

## Drug Law Reform Annotated Bibliography, put together by the Drug Policy Modelling Program 2016

### Introduction

Given ongoing discussions about drug law reform, the Drug Policy Modelling Program (DPMP) has put together a list of Australian and international reference material that addresses drug law reform explicitly. Our choice was guided by:

- seminal pieces;
- original contributions; and
- a desire to include a range of articles including opinion pieces and research articles.

The list is structured as follows:

1. Australian-focussed drug law reform material (Table 1)
2. International material (Table 2)
3. Cannabis legalisation (Table 3)

The citations are ordered by year.

**Table 1. Australian-focussed material**

Authors	Year	Reference and Link ( <i>CNTRL + Click to proceed to source</i> )	Summary
Hughes, C.E., Cowdery, N. & Ritter, A.	2015	<a href="#">Deemed supply in Australian drug trafficking laws: A justifiable legal provision? <i>Current Issues in Criminal Justice</i>, 27(1), 1-20.</a>	A legal and historical analysis of deemed supply provisions in Australian drug trafficking laws. Demonstrates that Australian deemed supply laws were introduced to overcome perceived difficulties in the prosecution and sanction of drug traffickers, but that the laws are inconsistent with Australian criminal law; inconsistent with international drug trafficking laws; conflict with the goals of Australia's National Drug Strategy and threaten confidence in the Australian judicial system. Calls for the laws to be subject to legislative review and/or abolition from Australian drug trafficking law.

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
NSW Bar Association	2015	<a href="#">Drug Policy Discussion Paper</a>	The Criminal Law Committee of the New South Wales Bar Association has released a discussion paper in relation to drug law reform. The committee concluded that prohibition has been largely ineffective at preventing the availability of prohibited drugs or in decreasing levels of use. Given the harm to individuals and society that results from prohibition, the time has come to give serious consideration to alternatives. The Bar Association will be hosted a conference on 29 May 2015 to debate the issues raised by the discussion paper with a range of stakeholders.
Hughes, C., et al.	2015	<a href="#">Australian drug trafficking laws: guilty until proven innocent? DPMP Policy Briefing. Sydney, National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre, UNSW Australia</a>	Summary bulletin paper for policy makers outlining issues with Australian deemed supply laws.
Belackova, V., et al.	2015	<a href="#">Medicinal cannabis in Australia - Framing the regulatory options. Sydney, Drug Policy Modelling Program, NDARC, UNSW</a>	Options paper that provide a framework for discussing regulatory issues, notably access and supply, surrounding medicinal cannabis in Australia. Highlights key distinction and options surrounding both 1) patient authorisation (such as exemptions from law based on diagnoses) and 2) modes of cannabis supply (such as imported herbal cannabis), and how different modes of patient authorisation can go with different modes of cannabis supply.
Hughes, C., et al.	2015	<a href="#">Evaluating Australian drug trafficking thresholds: Proportionate, equitable and just? Report to the Criminology Research Advisory Council. Canberra, Criminology Research Advisory Council</a>	Legal threshold quantities for drug trafficking, over which possession of an illicit drug is sanctionable as 'trafficking' as opposed to 'personal use' are used in all Australian states and territories. This report evaluates the legal thresholds in six states against five different data sources (including patterns of drug user consumption and purchasing and retail value and harms of drugs). It finds that the current thresholds are not fit for purpose. For example, some legal thresholds are set too low, placing users at risk of an unjustified charge or sanction for an offence of drug trafficking. The legal thresholds are also disproportionate to the relative seriousness of an offence of trafficking in different controlled drugs, and do not reflect evidence on which drugs cause the most harm to the community.
Douglas, R, Wodak, A & McDonald, D	2012	<a href="#">Alternatives to prohibition: Illicit drugs: How we can stop killing and criminalising young Australians</a>	This report follows from a Roundtable discussion held in July 2012 to consider new approaches to public policy about illicit drugs in Australia.

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Ritter, A.	2012	<a href="#">Decriminalisation or legalisation: injecting evidence in the drug law reform debate</a>	A review of the options for decriminalisation and legalisation.
Douglas, B., & McDonald, D.	2012	<a href="#">The Prohibition of illicit drugs is killing and criminalising our children and we are all letting it happen. Australia 21, Canberra.</a>	The report, arising from a roundtable held by Australia21, a non-for-profit Australian organisation that aims to generate new thinking around social problems, argues for decriminalisation options.
Hughes, C & Wodak	2012	<a href="#">What can Australia learn from different approaches to drugs in Europe?</a>	A background paper for an Australia21 roundtable, Melbourne, 6 July 2012, addressing the question: What can Australia learn from different approaches to drugs in Europe including especially Portugal, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Sweden? Australia21, Canberra.
Savulescu, J., & Foddy, B.	2012	<a href="#">'A moral argument against the war on drugs', The Conversation, no. 5 April</a>	It is common to hear moral arguments in favour of a prohibition approach to drug policy but here we have two scholars presenting moral arguments in favour of changing drug policy away from what they characterised as a 'war on drugs' approach.
Wodak, A.D.	2012	<a href="#">The need and direction for drug law reform in Australia', Medical Journal of Australia, vol. 197, no. 6, pp. 1-2.</a>	In this editorial the author presents a contemporary overview of what he sees as the need for drug law reform in Australia and goes on to indicate what this might look like. Note that this editorial is published in a mainstream medical Journal rather than specialist drug and alcohol journal, demonstrating how well documented discussions of drug law reform are now in the mainstream.
McDonald, D.	2011	<a href="#">A background paper for an Australia21 Roundtable, Sydney, 31 January 2012, addressing the question "What are the likely costs and benefits of a change in Australia's current policy on illicit drugs?", Australia21, Canberra.</a>	An overview of evidence about the likely consequences and benefits of changing Australia's policy on illicit drugs for the Australia 21 Roundtable participants, and subsequently made available widely.
Featherston, J., & Lenton, S.	2007	<a href="#">Effects of the Western Australian Cannabis Infringement Notice Scheme on public attitudes, knowledge and use: Comparison of pre- and post-change data.</a> Perth: National Drug Research Institute.	Evaluation of the WA Cannabis Infringement Notice scheme – a pre-post study of the impact of the introduction of civil penalties for cannabis. Consistent with national trends, cannabis use declined in Western Australia after the introduction of civil penalties. The authors conclude that the change from criminal to civil penalties for cannabis use/possess did not impact on rates of cannabis use.

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Macintosh, A.	2006	<a href="#">Drug law reform: beyond prohibition, Discussion Paper no. 83, The Australia Institute, Canberra.</a>	An influential report from an independent Australian think tank reviewing the science and advocating for drug law reform. They also recommend greater investment in drug treatment, as an evidence-based intervention.
Wodak, A., & Moore, T.	2002	<a href="#">Modernising Australia's drug policy, UNSW Press, Sydney.</a>	A useful overview of drug policy in Australia and suggestions for the nature and processes of updating it.
Lenton, S., Heale, P., Erickson, P., Single, E., Lang, E., & Hawks, D.	2000	<a href="#">The regulation of cannabis possession, use and supply: A discussion document prepared for The Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee of The Parliament of Victoria.</a> Perth: National Drug Research Institute.	This document summarises options for the legal regulation of cannabis possession, use and supply suitable to a harm minimisation framework; provides a comparative analysis and evaluation of the practicality, effectiveness and potential benefits of the alternative forms of regulation and gives a recommended model for the Victorian situation, which was a variant of the <i>prohibition with civil penalties</i> approach. It provides a comprehensive review of the national and international literature on drug law reform issues to the time of writing (2000).
Santamaria, J.N.	2000	<a href="#">Drugs Dilemma: a way forward. New Weekly Books.</a>	This book is pro-prohibition. From the DFA website: "In this book, medical experts, social commentators and drug counsellors take a closer look at the European experience and the arguments in favour of "harm minimisation" and find them seriously flawed. But there are alternatives which are working".
Daryal, M.	1999	<a href="#">Prices, Legalisation and Marijuana Consumption. Australia: Economics Research Centre, University of Western Australia.</a>	This work considers the impact of changes in the price of cannabis on consumption rates (price elasticity of demand), where the authors assume that under legalisation, cannabis price would be lower than under prohibition. They estimate price elasticity of demand
Lenton, S., Christie, P., Humeniuk, R., Brooks, A., Bennett, M., & Heale, P.	1999	<a href="#">Infringement versus Conviction: the Social Impact of a Minor Cannabis Offence Under a Civil Penalties System and Strict Prohibition in Two Australian States</a> (No. 36). Canberra: Department of Health and Aged Care.	This study compared South Australian cannabis users under the civil penalties scheme with the Western Australian cannabis users under the then criminal penalties scheme. There were a number of similarities between the experiences and outcomes of the two groups, but notably more negative impacts for the WA criminal penalties group (such as loss of employment).

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
McDonald, D., Moore, R., Norberry, J., Wardlaw, G., & Ballenden, N.	1994	<a href="#">Monograph Series No. 26. Legislative options for cannabis in Australia. Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology.</a>	While dated (published in 1994) this monograph is extremely useful in laying out the types of drug law regimes and clarifying the associated language. The terminology suggested in this report is still widely in use in Australia as a framework for considering options.
Manderson, D.	1993	From Mr Sin to Mr Big: a history of Australian drug laws, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.	A very frequently cited work explaining how Australia's policies on drugs have evolved from the earliest days of colonial settlement, pointing out that many of the origins of drug policies and laws are to be found in the racist and sexist attitudes of previous generations.
Marks, R.	1989	<a href="#">Prohibition or regulation an economist's view of Australian heroin policy.</a> Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 23(2), p.65-87.	This paper examines the structure of the black market, using evidence collected from an anonymous Victorian prisoner (1981). It identifies a substantial number of users who do not come to the attention of the authorities. The paper explores the possible impacts on the prevalence of heroin use in a regime of controlled availability were put in place.

Table 2. International material on drug law reform

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
International Drug Policy Consortium	2016	<a href="#">Online Tool: Comparing models of drug decriminalisation</a>	From the website: 21 countries and jurisdictions are reported to have decriminalised drug use or possession of drugs for personal use. However, the models of decriminalisation implemented all over the world vary widely. This e-tool, developed by the International Drug Policy Consortium, aims to map out how these models work in practice, describing their legal framework, the role of the police (if any), the judicial or administrative process, the applicable sanction (if any), and examples of countries illustrating each model. The e-tool enables a comparison of the various models of decriminalisation.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy	2016	<a href="#">After the Drug Wars: Report of the LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy</a>	In this report puts together a number of articles on drug policy utilising the Sustainable Development Goals. Each article considers metrics for evaluation and policy recommendations in lead up to UNGASS 2016.
EMCDDA	2015	<a href="#">Web Resource: EMCDDA Penalties for drug law offences in Europe at a glance</a>	From the website: This tool lets you examine and compare the penalties or rehabilitative responses for the core offences of drug use, possession for personal use, and supply-related offences, across countries in Europe. It also allows you to see how the laws vary those penalties according to the type or quantity of the drug, and the addiction or recidivism of the offender.
United Nations Human Rights Council	2015	<a href="#">Study on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights (No. A/HRC/30/65).</a>	Study prepared by the Human Rights Council in consultation with States on the impact on the enjoyment, respect for and protection of human rights in the context of the world drug problem and the current international conventions.
London School of Economics	2014	<a href="#">Ending the Drug Wars: Report of the LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy</a>	This report is a collection of 10 articles from members of the LSE drug policy expert group that examines a number of different perspectives of drug policy, arguing for evidence-based, economically beneficial policies. This report is a good compliment to the 2016 report, providing a broader perspective on the global drug policy issues.
EMCDDA	2014	<a href="#">Estimating public expenditure on drug-law offenders in prison in Europe. Lisbon, European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction.</a>	This study estimates how much 22 European countries spent on drug-law offenders in prisons during the last decade. Based on this, an estimate for public expenditure on drug-law offenders at the European level was made.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
General Secretariat for the Special General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS)	2014	<a href="#">The OAS Drug Report: 16 Months of Debates and Consensus</a>	Report based on the bringing together of more than 300 civil servants, specialists from the private sector and international organizations, academics, and social and political leaders who contributed with their opinions and experience on the drug problem in the Americas to formulate four broad points of consensus to progress drug policy: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The drug problem needs to be addressed from a public health perspective.</li> <li>2. Judicial reforms must be enacted to provide alternatives to incarceration.</li> <li>3. Transnational organized crime is a major player in the drug problem.</li> <li>4. It is essential to strengthen judicial and law-and-order institutions.</li> </ol>
Pinto Coelho, M.	2013	<a href="#">Drugs: The Portuguese Fallacy and the Absurd Medicalization of Europe</a>	This report provides a different assessment of the Portuguese experience of decriminalisation to that presented by Hughes et al. The author argues that the data have been misinterpreted.
Rosmarin, A. and N. Eastwood	2013	<a href="#">A quiet revolution: Drug decriminalisation policies in practice across the globe. London, Release.</a>	Provides a plain language summary of drug decriminalisation policies and experiences across 20 different countries: including Brazil, Peru, Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, Russia, the Netherlands, Spain, Germany, Belgium, Portugal, Italy and Estonia.
Organization of American States	2013	<a href="#">Report on the drug problem in the Americas. Washington D.C., Organization of American States.</a>	A technical study of drug use, production, transit, and trafficking and of the scope of the drug business in the U.S. The report was developed by leading academics, political leaders, social leaders, and experts who following a detailed breakdown of the issues in the Americas, present legal and regulatory alternatives, and presents steps forward in creating a new dialogue that involve taking a public health approach, tailoring policies to the different needs and phases of countries and increasing citizen security in key areas.
Bewley-Taylor, D.	2012	<a href="#">Towards revision of the UN drug control conventions: The logic and dilemmas of like-minded groups.</a> Transnational Institute/IDPC Series on Legislative Reform of Drug Policies Nr. 19	Recent discontent about the strictly prohibitionist reading of the UN drug conventions has been driven by a belief that non-punitive and pragmatic health oriented policy approaches better address the complexities surrounding illicit drug use than the zero-tolerance approach privileged by the present international treaties.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Room, Robin	2012	<a href="#">Roadmaps to Reforming the UN Drug Conventions, The Beckley Foundation</a>	Report that presents possible roadmaps and proposals for change for drug law reform regarding treaty reform, amendments and moving toward a 'Single Convention'.
Bewley-Taylor, D., & Jelsma, M.	2012	<a href="#">The UN drug control conventions: The limits of latitude. Transnational Institute/IDPC Series on Legislative Reform of Drug Policies Nr. 18</a>	This briefing paper outlines the international legal drug control obligations, the room for manoeuvre the regime leaves open to national policy makers and the clear limits of latitude that cannot be crossed without violating the treaties.
Inkster, N., & Comolli, V.	2012	<a href="#">Drugs, Insecurity and Failed States: The Problems of Prohibition</a> . London: Routledge.	By examining the destabilising effects of prohibition and alternative approaches, this book shows how progress may be made by treating consumption as a healthcare issue rather than a criminal matter, thereby freeing states to tackle the cartels and traffickers who hold their communities to ransom.
International Drug Policy Consortium	2012	<a href="#">Drug policy guide, 2nd edn</a> , International Drug Policy Consortium, London.	This publication presents an overview of drug policy internationally, structured around the core principles, criminal justice, health and social programs and strengthening communities. The report strongly recommends the structured and integrated involvement of multiple government departments for the development of drug policy.
Merkinaitė, S.	2012	<a href="#">The war against people who use drugs: The costs. Eurasian Harm Reduction Network.</a>	This report from the Eurasian Harm Reduction Network shows that implementation of criminal laws regulating drug use and drug possession with no intent to supply costs more than double the amount spent on drug treatment in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.
Nutt, D.	2012	<a href="#">Drugs without the hot air: minimizing the harms of legal and illegal drugs</a> , UIT Cambridge.	The author is a prominent British scientist who was sacked by the UK government because they were uncomfortable with the policy advice that he was giving on drugs. This book, written for the general public, '...is framed around controversial issues such as the banning of mephedrone, whether alcohol is more harmful than many illegal drugs, and whether addiction can be cured'.
Office of National Drug Control Policy (USA)	2012	<a href="#">Principles of modern drug policy, Office of National Drug Control Policy.</a>	The Obama government has moved a long way from the repressive 'war on drugs' policies of previous USA administrations. This document puts forward a new set of principles that the government states underlies contemporary USA drug policy.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
<b>Rolles, S., Murkin, G., Powell, M., Kushlick, D., &amp; Slater, J.</b>	2012	<a href="#">The alternative World Drug Report: counting the costs of the war on drugs, Transform Drug Policy Foundation, London</a>	From the publisher's website: 'The Alternative World Drug Report, launched to coincide with publication of the UN Office on Drugs and Crime's 2012 World Drug Report, exposes the failure of governments and the UN to assess the extraordinary costs of pursuing a global war on drugs, and calls for UN member states to meaningfully count these costs and explore all the alternatives.'
<b>Room, R., &amp; Reuter, P.</b>	2012	<a href="#">How well do international drug conventions protect public health? <i>The Lancet</i>, 279(9810), 84-91.</a>	From the abstract: The need for reform of the overarching international convention regimes of drug control is placed in the context of public health arguments, arguing that the international treaties have constrained national policy experimentation by requiring that nations criminalise drug use. Provides a good overview of the international system and examples of the limitations placed on policy development in individual nations.
<b>Rosmarin, A. &amp; Eastwood, N.</b>	2012	<a href="#">A quiet revolution: drug decriminalisation polices in practice around the globe.</a> Release.	From the website: This report describes the considerations in comparing models of decriminalisation across countries, including threshold quantities, types of administrative procedures, roles of judiciary and police, role of medical profession, implementation challenges and social, cultural, economic and religious characteristics. It then provides brief summaries of the decriminalisation arrangements in 21 countries: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Mexico, The Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, The Russian federation, Spain, Uruguay and the USA (California). The report concludes with recommendations for an effective decriminalisation policy model.
<b>Strang, J., Babor, T., Caulkins, J., Fischer, B., Foxcroft, D., &amp; Humphreys, K.</b>	2012	<a href="#">Drug policy and the public good: Evidence for effective interventions. <i>The Lancet</i> 379, 71–83.</a>	From the abstract: 'Debates about which policy initiatives can prevent or reduce the damage that illicit drugs cause to the public good are rarely informed by scientific evidence. Fortunately, evidence-based interventions are increasingly being identified that are capable of making drugs less available, reducing violence in drug markets, lessening misuse of legal pharmaceuticals, preventing drug use initiation in young people, and reducing drug use and its consequences in established drug users. We review relevant evidence and outline the likely effects of fuller implementation of existing interventions.'

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + <i>Click to proceed to source</i> )	Summary
World Forum Against Drugs	2012	<a href="#">Joint statement: For a humane and balanced drug policy, Stockholm 20 May 2012, World Forum Against Drugs</a>	A joint statement by the USA Director of Drug Control Policy, Gil Kerlikowske; Sweden's Health Minister, Maria Larsson; Russia's Director of Federal Narcotic Service, Viktor Ivano; Italy's Head of Department for Anti Drug Policies, Giovanni Serpelloni, and the UK's Head of the Drug and Alcohol Unit, Gus Jaspert that reaffirms their commitment to the UN drug control conventions and opposes drug law reform.
Domosławski, A.	2011	<a href="#">Drug policy in Portugal: the benefits of decriminalizing drug use, Open Society Foundations, Global Drug Policy Program, New York</a>	From the publisher's website: 'Drug Policy in Portugal describes the process, context, ideas, and values that enabled Portugal to make the transition to a public health response to drug use and possession. Now, with a decade of experience, Portugal provides a valuable case study of how decriminalization coupled with evidence-based strategies can reduce drug consumption, dependence, recidivism, and HIV infection, and create safer communities for all.'

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + <i>Click to proceed to source</i> )	Summary
Drug Prevention Network of the Americas (DPNA), Institute on Global Drug Policy, International Scientific and Medical Forum on Drug Abuse, International Task Force on Strategic Drug Policy, People Against Drug Dependence & Ignorance (PADDI), Nigeria, Europe Against Drugs (EURAD), World Federation Against Drugs (WFAD), Peoples Recovery, Empowerment and Development Assistance (PREDA) & Drug Free Scotland	2011	<a href="#">Drug legalisation: an evaluation of the impacts on global society. Position statement December 2011</a>	This document is pro-prohibition. Drug Free Australia wrote of it: ‘Significant Drug Policy groups from across the globe came together to evaluate the potential impact of drug legalisation. This alliance of drug policy experts found that drugs are an enormous social problem and that the drug trade adversely affects the global economy. In a position statement issued by the coalition titled Drug Legalization: An Evaluation of the Impacts on Global Society, they discredited those supporting drug legalization.
Global Commission on Drug Policy.	2011	<a href="#">War on drugs: Report of the Global Commission on Drug Policy 2011. Brazil: Rio de Janeiro.</a>	Argues that the war on drugs has failed and calls for an end to the ‘criminalisation, marginalisation and stigmatisation of people who use drugs’, experimentation by governments to pursue other forms of regulation, focus enforcement on organised crime, offer treatment and harm reduction services to those in need, invest in prevention and ‘begin the transformation of the global drug prohibition regime’.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Jelsma, M. (ed.)	2011	<a href="#">The development of international drug control: lessons learned and strategic challenges for the future, Working Paper prepared for the first meeting of the Global Commission on Drugs</a> , Geneva, 24-25 January 2011, Global Commission on Drugs, n.p	‘This paper describes how the foundations for the global [drug] control system were established, the radicalization of the system toward more repressive implementation, consequently leading to soft defections and de-escalation efforts becoming more widespread; and in the last section projects a future for the ongoing reform process toward a modernization and humanization of the control system’s international legal framework as laid down in the UN drug control conventions
Kleiman, M.A.R., Caulkins, J.P., & Hawken, A.	2011	<a href="#">Drugs and drug policy: what everyone needs to know</a> , Oxford University Press, Oxford.	Written by leading drug policy scholars and intended to be read by the general public, it covers many areas of drug policy under the topics including why have drug laws, how does drug-law enforcement work, what prevents drug abuse, what treats drug abuse, how much crime is drug-related, what are the benefits of drug use, can drug problems be dealt with at the source, does international drug dealing support terrorism, when it comes to drugs why can't we think calmly and play nice, and what is to be done?
Stevens, A.	2011	<a href="#">Drug policy, harm and human rights: A rationalist approach</a> . <i>International Journal of Drug Policy</i> 22(3), 233-238.	From the abstract: ‘It has recently been argued that drug-related harms cannot be compared, so making it impossible to choose rationally between various drug policy options. Attempts to apply international human rights law to this area are valid, but have found it difficult to overcome the problems in applying codified human rights to issues of drug policy...This article applies the rationalist ethical argument of Gewirth (1978) to this issue...CONCLUSION: There exists a sound, rational, extra-legal basis for the discussion of drug policy and related harms which enables commensurable discussion of drug policy options.’
Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A.	2010	<a href="#">What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization of illicit drugs?</a> <i>British Journal of Criminology</i> , 50(1), 999-1022.	This paper describes an evaluation of the Portuguese decriminalisation regime (which commenced in 2001). The authors analyse the criminal justice and health impacts against trends from neighbouring Spain and Italy. They conclude that “contrary to predictions, the Portuguese decriminalization did not lead to major increases in drug use”.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Nutt, D.J., King, L.A. & Phillips, L.D. on behalf of the Independent Scientific Committee on Drugs	2010	<a href="#">'Drug harms in the UK: a multicriteria decision analysis'</a> , <i>The Lancet</i> , vol. 376, no. 9752, pp. 1558-65.	Gives an example of using expert opinion to rate the relative harmfulness of various categories of drugs and relates the findings to the ways that the drugs are classified in contemporary legislation, pointing out that many of the drugs that are most harmful are those that are treated most gently in drug law.
Reuter, P.	2009	<a href="#">'Report 5: the unintended consequences of drug policies'</a> , in P Reuter & F Trautmann (eds), <i>A report on global illicit drug markets 1998-2007</i> , European Commission, [Brussels]	The author presents a framework for classifying the various unintended negative consequences of drug policies, pointing out that many of these whilst unintended are certainly foreseeable.
Rolles, S.	2009	<a href="#">After the war on drugs: Blueprint for regulation.</a> London: Transform Drug Policy Foundation.	Outlines models of drug legalisation. Useful resource for considering all aspects of regulation options.
Costa, A.M.	2008	<a href="#">Making drug control 'fit for purpose': building on the UNGASS decade. Report by the Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime as a contribution to the review of the twentieth special session of the General Assembly</a> , E/CN.7/2008/CRP.17, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna	A landmark paper in which the author acknowledges that the current approaches to drug policy, led by his Office, have produced a range of negative unintended consequences, and that much of the international approach to illicit drugs is no longer 'fit for purpose'. He proposes directions for improvement which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bringing public health "back to centre stage"</li> <li>• Enforce the laws, prevent use, treat and rehabilitate those who are not deterred or prevented from using drugs, and mitigate the negative consequences of use and trafficking related crimes.</li> <li>• Mitigate the unintended consequences of the drug problem through crime prevention, harm minimisation, and the protection of human rights.</li> </ul>
Meadowcroft, J. (Ed),	2008	<a href="#">Prohibitions.</a> London: Institute of Economic Affairs.	Monograph/Report which covers a range of prohibited goods/markets, including drugs. Generally points out flaws in prohibition.
Thornton, M.	2007	<a href="#">Prohibition versus legalisation: Do economists reach a conclusion on drug policy? Independent Review XI(3), 417-433.</a>	From the abstract: "Although drug-policy researchers and economists in general seem opposed to prohibition, they are timid in their advocacy of decriminalization and even less supportive of legalization".
Transform Drug Policy Foundation.	2007	<a href="#">After the war on drugs: Tools for the debate.</a> Bristol, UK: Transform Drug Policy Foundation.	Makes the case for drug policy and law reform and shows how to conceptualise and articulate the arguments for reform.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Bewley-Taylor, D. & Trace, M.	2006	<a href="#">The International Narcotics Control Board: watchdog or guardian of the UN drug control conventions?</a> , The Beckley Foundation Drug Policy Programme, report 7, The Beckley Foundation, Oxford.	From the website: ‘While the Board’s role in overseeing and quantifying the legal market in controlled drugs for medical and scientific uses is widely admired, there is growing discontent with the unbalanced nature of its contribution to the much more complex and sensitive debates surrounding the issue of illegal drug markets and how best to respond to them.’
Godfrey, C.	2006	<a href="#">Evidenced based illicit drug policy: the potential contribution of economic evaluation techniques. De Economist 154(4), 563-580.</a>	Arguments about drug policy are often emotive. This paper argues that economic evaluation techniques provide a valuable framework to explore the different impacts of drug policy choices.
King County Bar Association	2005	<a href="#">Effective drug control: Toward a new legal framework. Drug Policy Project. Seattle, King County Bar Association.</a>	This report argues that state-level regulation and control of psychoactive substances is a ‘workable alternative’ to prohibition.
Haden, M.	2004	<a href="#">Regulation of illegal drugs: an exploration of public health tools. International Journal of Drug Policy, 15(4), 225-230.</a>	This paper discusses the various ways in which public health regulatory tools could be deployed to control access to substances under a regulated model.
Haden, M.	2002	<a href="#">Illicit IV drugs: A public health approach. Canadian Journal of Public Health, 93(6), 431-434.</a>	From the abstract: ‘This article explores, from a public health perspective, the harm done by Canadian drug laws, to both individuals and society. It challenges the perceived dichotomy of legalization and criminalization of intravenous drugs. The article then expands the discussion by exploring eight legal options for illicit drugs and examines how these options interact with the marginalization of users, the illicit drug black market, and levels of drug consumption. While the main focus of this article is intravenous drugs, it draws some lessons from cannabis research.’
Dorn, N., & Jamieson, A.	2001	<a href="#">European Drug Laws: the Room for Manoeuvre - The full report. London: DrugScope.</a>	Overview of comparative legal research into national drug laws of France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands and Sweden and their relation to three international drugs conventions.
MacCoun, R., & Reuter, P.	2001	<a href="#">Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times, and Places. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</a>	One of the classic text books outlining drug law reform issues. The book outlines the various positions and provides a framework for assessing the alternatives that uses a harm matrix which includes types of harm, and who bears the harm.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
MacCoun, R., & Reuter, P.	1998	<a href="#">Drug Control. Reprinted from The Handbook of Crime and Punishment. Santa Monica, Drug Policy Research Centre, RAND.</a>	From the website: “The effort to control illicit drugs seems to have become a permanent element of American social policy in the last third of the twentieth century. A large fraction of adolescents experiment with illicit drugs, primarily marijuana. Most do no more than experiment, but enough go on to consume them frequently that drug use and selling, as well as drug control itself, have become a major source of harm to the nation. These harms, particularly the ones related to crime, are heavily concentrated in urban minority communities. Cross-national comparisons of social policy are fraught with problems. Nonetheless, we draw four lessons: depenalization, prevalence of use, goals of drug policy, and the role of government. As currently implemented, U.S. drug policies are unconvincing. They are intrusive, divisive, expensive, and yet they leave the nation with a massive drug problem”.
MacCoun, R., Reuter, P., & Schelling, T.	1996	<a href="#">Assessing alternative drug control schemes. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 15(3), 330-352.</a>	From the abstract: ‘The debate over alternative regimes for currently illicit psychoactive substances focuses on polar alternatives: harsh prohibition and sweeping legalization. This study presents an away of alternatives that lies between these extremes. The current debate lacks an explicit and inclusive framework for making comparative judgments. In this study, we sketch out such a framework...’.
Kleiman, M.A.R.	1992	<a href="#">Against excess: drug policy for results, Basic Books, New York, NY.</a>	From the blurb: ‘Policies have unwanted side effects. Taxes create moonshining, regulation creates evasion and corruption, prohibition creates black markets, programs cost money and often create perverse incentives. Since all drugs are dangerous and all policies are costly, we ought to consider, for each drug and for all of them together, what set of policies would create the least onerous overall problem, adding together the damage done by drug abuse and the damage done by attempts to control it.’

Table 3: Cannabis legalisation

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Guttmanova, K., et al.	2016	<a href="#">Impacts of Changing Marijuana Policies on Alcohol Use in the United States</a> <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i> <b>40</b> (1): 33-46	Systematic review of impacts of change in cannabis laws (marijuana decriminalization, medical marijuana legalization, and nonmedical or recreational marijuana legalization) in the US on alcohol use. Finds evidence that cannabis law reform is associated with both substitution (i.e., more liberal marijuana policies related to less alcohol use as marijuana becomes a substitute) and complementary (i.e., more liberal marijuana policies related to increases in both marijuana and alcohol use).
van Ooyen-Houben, M. M. J., Bieleman, B., & Korf, D.	2016	<a href="#">Tightening the Dutch coffee shop policy: Evaluation of the Private Club and the Residence criterion.</a> <i>International Journal of Drug Policy</i> .	Analysis of Government decision to tighten the Dutch coffee shop regulations via introduction of requirement for club entrants to be Dutch residents and registered as part of a club, and subsequent decision to abolish the private club requirement. This showed that the new regulations led to rapid displacement to illegal market e.g. more cannabis purchases and consumption outside of the coffee-shops and more youth involvement in the cannabis trade and nuisance, without any impacts on the overall prevalence of use.
Caulkins, J. P., Kilmer, B., Kleiman, M., MacCoun, R., Midgette, G., Oglesby, P., Pacula, R.L., & Reuter, P.H.	2015	<a href="#">Considering marijuana legalization: Insights for Vermont and Other Jurisdiction.</a> Santa Monica, RAND Corporation.	Report that provides insights into issues that ought be considered before legalising cannabis. Of particular note the authors outlined twelve models through which cannabis could be supplied (and pros and cons of each): including allowing distribution only within small co-ops or buyers' clubs and having a government monopoly and permitting only not-for profit organisation to sell. While directed at a US audience it shows that there are a large number of different approaches to legalising cannabis that could be used beyond "commercial legalisation and regulation".
Steve Rolles George Murkin	2014	<a href="#">How to Regulate Cannabis: A Practical Guide</a>	This is a guide to regulating legal markets for the non-medical use of cannabis. It is for policy makers, drug policy reform advocates and affected communities all over the world, who are witnessing the question change from, 'Should we maintain cannabis prohibition?' to 'How will legal regulation work in practice?'

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Franklin Apfel, Managing Director at World Health Communication Associates (Axbridge, UK).	2014	<a href="#">Policy paper 5. Cannabis: From prohibition to regulation</a>	Drawing on global and European experience in regulating tobacco and alcohol, the 5th ALICE RAP Policy Paper makes the case for why current prohibitionist approaches need to be changed and how legal regulatory cannabis policies can be crafted that protect public health, wealth and well-being.
Pacula, R. L. and E. L. Sevigny	2014	<a href="#">"Marijuana liberalization policies: why we can't learn much from policy still in motion."</a> <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 33(1): 212-221.	Article that reminds of the hazards of evaluating drug law reforms too early, particularly when using natural experiments to evaluate the impacts of drug law reforms. They note that many of the US cannabis liberalisations have continued to evolve over time: and until they are stable there are limits to what can be learned from these. They also note that early evaluations are also often flawed due to insufficient data points and/or lack of attention to the big policy questions, that may only emerge as important some years after implementation.
Kilmer, B., Kruithof, K., Pardal, M., Caulkins, J. & Rubin, J	2013	<a href="#">Multinational Overview of Cannabis Production Regimes</a> , Santa Monica, RAND Corporation. Document Number: RR-510-WODC	Commissioned by the Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice this report presents four-country case-studies of cannabis production for non-medical and non-scientific consumption (from Spain, Belgium, United States (Colorado and Washington) and Uruguay). It also provides an overview of eight countries' cannabis production for medicinal and scientific purposes. One appeal of this report is that it can be read at two levels. For those who are interested in keeping up to date on the various international regimes for cannabis, this information is easily accessible. However, for those who are interested in such detail, a key strength of this report is the inclusion of references to the actual legal documents in the language of the country of interest.

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Caulkins, J., Hawken, A., Kilmer, B., & Kleiman, M.	2012	<a href="#">Marijuana Legalisation: What everyone needs to know.</a> Oxford University Press	From the website: A non-partisan primer about the topic, covering everything from the risks and benefits of using marijuana, to describing the current laws around the drug in the U.S. and abroad. The authors discuss the likely costs and benefits of legalization at the state and national levels and walk readers through the "middle ground" of policy options between prohibition and commercialized production. The authors also consider how marijuana legalization could personally impact parents, heavy users, medical users, drug traffickers, and employers.
Caulkins, J., Kilmer, B., Maccoun, R.J., Pacula, R.L., & Reuter, P.	2012	<a href="#">Design considerations for legalizing cannabis: lessons inspired by analysis of California's Proposition 19.</a> Addiction 107(5), p. 865-871.	This paper presents insights about the effect of legalization on production costs and consumption and highlights important design choices
Caulkins, J.	2010	<a href="#">Cost of marijuana prohibition on the California justice system.</a> Working Paper Santa Monica, RAND Drug Policy Research Centre. WR-763-RC.	From the website: This paper estimates the current cost of enforcing marijuana laws in California, both in total and for those 21 and over. The calculations suggest that total costs probably do not much exceed \$300 million, with perhaps one-fifth of those costs associated with defendants under the age of 21. These estimates are far below the roughly \$1B in savings some predict from marijuana legalization in California, and it is worth noting that savings – in the sense of reduced spending – could be smaller than current enforcement costs if freed resources are reallocated to enforcement against other crimes, rather than being "rebated" to the taxpayer.
Caulkins, J.	2010	<a href="#">Estimated cost of production for legalised cannabis.</a> Working Paper Series. Santa Monica RAND Drug Policy Research Centre. WR-764-RC.	This paper estimates post-legalization production costs for indoor and outdoor cannabis cultivation as well as parallel estimates for processing costs.

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Pudney, S.	2010	<a href="#">Drugs policy: What should we do about cannabis? Economic Policy 25(61), 165-211.</a>	From the abstract “ <i>Cannabis consumption is unambiguously harmful in several ways, but this does not automatically justify the prohibitionist policy dictated by the international drugs conventions. This paper sets out the arguments for policy intervention in the cannabis market and reviews the directions of policy change that have been called for. We argue that existing theoretical insights and empirical evidence give little compelling reason to prefer prohibition to the alternative of legalization of cannabis with harms controlled by regulation and taxation.</i> ”
Reuter, P.	2010	<a href="#">Marijuana Legalisation: What can be learned from other countries?</a> Santa Monica, CA: RAND.	This paper provides a brief review of the changes that have been tried in other countries with an emphasis on the nature of the changes and how they have been implemented.
Macleod, J., & Hickman, M.	2010	<a href="#">How ideology shapes the evidence and the policy: what do we know about cannabis use and what should we do?</a> <i>Addiction</i> , 105(8), 1326-1330.	This paper reviews the evidence on the harmfulness of cannabis use, concluding that while there are certainly harms, good policy needs to minimise use but also other harms. “The most rational policy on cannabis from a public health perspective would seem to be one able to achieve the benefit of reduced use in the population while minimizing social and other costs of the policy itself. Prohibition, whatever the sentence tariff associated with it, seems unlikely to fulfil these criteria”.
Hall, W., & Lynsky, M.	2009	<a href="#">The challenges in developing a rational cannabis policy.</a> <i>Current Opinion Psychiatry</i> , 22(3), 258-262.	This paper reviews epidemiological evidence on the harmful effects of cannabis use and social research on the costs and benefits of cannabis prohibition. The authors conclude that better evaluation is required.
MacCoun, R., Pacula, R., Chriqui, J., Harris, K., & Reuter, P.	2009	<a href="#">Do citizens know whether their state has decriminalised marijuana? Assessing the perceptual component of deterrence theory.</a> <i>Review of Law &amp; Economics</i> 5(1), 347-371.	This paper demonstrates the gap between the laws and people’s knowledge of those laws.

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Reinarman, C.	2009	<a href="#">Cannabis policies and user practices: Market separation, price, potency, and accessibility in Amsterdam and San Francisco. International Journal of Drug Policy 20(1), 28-37.</a>	This paper describes a study comparing users' practices and perceptions in two different cannabis markets. They find a separation of the market in Amsterdam, not found in San Francisco, along with other differences.
Sznitman, S.R. Olsson, B. & Room, R. (Eds.)	2008	<a href="#">A cannabis reader: Global issues and local experiences (pp.173-198). Lisbon: European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Addiction (EMCDDA).</a>	From the website: "The EMCDDA's cannabis monograph addresses one basic question. How can I find quality information on cannabis, amid all the bias and opinion? The monograph is divided into two volumes. The first volume centres on political, legislative, commercial and social developments relating to cannabis. Its core audience thus comprises policymakers, sociologists, historians, journalists and those involved in enforcement. The second volume is targeted at drugs professionals working in the fields of treatment, prevention and healthcare".
Franklin Apfel, Managing Director at World Health Communication Associates (Axbridge, UK).	2008	<a href="#">AR Policy Paper 5 CANNABIS – FROM PROHIBITION TO REGULATION "When the music changes so does the dance"</a>	Policy paper addresses the following issues regarding cannabis policy: 1. What can we learn from the health, social and economic impacts of current prohibitionist approaches? And; 2. How can legal regulatory cannabis policies be crafted and implemented so that public health, wealth and well-being are protected? One of the paper's key conclusions is that a net positive or negative effect of cannabis legislation on public health and safety depends on how well regulations are formulated and implemented.
Room, R., Fischer, B., Hall, W., Lenton, S., & Reuter, P.	2008	<a href="#">The Global Cannabis Commission Report: Cannabis Policy: Moving Beyond Stalemate Oxford: The Beckley Foundation.</a>	Overview of cannabis use, epidemiology, trends in health and criminal justice outcomes, and impacts of cannabis policy reform

Authors	Year	Reference and Link (CTRL + Click to proceed to source)	Summary
Pacula, R. L., Chriqui, J. F., & King, J.	2004	<a href="#">Marijuana Decriminalization: What does it mean in the United States? (NBER Working Paper No. 9690). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.</a>	This report examines the 11 decriminalization statutes in the US, documenting key dimensions of these laws and identifying their common denominator. They demonstrate that “it is impossible to uniquely identify the so-called decriminalized states” because often other states have reduced penalties. These findings call into question “the interpretation of studies evaluating this policy during the past decade”.
Englesman, E.	2003	<a href="#">Cannabis Control: the model of the WHO tobacco control treaty. International Journal of Drug Policy, 14(2), 217-219.</a>	“If we were to bring (‘schedule’) cannabis under the FCTC [Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, WHO 2002] it would offer room for a shift from <i>prohibition</i> to <i>regulation and control</i> . In other words: decriminalisation can be compensated by a regulatory regime”.
Hall, W., & Pacula, R.	2003	<a href="#">Cannabis Use and Dependence. Public Health and Public Policy. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.</a>	From publisher’s website: ‘This book explores the relationship between health policy, public health and the law regarding cannabis use. It assesses the impact of illegality in drug use and relates this to contemporary policy analysis in the US, Europe and Australia and other developed societies. Current debates about ‘safe use’ and ‘harm minimization’ approaches are evaluated, as well as the experiences of different prevention, treatment and education policies.’
MacCoun, R., & Reuter, P.	2001	<a href="#">Evaluating alternative cannabis regimes. British Journal of Psychiatry, 178, 123-128.</a>	‘Alternatives to an aggressively enforced cannabis prohibition are feasible and merit serious consideration. A model of depenalised possession and personal cultivation has many of the advantages of outright legalisation with few of its risks.’