply Pilot Programs

§ 401. Federal authorization of state-level safe supply pilot programs under medical supervision. § 402. Liability framework; data collection; sunset and re-authorization.

Title V: Scheduling Reform

§ 501. Removal of cannabis from CSA schedules; transfer to FDA/state regulatory regime. § 502. Rescheduling of psilocybin, MDMA, and ibogaine to Schedule II pending therapeutic regulatory framework. § 503. Streamlined research authorization for Schedule I substances with peer-reviewed therapeutic evidence. § 504. Reform of FDA advisory committee disclosure rules to address regulatory capture.

Title VI: Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform

§ 601. Prohibition of civil forfeiture in drug cases absent criminal conviction. § 602. Elimination of federal equitable sharing in drug-related forfeitures. § 603. Redirect of forfeiture proceeds to general fund. § 604. Heightened pleading and burden of proof standards in any remaining civil forfeiture proceeding.

Title VII: Racial Justice Repair

§ 701. Federal expungement of federal cannabis convictions. § 702. State expungement requirement as condition of Title III funding. § 703. Community reinvestment formula for cannabis tax revenue. § 704. Equity provisions for licensing in regulated psychedelic and cannabis markets.

Title VIII: Religious Freedom Protections

§ 801. Codification of *O Centro* framework for religious and sacramental use of controlled substances. § 802. Tribal sovereignty over plant medicine within reservation boundaries.

Title IX: Severability and Effective Dates

§ 901. Severability. § 902. Phased effective dates aligned with infrastructure capacity.

APPENDIX C: Litigation Pathway — ADA Challenge Framework

EDITORIAL NOTE ON ARGUMENT EVOLUTION
A manifesto that cannot be turned into a complaint is theater. Version 4.0 sketches the architecture of an ADA-grounded challenge to the discrimination pipeline. This is general framework, not legal advice for any specific case.

A. Plaintiff Profile and Standing

The strongest plaintiff is an individual who: - has a documented psychiatric disability under the ADA; - has a documented history of attempting to access adequate psychiatric care and being denied (waitlist evidence, insurance denials, bed-shortage documentation); - engaged in self-medication that resulted in arrest, prosecution, or other adverse government action; - can demonstrate that the adverse action would not have occurred but for the underlying disability.

Standing under *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* requires concrete and particularized injury, traceability, and redressability. Each element is satisfiable on the typical fact pattern described in this manifesto. Class action vehicles may be available where the policy targeted is systemic.

B. Theory of the Case

The protected class is "person with a psychiatric disability denied adequate care." The discrimination is the criminalization of the adaptive response to that denial. The §12114 exclusion is addressed by: 1. framing the protected characteristic as the underlying disability rather than the drug use; 2. invoking *Olmstead* for the proposition that unjustified institutionalization-equivalent (here, incarceration) of persons with mental disabilities constitutes ADA discrimination; 3. citing *Sheehan*, *Thompson*, and analogous Cir-

cuit authority for the proposition that the ADA applies to law enforcement encounters where conduct is a manifestation of disability.

C. Defendants

Federal defendants under *Bivens* are constrained; suit will more likely target: - state and local enforcement entities under § 1983 for constitutional claims; - public entities under Title II of the ADA for the discrimination claim; - state Medicaid programs and behavioral health systems under Title II for the failure-to-treat predicate.

D. Relief Sought

- Declaratory relief: that the discrimination pipeline as applied to the plaintiff violates the ADA.
- Injunctive relief: orders requiring meaningful accommodation, diversion to treatment in lieu of prosecution, and where systemic, affirmative orders for the construction or contracting of treatment capacity.
- Monetary damages where authorized by statute; attorneys' fees under 42 U.S.C. § 12205.

E. Evidentiary Foundation

The evidentiary record this manifesto relies on—peer-reviewed studies, GAO reports, *PLOS Medicine* and *JAMA Psychiatry* publications, Treatment Advocacy Center data, ACLU racial disparity reporting—is the same evidentiary foundation that would support expert testimony in an ADA challenge. Plaintiffs' counsel should expect to retain experts in psychiatry, public health, and disability policy.

F. Anticipated Defenses

- §12114 exclusion: addressed in Section III and above.
- Sovereign immunity: state defendants may invoke Eleventh Amendment immunity; *United States v. Georgia*, 546 U.S. 151 (2006) and progeny address abrogation in ADA Title II cases involving constitutional violations.

- Qualified immunity (for individual defendants under § 1983 claims): the contours are heavily litigated; the *Sheehan* line of authority provides the most direct support.
- Standing and ripeness: discussed in Section A above.

G. Strategic Considerations

The strongest case is not necessarily the easiest to file. Test cases should be selected for: - factual sympathy (the plaintiff's mental illness, treatment-seeking, and lack of harm to others should be unambiguous); - jurisdictional posture (Ninth Circuit law is most favorable); - defendant solvency for damages purposes; - record sufficiency for the systemic claim.

Coordination with established disability rights litigation organizations (Bazelon Center, Disability Rights Advocates, the protection-and-advocacy network) is strongly advised.

Sources and References

Primary Legal Sources

[1] Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. [2] 42 U.S.C. § 12114 — ADA exclusion for current illegal drug users (acknowledged and addressed in Section III). [3] *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999); *Sheehan v. City and County of San Francisco*, 743 F.3d 1211 (9th Cir. 2014); *Thompson v. Davis*, 295 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 2002). [3a] *Employment Division v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990). [3b] *Gonzales v. O Centro Espírita Beneficente União do Vegetal*, 546 U.S. 418 (2006). [3c] *Timbs v. Indiana*, 586 U.S. ___ (2019). [3d] *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, 603 U.S. ___ (2024). [3e] American Indian Religious Freedom Act Amendments of 1994, 42 U.S.C. § 1996a. [3f] Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb et seq.

Psychiatric Bed Shortage Data

[4] Lindenfeld, Z. et al. (2025). "Inpatient psychiatric bed capacity within CMS-certified U.S. hospitals, 2011–2023." *PLOS Medicine*, 22(7), e1004682. [5] Treatment Advocacy Center. (2024). *Going, Going, Gone: Trends and Consequences of Eliminating State Psychiatric Beds*. [6] NRI, Inc. (2025). *Use of State Psychiatric Hospitals, 2025*. NRI 2025 State Profiles. [7] McBain, R.K. et al. (2022). "Estimating Psychiatric Bed Shortages in the US." *JAMA Psychiatry*, 79(4), 279–280. [8] American Psychiatric Association. (2023). *The Psychiatric Bed Crisis in the United States*. APA Presidential Task Force Report. [9] Hudson, C.G. (2021). "Benchmarks for needed psychiatric beds." *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 18(22), 12205.

Cost Data

[10] Montana Legislative Branch. (2014). *Building and Operating a 16-Bed Inpatient Facility*. HJR16 Report. [11] Autodesk Construction Blog (2025);

Zintego (2025); Erecre Group Realty (2022). Hospital construction cost analyses.

Drug Control Spending

[12] U.S. GAO. (2025). *ONDCP: Experts' Views on Developing a National Media Campaign*. FY 2024 budget: $43.6 billion. [13] ONDCP. (2024). *FY 2025 Budget Highlights*. [14] Open Society Foundations / Count the Costs (2013). *Wasting Billions, Undermining Economies*.

Overdose Death Data

[15] Spencer, M.R. & Ahmad, F. (2026). "Drug Overdose Deaths in the U.S., 2023–2024." *NCHS Data Brief No. 549.* [16] CDC NCHS. (2025). *Provisional Drug Overdose Death Data*. [17] CDC NCIPC. (2025). *Statement on Provisional 2024 Overdose Data*. [18] Overdose Lifeline. (2025). *2024 Opioid Overdose Data Report*. [18a] CDC. *National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System — Provisional Drug Overdose Death Counts*. — 81,313 total drug overdose deaths in 2024, of which 55,296 involved an opioid; 2025 provisional: 44,564 opioid-involved deaths, a third consecutive annual decline. [18b] CDC WONDER cumulative analysis, 1999–2024. — Approximately 806,765 opioid-involved overdose deaths. [18c] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. *Global Burden of Disease Study 2021.* — Age-standardized death rate from drug use disorders: United States 20.25 per 100,000 (≈203 per million); Portugal 0.64 per 100,000 (≈6.4 per million).

Pharmacology and Psychedelic Research

[19] Paracelsus. (1538). *Die dritte Defension wegen des Schreibens der neuen Rezepte*. [19a] Carhart-Harris, R.L., et al. (2016). "Psilocybin with psychological support for treatment-resistant depression: an open-label feasibility study." *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(7), 619–627. [19b] Goodwin, G.M., et al. (2022). "Single-Dose Psilocybin for a Treatment-Resistant Episode of Major Depression." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 387, 1637–1648. [19c] Mitchell, J.M., et al. (2021). "MDMA-assisted therapy for severe PTSD: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 study." *Nature Medicine*, 27, 1025–1033. [19d] Bogenschutz, M.P., et al. (2022). "Percentage of Heavy Drinking Days Following Psilocybin-Assisted Psychotherapy vs

Placebo in the Treatment of Adult Patients With Alcohol Use Disorder." *JAMA Psychiatry*, 79(10), 953–962. [19e] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids*. [19f] In the Matter of Marijuana Rescheduling Petition, DEA Docket No. 86-22, Opinion of Administrative Law Judge Francis L. Young (1988). [19g] FDA Complete Response Letter to Lykos Therapeutics regarding MDMA-assisted PTSD therapy (August 2024); related advisory committee proceedings.

Comparative International

[20] EMCDDA. *Country Drug Reports: Portugal*. [20a] Hughes, C.E. & Stevens, A. (2010). "What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization of illicit drugs?" *British Journal of Criminology*, 50(6), 999–1022. [20b] Oregon Health Authority. *Measure 110 Implementation Reports* (2021–2024); Oregon HB 4002 (2024). [20c] Swiss Federal Office of Public Health. *Heroin-Assisted Treatment Program Evaluations*. [20d] BC Centre on Substance Use. *Safer Supply Pilot Evaluations* (2023–2025).

Mental Health and Substance Use Data

[21] SAMHSA. (2024). *Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators: 2023 NSDUH*. [22] WHO. *Principles on the Right to Health.* [23] Fein, R.A. & Vossekuil, B. (1998). *Protective Intelligence and Threat Assessment Investigations: A Guide for State and Local Law Enforcement Officials*. U.S. Secret Service / National Institute of Justice.

International Human Rights

[22a] UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health (Pūras). (2017). *Report on Drug Policy*. [22b] UN Chief Executives Board for Coordination. (2019). *Common Position on Drug Policy*. [22c] Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). [22d] International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), Articles 7 and 26.

Race and the War on Drugs

[22e] Baum, D. (April 2016). "Legalize It All: How to win the war on drugs." *Harper's Magazine*. (Ehrlichman quotation.) [22f] American Civil Liberties Union. (2020). *A Tale of Two Countries: Racially Targeted Arrests in the Era of Marijuana Reform*. [22g] The Sentencing Project. *Reports on Federal Drug Sentencing Disparities* (multiple years). [22h] Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, P.L. 99-570; Fair Sentencing Act of 2010, P.L. 111-220; First Step Act of 2018, P.L. 115-391. [22i] Provine, D.M. (2007). *Unequal Under Law: Race in the War on Drugs*. University of Chicago Press.

Civil Asset Forfeiture

[22j] Institute for Justice. *Policing for Profit: The Abuse of Civil Asset Forfeiture* (3d ed. 2020).

Pharmaceutical Industry / Sackler Case Study

[22k] Keefe, P.R. (2021). *Empire of Pain: The Secret History of the Sackler Dynasty*. Doubleday. [22l] U.S. Department of Justice. Settlement agreements with Purdue Pharma L.P. (2007 and 2020). [22m] Multistate settlements with McKinsey & Company regarding opioid consulting (2021).

Iran War Cost Data (Section XIII-C)

Earlier snapshot (April 2026):

[24] Cancian, M. (CSIS). NPR Interview, April 7, 2026. [25] Bilmes, L. Harvard Kennedy School. Interview, April 6, 2026. [26] CSIS Updated Analysis. McCusker, E. (AEI). [27] Pentagon Classified Briefing to Congress. (NYT, *Guardian*.) [28] Kristof, N. "Iran Is a $1.3-Million-a-Minute War." *New York Times*, March 21, 2026. [29] Warren, E. Quoted in *Time*, "What US Spending on the War Could Fund Instead," March 16, 2026. [30] UPI. Pentagon $200B supplemental request. March 24, 2026. [31] *The Intercept*. "Trump's War on Iran Could Cost Trillions." March 17, 2026. [32] Bilmes, L. "The real cost of the war with Iran." *Boston Globe*, March 10, 2026. [33] IranWarCost.com. Live tracker.

July 2026 refresh (primary sources for current XIII-C figures):

[34] CSIS. "The War May Be Ending. What Did Epic Fury Cost?" (June 2026). — Direct campaign cost $34–42B; retrospective accounting after April 8 ceasefire. [35] CENTCOM public disclosures on strike munitions expended: 13,629 munitions against 13,000+ targets; $26.1B munitions cost. [36] Bilmes, L. Harvard Kennedy School. NPR interview, July 25, 2026. — ~$120B short-term cost at replacement value; $250–500B lifetime veterans' benefits. [37] Payne Institute, Colorado School of Mines. Analysis of U.S. base damage rebuilding costs (~$250B). [38] Penn Wharton Budget Model. Fiscal analysis of Operation Epic Fury supplemental appropriations. [39] Brown University Watson Institute. *Costs of War* project — lifetime cost projections. [40] FY2026 Enacted Appropriations. SAMHSA $7.44B; DEA $3.46B. [41] Treatment Advocacy Center. *Estimating Psychiatric Bed Need* (2024). — 50–60 beds per 100,000 clinical standard. [42] National Alliance to End Homelessness (2025). Housing First cost estimates: $9.6B/yr for every sheltered household. [43] CBO / KFF coverage estimates. — 15 million Americans losing health coverage. [44] OMB / Congressional appropriations records. — $87.6B war supplemental. [45] THAAD interceptor procurement contract disclosures. — $12.7M per interceptor; 198 fired in first 16 days (~40% of inventory); $35.3B replenishment contract.

This manifesto is published under the advocacy of Pneumapsyche because the breath of the soul should not be criminalized.

pneumapsyche.com | lived.pneumapsyche.com | pharmacratic-inquisition.info