

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

A LAWFUL INVESTIGATE OF MEDICATION PROGRESSION AS AN ELECTIVE PANACEA TO BATTLE MEDICATION DEALING

Professor T. I. Emmanuel

Professor Of Law, Department Of Business & Industrial Law, Faculty Of Law, Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti, Nigeria

Dr. E. K. Haruna

Senior Lecturer, Department Of Public Law, Faculty Of Law, Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti, Nigeria

Abstract: *The movement toward a drug elevating policy as opposed to a prohibitionist approach has not only begun, but it has also not settled down yet. Drug elevating, according to proponents, has a number of benefits, including a decrease in crime, an increase in tax revenue, a reduction in spending on the criminal justice system, improved public health, increased traffic safety, and overall economic growth. The global impact of drug ratification has been the subject of several studies. Be that as it may, accessible reports on the results of medication progression have been conflicting maybe because of restricted information. Those who oppose a drug elevating policy have argued vehemently that, in addition to having negative socioeconomic, political, and cultural effects, the strategy will also serve as an attraction for those who have not previously consumed illicit drugs. The focus of this paper is on the advantages and disadvantages of a drug elevating policy as an alternative to drug war.*

Keywords: *Medication, elevating, Investigate, drug.*

INTRODUCTION

In spite of numerous drug control conventions and significant financial commitment to the cause, combating the illicit drug trade has been a monumental task in all jurisdictions around the world and has achieved negligible success. This development has sparked the idea that drug policy should be liberalized rather than restricted, as is currently the case. This viewpoint has coincided with the emergence of elevating principles like ratification and decriminalization.

The backers of advancement strategy make no guise that the arrangement is full evidence measure to handle the medication challenge. Instead, they emphasize the comparative advantage that the elevating policy measure claims to have over the conventional drug war. Therefore, elevating policy, like any imperfect man-made policy measure, has some drawbacks that the paper will take into consideration in order to decide whether or not the policy measure should be embraced as a better alternative to the prohibitionist approach.

Published Date: - 09-03-2023**Drug Ratification**

Proponents of ratification argued that prohibition, which they claim leads to violence and does not improve people's health or safety, is the primary goal of drug control laws. As a result, the ratification school of thought supports regulation with the goals of preserving people's health and safety while respecting their human rights to use whatever drugs they deem necessary. This group has also emphasized the fact that the inability of law enforcement agencies to control the supply of drugs in producing nations has frequently resulted in an increase in the use of military intervention to help with drug control¹. Drug traffickers' wealth has increased as a result of police and military crackdowns on drug use, and the violence associated with the drug trade has increased human rights abuses, generated instability, and posed significant challenges to economic growth.

In addition, given the levels of poverty and the influence of drug money in drug-producing nations, increased military-to-drug trafficker contact may increase institutionalized corruption within the armed forces, which frequently have a history of maintaining symbiotic relationships with the drug industry. In addition, it has been argued that escalating militarization cannot be effective because it does not address the underlying causes of the drug problem, such as poverty in developing nations and the demand for drugs in developed nations, among other things.

It is the dispute of the medication freedom way of thinking that the worldwide government's endeavors to battle unlawful medications have been an all out disappointment. Spending money on drug abuse treatment and the government's efforts to combat the illegal drug trade would be more effective. The social costs of ratification would be significantly outweighed by the tax revenue that would be collected from drug sales as a result of ratification.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The belief that drug use would rise if there were no penalties for it is the main reason why liberalizing drug policies is opposed. This belief is based on the idea that societies would experience negative social, political, and economic effects that are equal to or worse than those experienced under the current prohibition regime. Additionally, it is feared that if the social stigma associated with drug use were removed, children would be more likely to be exposed to it. Last but not least, there are concerns regarding the practical difficulties of legal drug distribution to such a large number of users.

Then again, the medication legitimization way of thinking has fought that expanded substance addiction doesn't give off an impression of being the unavoidable consequence of the advancement of medication regulations. As per this school, in a few Latin American nations, the simple accessibility of cocaine at low costs has not led to any significant cocaine misuse issues. The use of cannabis and cocaine is significantly lower in Amsterdam than it is in the United States, where there are severe penalties for drug use.

The fact that drugs have little intrinsic value is another argument advanced by ratification groups. Traffickers receive enormous financial support from prohibition. The profits are enormous, and the

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

violence and corruption necessary to safeguard them are also extreme. A shift in drug policy from prohibition to ratification would result in a significant price drop and a modest rise in demand. Traffickers make significantly less money when the drug market generates less revenue. With lower benefits, hoodlums will probably leave the medication market, forsaking drug creation looking for other more beneficial and logical illegal, markets. Additionally, the arms trade, human trafficking, and terrorism are all closely related to the illicit drug market. For instance, criminal organizations that acquire weapons from the arms trade and train terrorists frequently receive funding from illegal investments in the drug trade.

The criminalization of drugs has a number of economic and social effects. Drug prices and potency rise as a result of prohibition, which also increases crime (crime, violence, and corruption). The production of drugs offers a way out of poverty in many developing nations. According to Milton Friedman's estimation, the criminalization of drugs is responsible for over 10,000 deaths annually in the United States, and if drugs were made legal, the number of innocent victims, such as those who are shot and killed in drive-by shootings, would either stop or decrease. Drug-liberty advocates have harshly criticized the economic inefficiency and ineffectiveness of such government intervention in preventing drug trade.

A reduction in the violence associated with the drug trafficking aspect of the trade would be the immediate benefit of ratification. By driving the drug market underground, prohibition opens the door to self-help violence in the industry. Similar to what occurred in the United States after the prohibition of alcohol ended in the 1930s, ratification would establish a legitimate market for drugs, making it possible to settle disputes in courts of law and attracting market participants who are not criminals rather than criminals.

This group also emphasizes that drug addiction is a disease that must be treated because people are not intentionally causing harm. Rather, generally, they are accomplishing something that they find will help them in their lives, regardless of whether it is brief and it gets them into a wide range of different issues. Drug use can be a response to rebellion, escape, coping, survival, belonging, or resignation and defeat. The ongoing worldwide expansion in the utilization of illegal medications might be connected with changes in the public arena, including diminished family and local area cohesiveness, expanded joblessness and more noteworthy sensations of estrangement. It is important to note that some criminals find intrinsic fulfillment in inflicting pain on others, even for no legitimate reason. The book haram set's senseless and incessant killing of innocent Nigerian citizens serves as an excellent illustration. Therefore, it is a known fact that some individuals will not intentionally cause havoc. Intoxicants that both benefit and harm people have always been consumed. However, there are ways to make these activities safer and less harmful to people, society, and the world. Instead of being spent on the global war on drugs, money could be spent on health, addiction treatment and prevention, and other socially beneficial endeavors. Due to the possibility that drug addicts will no longer be required to serve time in prison, ratification is also said to have the potential to significantly reduce the number of people in prison. Because the quantity and quality of the drugs would be marked and controlled, there would also be a lower chance of overdose death.

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

Addicts would be less likely to hide, less likely to share needles, and more likely to test positive for HIV in a world where drug use is not a crime. It is possible to prevent millions of new HIV infections. Prohibition could also reduce other human rights violations, like the use of the death penalty in countries like Iran, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Indonesia, and others. Finally, ratification would enable thousands of farmers and producers in some of the world's poorest nations to live in peace and dignity.

Decriminalization

Although decriminalization is not a legally defined term, it is commonly used in drug policy to refer to the removal of criminal penalties for personal possession of small amounts of currently illegal drugs, sometimes with civil or administrative penalties instead. Decriminalization can occur at the user, producer, or trafficker levels in the drug chain. It can range from the complete abandonment of controls to the selective relaxation of absolute prohibition. Decriminalization means removing some penalties or at least looking the other way.

When compared to the laws that are already in place, this policy measure calls for less control and fewer penalties. Drug decriminalization advocates frequently propose systems in which illegal drug users who are caught would be fined but would not receive a permanent criminal record. These systems would replace prison sentences with fines or other forms of punishment. The idea of reducing harm is a key component of drug decriminalization.

Drug decriminalization has been criticized as "the worst of both worlds" in that drug sales would still be illegal, perpetuating the problems associated with leaving the production and distribution of drugs to the criminal underworld, while also failing to discourage illegal drug use by removing the criminal penalties that might otherwise cause some people to choose not to use drugs. In some ways, drug decriminalization serves as an intermediate between prohibition and ratification. However, it has been argued that the decriminalization of drug possession would reorient the law enforcement system of any nation so that it would be more effective to focus on arresting dealers and high-level criminals rather than minors for mere possession.

According to proponents of decriminalization, there would be no incentive for drug traffickers, smugglers, and pushers to wage turf wars, assault police, terrorize neighborhoods, or undermine the institutional integrity of consuming nations if drug use were made illegal. Other programs, such as drug education and treatment, could benefit from the cost savings generated by decriminalization. Clean drugs, clean needles, and a humane environment could lower the risk of drug-related HIV transmission for health reasons.

Ratification, on the other hand, would have the same impact on the market as decriminalization. Since drug production and trafficking would still be illegal in a decriminalized world, dangerous criminal organizations would continue to profit from it, as would violence and the drug trade. This would provide an incentive for self-help. Additionally, countries operating under a decriminalization framework would face the same domestic drug issues as those arising from ratification.

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

It is important to note that decriminalization can only aim to reduce the costs and harms caused by criminalizing drug users, not the harms caused by the criminal trade or supply-side drug enforcement. Decriminalization, on the other hand, will have little effect if it is not well thought out or carried out, and it may even lead to the emergence of new issues (such as an increase in the number of people who come into contact with the justice system).

Decriminalization can be seen as a part of a broader approach to harm reduction and as a key to creating an environment that is conducive to other health interventions, despite the flaw in the policy measure. Essentially, decriminalization is viewed as contributing towards better focusing of wellbeing reactions, which ought to over the long haul diminishes the turn of events and degree of medication related issues, for example, go too far, HIV, TB. However, in order to achieve this, there must also be enough treatment facilities and responses to meet the current drug demand.

Early intervention, more targeted and therapeutic responses to drug users, increased collaboration across a network of services, and a greater focus on adopting effective policies are all benefits of decriminalization. It is thought that this is lowering the amount of harm and drug use that occurs now and in the future. The goal of any drug policy model is unquestionably to lessen the harms caused by people who can't or won't stop using drugs.

Consideration of Drug Elevating Policy in Selected Jurisdictions

The search for a shift from a prohibitionist to a drug elevating policy has not just begun; in several jurisdictions, there has been a tendency in that direction for many years. For instance, possession of drugs for personal use remained legal in the Czech Republic until December 31, 1998, when only possession "for other person," also known as intent to sell, was considered a crime. This was in contrast to production, importation, exportation, offering, or mediation, which was and remains a crime.

Possession of "amount larger than small" for personal use became a misdemeanor on January 1, 1999, as a result of an amendment to the Criminal Code that was required to bring Czech drug laws into line with the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. Possession of "amount larger than small" for personal use was also made a crime. The judicial practice concluded that the "amount larger than small" must be between five and ten times greater than a typical single dose taken by an average consumer, depending on the drug.

Regulation No. was subsequently adopted by the Czech government. which went into effect on January 1, 2010, defined what the Criminal Code meant by "amount larger than small," effectively replacing the amounts that had been established by previous judicial practice. As per the guideline, an individual could have as much as 15 grams of maryjane or 1.5 grams of heroin without having to deal with criminal penalties. Since April 1, 2013, prescription use of cannabis has been legal and regulated³⁸.

The Netherlands' drug policy is based on two principles: drug use is a public health problem and not a crime, and there is a difference between hard and soft drugs. Marijuana stays a controlled substance in

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

the Netherlands and both belonging and creation for individual use are still offenses, deserving of fine. Pot cafés are likewise unlawful as per the resolutions. However, as a result of a policy of non-enforcement, reliance on non-enforcement has become common, and the courts have ruled against the government in individual cases.

Portugal was the first nation in Europe to end all criminal penalties for personal drug possession in 2001. Portugal is the main country that has decriminalized the utilization, everything being equal, to positive outcomes. Anybody got with a medication in Portugal, on the off chance that it is for individual utilization, won't be detained. Since then, Spain and Italy have followed Portugal's lead.

Additionally, drug users would receive therapy rather than prison terms. Glenn Greenwald's research, commissioned by the Cato Institute, found that in the five years following the start of decriminalization, the rate of HIV infections among drug users had decreased, the number of heroin-related deaths had decreased by more than half, and the number of people seeking treatment for drug addiction had doubled.

However, Professor of Criminology and Public Policy at the University of Maryland, College Park, Peter Reuter, acknowledges that "decriminalization in Portugal has met its central goal" despite suggesting that the heroin use rates and related deaths may have been caused by the cyclical nature of drug epidemics. The use of drugs did not rise.

"Adults should be free to make lifestyle decisions without the intervention of the state," the Argentine Supreme Court said in a landmark ruling in August 2009, declaring that it was against the constitution to prosecute citizens for possessing drugs for personal use. The decision had an effect on the second paragraph of Article 14 of the country's drug control law, which states that possessing drugs for personal consumption carries a prison sentence of one month to two years (though education or treatment measures can be substituted for the sentence). The unlawfulness of the article concerns instances of medication ownership for individual utilization that doesn't influence others.

Brazil underwent legislative changes in 2002 and 2006, which led to the partial decriminalization of possession for personal use. Educational measures and community services took the place of prison sentences as they no longer applied. In any case, the 2006 regulation doesn't give objective means to recognize clients or dealers. A difference exists between the decriminalization of medication use and the expanded punishment of selling drugs, culpable with a most extreme jail sentence of 5 years for the offer of exceptionally minor amounts of medications. The majority of those imprisoned for drug dealing are wrongdoers found selling little amounts of medications, among them drug clients who offer medications to fund their medication propensities.

Drug possession for personal use is no longer illegal in Costa Rica. Drug manufacturing and distribution remain punishable by imprisonment. According to Ecuador's Constitution of 2008, drug use is not considered a crime but rather a health risk. The State Drugs Regulatory Office CONSEP has published a table since June 2013 that lists the maximum quantities that can be carried by a person to be considered

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

in legal possession and not a drug seller. The state of Ecuador is of the firm opinion that decriminalization would significantly reduce the violence associated with drug trafficking because there are an estimated 70 percent of the 8-10 murders that occur each day as a result of this international drug trade.

Changes to the General Health Law that decriminalized the possession of illegal drugs for immediate consumption and personal use were approved by the Mexican Congress in April 2009, allowing a person to possess up to 5 grams of marijuana or 500 milligrams of cocaine. The only restriction is that drug users must stay at least 300 meters away from schools, police stations, and correctional facilities. Opium, heroin, LSD, and other synthetic drugs were also made illegal. As long as the dose does not exceed the limit set by the General Health Law, it will not be considered a crime.

This is questioned by many, as both cocaine and heroin are synthesized plant extracts. The law lays out extremely low sum limits and stringently characterizes individual dose. Even if there are no other indications that the quantity was intended for sale, those who are arrested with more than the threshold allowed by the law run the risk of receiving severe prison sentences.

One of the few nations that never made it illegal to possess drugs for one's own use is Uruguay. Since 1974, the law has set no quantity limits, so the judge can decide if the intent was for personal use or not. Whenever not entirely settled by the appointed authority that the sum under lock and key was intended for individual use, there are no approvals.

Cannabis cultivation is currently against the law in Canada, with the exception of medical use. Nonetheless, the utilization of pot by the overall population is endured partially and shifts relying upon area and purview and an incredible mission to sanction weed is in progress from one side of the country to the other. The offer of weed seeds stays legitimate.

One of the highest rates of marijuana use in the world is found in Australia. With the Cannabis Research Foundation of Australia in Victoria, Australians have been advocating for cannabis ratification since the early 1970s. With numerous new groups forming in various states and using social media as a conduit and forum, the Cannabis Campaign appeared to experience a renaissance in Australia in 2011 without a doubt due to global developments. The Federal Government has declared a "War on Drugs" since 1985, and despite initially leading the world in the "harm-minimization" approach, Australia has since lagged. A report on the decriminalization of drugs in Australia was released in 2012 by the Think Tank Australia 21.

The movement to decriminalize marijuana in the United States began in the late 1960s as a result of calls for changes to federal laws that regulated marijuana use. On the other hand, in 1993, Surgeon General Elder made the proposal to study marijuana ratification. In 1996, California became the first state to pass marijuana laws.

In November of 2020, voters in Arizona, Mississippi v. Montana, New Jersey, and South Dakota overwhelmingly supported the ratification of marijuana for medical and recreational use. It is important to note that the COVID-19 pandemic put an end to many state legislative efforts to legalize marijuana in

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

2020. However, in 2021, many of those efforts have been revived. In fact, marijuana ratification has begun in some states for the first time. In November 2020, marijuana ratification was approved by a vote in South Dakota and Mississippi. It is true that the current drug policy needs to be improved and that treatment and prevention need to play a big role in future drug policies. However, ratification is not a good idea just because current policies fail to meet expectations. The many associated social costs, such as unemployment and underemployment, as well as the costs of health care, would rise if illegal drugs were legalized as they are currently.

Ratification of current illicit drugs does not appear to be a viable solution to the global drug problem and would in fact exacerbate the issue, despite the substantial benefits that would accrue from such a policy as an alternative to the "drug war." It is necessary to reevaluate drug control policies, but probably not in the direction of drug elevating, given that supply suppression appears to be a general failure at the current levels of investment in drug control—both in its entirety and as a substitute for consumption control.

The United Nations Drug Conventions were enacted as a result of the international community's recognition that the trade in drugs has a negative impact on the global economy and the viability of some countries that have become transit points. Terrorism, human trafficking, prostitution, and the arms trade are just a few of the international organized criminal activities that are inextricably linked to the huge sums of illegal money generated by the drug trade. Both of these activities encourage money laundering. To the great detriment of law-abiding citizens, drug lords have undermined the democratic governments of certain nations.

In addition, the United Nations Conventions stipulate that drugs should only be produced legally and under strict supervision for medical and research purposes. As a result, it is imperative that nations all over the world maintain and expand their efforts to stop the use, cultivation, production, trafficking, and sale of illegal drugs.

Indeed, there are a variety of reasons why drug ratification fails to gain support. For instance, only 6.1% of people worldwide between the ages of 15 and 64 use drugs. Due to the fact that people's actions are influenced by legal sanctions, prohibition has reduced the total number of users. The majority of United Nations Member States have ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), indicating that there is a specific obligation to safeguard children from the dangers of drugs. Member States: shall take all necessary measures, including legislative, administrative, social, and educational ones, to safeguard children from the illegal use of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, as defined by relevant international treaties, and to prevent children from participating in the illegal production and trafficking of such substances.

In addition, ratification conveys the perilous implicit message of acceptance—that drug use is permissible and cannot be particularly harmful. Many people who wouldn't normally think about using dangerous drugs will use them more if they are allowed to and easy to get. Risks posed by law enforcement discourage drug use. Laws emphasize the boundaries and clearly define what is legal and illegal. Since

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

criminals will always find ways to counteract legislation, ratification would not eliminate the profit from the drug trade. In order to maximize sales and profits, they would carry on their risky activities, such as creating an artificial scarcity or replacing drugs with harmful substances. The rigorous application of aggressive marketing strategies, which are intended to encourage increased sales and use, would have a devastating impact.

Alcohol and tobacco, two other "legal" drugs, are frequently traded on the black market and a problem for international smuggling; every year, about 600 billion cigarettes are smuggled in. The money collected from taxes on these goods doesn't even come close to covering the costs of the consequences. Legalizing other dangerous substances is not justified by the assertion that alcohol and tobacco may cause more harm than some drugs.

Additionally, nearly every nation has ratified the United Nations' drug control conventions. Any administration or signatory nations pondering sanctioning would be in break of arrangements under the UN Shows which perceive that solidarity is the best way to deal with battling the worldwide chronic drug usage. Ratification would come with a huge administrative burden that most governments probably could not afford. Ratification would necessitate a significant commitment on the part of the government to production, supply, and security, as well as a bureaucracy that would unavoidably raise employment requirements and incur prohibitive costs for all personnel required to facilitate that development. The policy of legalizing drugs would pose a threat to public safety and health. The unstated consequence of such a policy would be an increase in the quantity and affordability of illegal drugs, inevitably leading to an increase in drug-related harm.

DISCUSSION

Additionally, ratification may result in a number of issues. Drugs could be made in more dangerous forms by manufacturers. Drugs could be legally distributed by street gangs, and the profits could be used for other violent activities. As a result, despite what appears to be a solution to the drug problem, a different kind of crime will rise to new heights. Consumption by minors and in public settings could also become common.

Drug trafficking has been a significant revenue stream for organized crime over the past few decades. Today, drug trafficking is associated with a wide range of crimes, including smuggling, terrorism, money laundering, assault, and murder. The drug's demand would rise, and drug-related crime would almost certainly get worse as a result of ratification. There would also be a slew of unintended but predictable consequences. Drug users make up an astonishingly high percentage of criminals.

The campaign for drug ratification is unique in that it emphasizes the government's potential gain from ratification in terms of additional revenue from taxing drug use and savings from ending the "war on drugs." However, these projections are filled with speculative assumptions and are highly speculative.

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

Ratification proponents contend that the government's efforts to combat the illicit drug trade have been costly failures. Thusly, they contend, zeroing in on substance misuse and treatment would be an additional compelling method for battling chronic drug use while lessening the viciousness and social ills originating from hostile to sedate implementation endeavors. There is no doubt that more people, including minors, would consume drugs if they were legalized. Abuse will rise as more people use because they won't be afraid of being caught and embarrassed.

As they see ratification as an opportunity to re-allocate police resources, free up prison space, reduce violent crime among drug dealers and consumers, and tax the industry, advocates of the ratification or decriminalization of drugs may appear to have a point. While these possibilities are intrinsically essential for legitimization and most likely support this contention, the expenses and advantages of authorization ought to be surveyed on the worldwide level, not on the absolutely homegrown level with respect to addictions to drugs every country definitely faces. The drug problem transcends local context, so this position seems logical.

When some nations refuse to legalize the drug trade, it could become complicated. This could lead to a balloon effect because drug traffickers will always move to areas where the profit from the illegal drug trade is still high and appealing.

There are some aspects of the idea of ratification and decriminalization that are appealing, but it is uncertain whether these measures can solve fundamental institutional issues like corruption, drug policing agents' complicity, and the political will necessary to successfully push for ratification. Equally perilous is the question of whether regulated drug markets will be able to effectively address the underlying factors that contribute to drug dependence, such as inequality and poverty.

CONCLUSION

It is evident from the preceding general consideration that the arguments in favor of and against a drug elevating policy continue to be fiercely competitive. However, despite the obvious drawbacks of the prohibitionist strategy, it still outperforms the elevating policy in terms of immediate and distant consequences. Farmers who have traditionally grown food may be tempted to shift their efforts to drug production due to the potential for a food shortage, which would raise the cost of living for the general populace. This is because of the substantial and superior income that drug production brings in. In the same way, increased demand for drugs, which elevating may encourage, may cause demand to exceed supply. When this occurs, the basic economic principle will apply by raising the price of drugs, which invariably results in traffickers making more money or profit.

Traffickers can easily take over the political structures of a country to the detriment of the masses by becoming financiers to politicians or by running for office themselves in areas where drug prices have increased. This is more likely to occur in developing nations with nascent democracy and significant monetization of the political process. In addition, with their enormous wealth, they may become sponsors

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

of terrorists or insurgent groups, resulting in the country's instability and ginger unrest, which ultimately affects every sector.

Drug elevating policy will ultimately encourage criminal behavior and other vices in society due to the link between drugs and crime. With expanded crime percentage in the general public, government will be compelled to use more prominent assets to battle the chaperon upsurge in demonstrations of guiltiness. It's possible that, at the expense of the government, the police, the court, and the correctional center will be stretched to the limit in their efforts to combat the growing number of crimes in society.

Additionally, individuals who have avoided using illegal drugs in the past out of fear of being punished; may now be tempted to freely experiment with drug use since the prohibition on drugs has been lifted. Such individuals may invariably develop drug addiction and become potential members of the criminal justice system. Ultimately, jail populaces would balloon when such people are indicted and condemned to a term of detainment by the court.

The elevating school of thought's argument that legalizing drugs could help producers escape poverty, particularly in developing nations, is certainly unappealing and encourages crime. Certainly, there is a link between poverty and criminal activity. However, there are a plethora of respectable and legal means by which one can earn their way out of poverty. In a similar vein, a significant number of people are afflicted with poverty but would not resort to illegal or criminal means of alleviating their circumstances. As a result, engaging in drug production under the guise of seeking an escape from poverty is a personal choice among several alternatives.

The idea that drug elevating policy will lead to a financial gain through taxes is just a smokescreen; any such financial gain will be erased by the enormous costs incurred by the government to address the massive increase in crime rates caused by drug liberty policy.

In addition, the argument made by proponents of a drug elevating policy that citizens have the right to use any drugs they deem appropriate is not without reservations. The prevention of any harm to the lives of the people is an essential part of the obligation that governments worldwide have to safeguard the lives of their citizens. The abusers' lives and, by extension, their right to life are at risk as a result of illicit drug use, which poses a potential threat to both. In point of fact, when the lives of its citizens are in grave danger under the guise of exercising their human right, no responsible government would turn a deaf ear.

Therefore, it is imperative that a legal equilibrium be maintained between the citizens' human right to consume any drug they choose and the government's legal obligation to guarantee and protect its citizens' lives from any form of harm or injury. As opposed to the drug elevating policy with its inherent aggravating characteristics, embellishing the drug war with the provision of health care facilities to address the consequences of illicit drug consumption will be a more effective strategy.

REFERENCE

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

1. The White House (2012): "White House Presidential Determination: Memorandum of Justification for Major Illicit Drug Transit or Illicit Drug Producing Countries for Fiscal Year 2013. Washington, D. C. September 14.
2. United Nations Research Institute For Social Development (1994): Illicit Drugs: Social Impacts and Policy Responses, UNRISD Briefing Paper No. 2, World Summit For Social Development, November.
3. For a preview of all potential arguments that the pro-ratification movement will make, one need go no further than the Web site of the Drug Policy Alliance. The Drug Policy Alliance: Alternatives to Marijuana Prohibition and the Drug War, <http://www.drugpolicy.org> (last visited August 31, 2010). The Web site contains a section titled "Myths and Facts About Marijuana." The Drug Policy Alliance: Myths and Facts About Marijuana, <http://www.drugpolicy.org/marijuana/factsmyths/> (last visited August 31, 2010). According to their Web site, the Drug Policy Alliance Network is the "nation's leading organization promoting policy alternatives to the drug war that are grounded in science, compassion, health and human rights." George Soros is on the Board of the Drug Policy Alliance. The Drug Policy Alliance: Board of Directors, Drug Policy Alliance, <http://www.drugpolicy.org/about/keystaff/boardofdirec/> (last visited August 31, 2010).
4. US Drug Enforcement Administration (May 2003) "Speaking Out Against Drug Ratification" U.S. Department of Justice.
5. Simon, T. (2008): "Marijuana: Facts for Teens", 7th Mar., available at http://www.drugabuse.gov/pdf/teens_Marijuana_brochure.pdf.
6. United Nations Research Institute For Social Development note 205.
7. Koch, J. V. (1971): "The Economics of Drug Control Policies". The International Journal of the Addictions 6: Pp. 571–584.
8. Grupp, S. E. (1973): "Police and Illicit Drug Markets: Some Economic Considerations". British Journal of Addiction 68: Pp. 351–362.
9. Audra, K. G. (2005): "Smuggling and Trafficking in Africa, in Transnational Threats: Smuggling and Trafficking in Arms, Drugs And Human Life", at 113, Pp. 117-19; Rollie, L. (2005): "South Asian Organized Crime and Linkages to Terrorist Networks", Transnational Threats: Smuggling And Trafficking In Arms, Drugs And Human Life, at 164.
10. Thornton, M. (2010): "The Economics of Prohibition", British Journal of Addiction, Vol. 75, Pp. 42-56.
11. Friedman, M. (1998): "There's No Justice in the War on Drugs". New York Times 1st November.
12. Wagstaff, A. & Maynard, A. (1988): "Economic Aspects of the Illicit Drug Market and Drug Enforcement Policies in the United Kingdom", Home Office Research Study 95, London.
13. United Nations Research Institute For Social Development note 205.
14. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2006): National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Drug Abuse, "Research Report on HIV/AIDS," March, page 2.
15. American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Substance Abuse and Committee on Adolescence Policy Statement (2004): "Ratification of Marijuana: Potential Impact on Youth," Pediatrics, Vol. 113, No. 6, June: 1825-1826.
16. Joffe, A. & Yancy, S. (2004): "Ratification of Marijuana Potential Impact on Youth," Pediatrics, Vol. 113, No.6, June

Published Date: - 09-03-2023

17. Stephanie, H. (2007): "In West Africa, Threat of Narco-States," Council on Foreign Relations Daily Analysis, July 10.