He goes on to say that “practice guidelines can be developed to ensure that all Drug Courts adhere to the best practices and take reasonable efforts to avoid foreseeable injuries. There is no need to “throw out the baby with the bath water.”” I agree. Each Drug Court should “take reasonable efforts to avoid [the] forseeable injuries”, called relapses and binges, caused by AA and NA. And the only way to do this is by requiring them to “throw out the bathwater”. Require them to stop the telling of war stories and teaching dangerous ideas proven wrong by research.

Dr. Marlowe goes on to say that the way to fix problems with Drug Courts is not to abandon them, and I agree. However, since **none** of the success of these courts is due to AA, NA, or disease-oriented treatment, it must be due to the “other services” Drug Courts provide. If you survey Drug Court participants, I believe you will find that the most effective service provided is the close supervision and the threat of jail or prison time.

Dr. Marlowe goes on to say that “The appropriate course of action is to conduct more sophisticated research to improve the intervention.” But why conduct more “sophisticated research” before taking a serious look at the sophisticated research that has already been done on AA and NA? Why not start “improv[ing] intervention” by requiring that these programs change or by no longer endorsing them? That would be a tremendous improvement. Dr. Marlowe says “The time has come for the Drug Court field…to [develop] guidelines for effective and ethical practices.” I certainly agree that some guidelines are needed for ethical practices.

In Phoenix Arizona, I wanted to sit in Drug Court as an observer. However, someone (the Bailiff I think) said they would call the Marshal’s on me if a participant got “upset” by my T-shirt which read: **DON’T BE DECEIVED! ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS IS DANGEROUS!** Even if I was as nice as can be to everyone in the courtroom, or if I did not say a word at all, I would be told to leave if someone got “upset”. But why not teach the “upset” participant to be tolerant rather than have me thrown out? This would be the “ethical” thing to do. Don’t participants need to learn to respect the right of others to have opposing views? One of the reasons many of them drink and use drugs is because they get “upset” when things don’t go their way. So this Drug Court may have had an opportunity to teach tolerance and self-control to someone who needed it. Instead, they chose to set an example of intolerance. This makes me believe that most (if not all) Drug Courts are sanctuaries for the goddess AA.**12**

Dr. Marlowe also says that a part of “rational drug policy” is determining “how to avoid or redress any potential harms.” He also says “the time has come” for this. So, according to the NADCP Chief of Science, Policy and Law, the “time has come” (for Drug Courts) to “avoid” or “redress” the “potential harm” caused by AA and NA. They also need to avoid or redress the potential harm that comes from offering only one religion to participants. True Bible-believers are being damaged both spiritually and emotionally by being forced to choose “treatment” from the recovery/treatment religion, which includes so-called Christian programs. This unjust and hurtful policy can (and should) be changed right away.

**NOTES** (Email**:** [**jbtentmaker@gmail.com**](mailto:jbtentmaker@gmail.com))

1. [www.nadcp.org/learn/setting-record-straight-criticisms- answered](http://www.nadcp.org/learn/setting-record-straight-criticisms-%20%20answered).

**2.** William Miller and Reid Hester, “The Effectiveness of

Alcoholism Treatment: What Research Reveals.”

*Treating Addictive Behaviors: Processes of Change*. W.

R. Miller and N. Heather, Eds. New York: Plenum Press, 1986, p. 135.

**3.** See Brandsma *et al* 1980; Ditman and Crawford (1966) assigned court mandated “alcohol addicts” to A.A., clinic treatment, or no treatment (probation only)

**4**. Google Beware of the Program Youtube Jim Battle.

**5.** Beyette, Beverly. “Alcoholism: Is It Really a Disease?: Controversial Author Contends Drinking Is Modifiable Behavior” LA Times; Peele, Sandford. “Herbert Fingarette, Radical Revisionist, Why Are People So Upset With This Retiring Philosopher?”

**6.** Fingarette, “Alcoholism: The Mythical Disease,” *op. cit.*, p. 68.

**7.** “Treatment of Alcoholism—Part II.” *The Harvard Medical School Mental Health Letter*, Vol. 4, No. 1, July 1987, p. 3.

**8.** Google AA is Religious.

**9.** Go to [www.nadcp.org/learn/what-are-drug-courts](http://www.nadcp.org/learn/what-are-drug-courts).

**10.** Google Evidence for the Bible and Christianity.

**11.** Go to [www.psychoheresy-aware.org/aaroots.html](http://www.psychoheresy-aware.org/aaroots.html). Also Google 12 Steps To Destruction ebook (read it for free online).

**12.** See King James Bible, Acts 19:23-28.

**Beware of Drug Court!**

This is a review of an article written by Dr. Douglas Marlowe in response to criticisms of Drug Courts made by criminal law attorneys. Dr. Marlowe is Chief of Science, Policy and Law at National Association of Drug Court Professionals (**NADCP**). The title of his article is “Drug Courts Save Lives and Money: So Why the Criticisms?”1

Dr. Marlowe starts out by saying that “the criminal justice system endorses evidence-based practices” – practices based on “favorable research findings”. However, he fails to mention that the criminal justice system also endorses programs that are **not** based on “favorable research findings”. And many of the practices (and beliefs) of these programs are not based on any evidence at all, favorable or **un**favorable. As a matter of fact, research findings show that none of these programs work and one of them is even harmful. The programs I am speaking of are disease-oriented treatment programs and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA). And since the teachings and practices of Narcotics Anonymous (NA) are virtually the same as AA’s, NA is harmful as well.

In a book titled **“The Effectiveness of Alcoholism Treatment: What Research Reveals”** the authors inform us that there are no *truly* scientific experiments that support the belief that AA works.**2** The authors start out by referring to some studies on AA that produced “results that are virtually uninterpretable.” In other words, the results of these studies cannot be explained. Therefore, they have no value. However, these (and other worthless studies) are the kind that some AA-believers use in order to fool people into believing there is scientific evidence that the program works. The findings of good research studies indicate that going to AA meetings causes many addicts to relapse and go on binges.**3** One of the reasons for this is the "war stories". At AA and NA meetings, some people brag about what they did when they were drunk or high on drugs. For some listeners, these stories bring back happy memories of days when theywere drinking and drugging and doing okay in life. While listening to these stories, they forget how much pain drinking and drugging eventually caused.

Common sense tells us that these war stories can stir up the desire to drink and use drugs, especially in addicts who have only been “clean and sober” a few days, weeks, or months. People tell me all the time how going to AA or NA meetings, and listening to these stories, made them feel like drinking and/or using drugs. And as soon as they left the meetings they went to a liquor store and/or a drug dealer. These stories even cause some of the storytellers to relapse. In my free booklet titled **Beware of the Program**, I show another way these programs cause people to relapse and binge. (This booklet should come with this pamphlet but, if not, you can read it on youtube.**4**)

Dr. Herbert Fingarette speaks against the disease theory of alcoholism, which was made popular by groups like AA and NA. His arguments against this theory were used by the U.S. Supreme Court in a 1988 decision.**5** In his book titled **Heavy Drinking: The Myth of Alcoholism as a Disease**, he points to a 1986 report which concludes that the vast majority of addicts who quit do it on their own. He goes on to explain how programs take credit for this.**6** He says that it only *seems* like treatment programs help because many addicts enter them at a low point. Therefore, they almost always improve for a while.**7**

However, **THERE IS NO EVIDENCE** that these programs have anything to do with the improvement of those that enter them. So AA, NA and disease-oriented “treatment” programs are operating on the basis of faith and hope, rather than on the basis of research and results, just like all other religions.**8** Therefore, Drug Courts should offer addicted offenders all others religions too, but they do not. I will explain why in a moment.

Dr. Marlowe (of **NADCP**) admits that “there is the possibility that some types of addicted offenders might not respond well to the Drug Court model and should be treated in other ways.” However, this is **not** just a “possibility”. It isafact. I have met many addicted offenders who do “not respond well to the Drug Court model.” They are the type that believe the Bible and would rather get help from their own religion. They hate “the Drug Court model” because it only offers the recovery/treatment religion. These addicted offenders recognize that belief in “disease”, “recovery” and “treatment” is **not** scientific but religious. Therefore, they do not want to be “treated” at all. When it comes to addictions, and related issues, they want to be taught the beliefs of their own religion, not the beliefs of AA. They want to attend their own religious meetings rather than the religious meetings of AA, NA, and others who preach “Recovery”. (They also want all of the counseling they receive to come from their own religion, rather than the religion called “Psychology” - Google **Bobgan - Psychology as Religion**)

However, Drug Courts refuse to allow this because they believe that “treatment” and “recovery” is the only solution. Dr. Marlowe said that some addicts should be “treated in other ways.” This proves that he believes some kind of “treatment” is necessary. Go to NADCP’s homepage and read **“How Drug Courts Work”**. Here, they say that Drug Courts provide “intensive treatment” and that this is “require[d] to get and stay clean and sober.”**9** So it is clear that Drug Courts are promoting the religious belief that some kind of “treatment” is required, although more than 70% of addicts quit on their own.

Dr. Marlowe also admits that “there is always the possibility that some Drug Courts might misapply their authority or mishandle their operations to the detriment of their participants.” However, this too is **not** just a “possibility”. It is a fact. And it is not just “some” Drug Courts but ALL of them that “misapply their authority or mishandle their operations to the [injury or damage] of their participants”. They do this by mandating or offering AA, NA and/or disease-oriented treatment.

I would also like to point out that Biblical Christianity has “favorable research findings” whereas AA, NA and disease-oriented treatment programs do not.**10** It also addresses the same problems that these programs address – addictions. So why do Drug Courts offer religions like AA and NA but will **not** offer Biblical Christianity? Because, when it comes to helping addicts “recover”, they believe that AA and NA’s religious teachings and practices are effective but Biblical Christianity’s are not. And they probably believe (like most people do) that “The 12 Steps” came from the Bible. However, in their book titled **12 Steps to Destruction**, Martin and Deidre Bobgan prove that this is **not** true.**11** And although some courts might offer “recovery” programs that *claim* to be Christian, that is as far as they will go. The (unspoken) message of Drug Courts, to those who believe that the Bible is sufficient, goes like this: “If you develop a program that teaches enough of AA’s religious beliefs, we might offer it as an alternative.” **THIS IS A GREAT INSULT TO THE GOD OF THE BIBLE AND HIS FAITHFUL FOLLOWERS!**

Dr. Marlowe says that “one group of [Drug Court] critics appears to be turning an intentionally blind eye to the research evidence to serve a drug-decriminalization policy agenda.” However, Drug Court professionals appear to be doing the same thing. They appear to be “turning an intentionally blind eye to the research evidence” against AA and treatment programs to serve a Recovery/Treatment agenda. But let’s give them the benefit of the doubt. Maybe they are just unaware of the evidence. If that is the case, they will take a serious look at the evidence after someone gives them this pamphlet.

So give this pamphlet to someone on the Drug Court team and ask them to share it with the rest of the team. If they turn a blind eye to the research evidence it points to, you can be sure that they have an agenda to promote the Recovery/Treatment religion. If they do **not** turn a blind eye to the evidence, they will do one of two things. They will either stop offering participants the Recovery/Treatment religion or they will allow them to choose from any religion that addresses the same issues. In light of the evidence, this is the only fair thing they can do.

Dr. Marlowe also said that “if negative effects do exist, then corrective measures can be developed and tested to address them.” So, according to Dr. Marlowe, since AA and NA have “negative effects” on addicts, “corrective measures” should be “developed and tested to address them.”