DRUG LAW REFORM – ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction

Given ongoing discussions about drug law reform, the Drug Policy Modelling Program (DPMP) has put together a list of Australia 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 reports and articles, that are all publically accessible.

The list is structured as follows:
1. Australian-focussed drug law reform material (Table 1)
2. International material (Table 2)

The citations are ordered by year.

This work was updated in March, 2018

Table 1. Australian-focussed material

Author(s)	**Year**	**Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)***	**Summary**
Gotsis, T., Angus, C. & Roth, L.	2016	Illegal drug use and possession: current policy and debates (Briefing paper). NSW Parliamentary Research Service.	The report provides an overview of personal and community harms from drug use, and drug policy considerations including national and NSW policy. Random roadside testing, diversion programs, harm reduction programs, and pill testing are discussed. Legal models are outlined by approach to drugs, use/possess offences, treatment, harm reduction and supply/manufacture offences for prohibition, depenalisation (defacto decriminalisation), decriminalisation (dejure), and legalisation. The authors contribute to the drug law reform debate by analysing different arguments and discussing decriminalisation approaches in Australia and other countries. Four main legal models that can apply to drug use/possess: 1) prohibition, 2) depenalisation (de facto decriminalisation), 3) decriminalisation (de jure), and 4) legalisation. Authors discuss the four models' approach to drugs, possess/use offences, treatment, harm reduction, and supply/manufacture offences (p. 66).
Palmer, M., Wodak, A., Douglas, B. & Stephens, L.	2016	Can Australia respond to drugs more effectively and safely? Australia21, Canberra	This report (from Australia21) summarises a 2015 roundtable held with law enforcement, researchers, advocates, and others, is structured around discussions about the possibility for drug policy reform (and what current policy is), assumptions underpinning the approach to reform, issues or factors to consider, and offer a vision and framework for drug policy reform which is legalisation.
Hughes, C., Ritter, A., Chalmers, J., Lancaster, K., Barratt, M. & Moxham-Hall, V.	2016	Decriminalisation of drug use and possession in Australia – A briefing note. DPMP, UNSW	This briefing paper explains: • What decriminalisation is, and how it differs from prohibition and legalisation • Public opinion on decriminalisation in Australia • What the research evidence tells us about decriminalisation • Which countries have adopted decriminalisation policies

			• What currently occurs in Australia
NSW Bar Association	2015	Drug Policy Discussion Paper	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	Evaluating Australian drug trafficking thresholds: Proportionate, equitable and just? Report to the Criminology Research Advisory Council. Canberra, Criminology Research Advisory Council	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.
Hughes, C.E., Cowdery, N. & Ritter, A.	2015	Deemed supply in Australian drug trafficking laws: A justifiable legal provision? Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 27(1), 1-20.	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.
Ritter, A.	2012	Decriminalisation or legalisation: injecting evidence in the drug law reform debate The Conversation	A summary of the options for decriminalisation and legalisation, published in *The Conversation*.
Douglas, R, Wodak, A & McDonald, D	2012	Alternatives to prohibition: Illicit drugs: How we can stop killing and criminalising young Australians Australia 21, Canberra	This report follows from a Roundtable discussion held in July 2012 to consider new approaches to public policy about illicit drugs in Australia.
Douglas, B., & McDonald, D.	2012	The Prohibition of illicit drugs is killing and criminalising our children and we are all letting it happen. Australia 21, Canberra.	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.
Savulescu, J., & Foddy,	2012	A moral argument against the war on	It is common to hear moral arguments in favour of a prohibition approach to drug policy but here we

B.		drugs. The Conversation	have two scholars presenting moral arguments in favour of changing drug policy away from what they characterised as a 'war on drugs' approach.
McDonald, D.	2011	*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.	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.
Hall, W., & Lucke, J.	2010	Legally coerced treatment for drug using offenders: ethical and policy issues, Crime and Justice Bulletin no. 144, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.	This bulletin discusses the policy and ethical implications raised by legally coercing drug offenders into drug treatment in the community and providing compulsory treatment within the prison system….in the light of the evidence reviewed, the bulletin discusses the NSW Compulsory Drug Treatment Corrections Centre and the challenges in evaluating its effectiveness.
Featherston, J., & Lenton, S.	2007	Effects of the Western Australian Cannabis Infringement Notice Scheme on public attitudes, knowledge and use: Comparison of pre- and post- change data. 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.
Macintosh, A.	2006	Drug law reform: beyond prohibition, Discussion Paper no. 83, The Australia Institute, Canberra.	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	*Modernising Australia's drug policy*, UNSW Press, Sydney.	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	The regulation of cannabis possession, use and supply: A discussion document prepared for The Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee of The Parliament of Victoria. 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 *prohibition with civil penalties* 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	Drugs Dilemma: a way forward. New Weekly Books.	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	Prices, Legalisation and Marijuana Consumption. Australia: Economics Research Centre, University of Western Australia. http://www.drugpolicy.org/docUploads/MDPap.pdf	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	*Infringement versus Conviction: the Social Impact of a Minor Cannabis Offence Under a Civil Penalties System and Strict Prohibition in Two Australian States* (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).
McDonald, D., Moore, R., Norberry, J., Wardlaw, G., & Ballenden, N.	1994	*Monograph Series No. 26. Legislative options for cannabis in Australia*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology.	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.

Table 2. International material on drug law reform

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
New Zealand Drug Foundation	2017	Whakawatea te Huarahi: A model drug law 2020 and beyond NZ Drug Foundation	This document proposes and gives rationale for a model drug law which includes removing criminal penalties for use/possess and social supply, developing a regulated cannabis market, and putting more resources into prevention, education and treatment. The proposed regulated cannabis market includes details around home and commercially grown cannabis, buying and selling at commercial sites, consumption, and regulation.
International Drug Policy Consortium	2016	Online Tool: Comparing models of drug decriminalisation	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.
Global Commission on Drug Policy	2016	*Advancing drug policy reform: a new approach to decriminalization*	This report outlines the harms created through implementing punitive, prohibitive drug policies. Authors provide a description of decriminalisation and suggest that although it has been poorly implemented and designed in the past, decriminalisation is a framework to improve public health and social outcomes. They offer several examples from countries who have decriminalised drugs in some way. Authors support that low level supply in the drug trade need alternatives to punishment (particularly those doing so to alleviate socioeconomic marginalization). Recommendations in this report include 1) abolishing the death penalty, 2) ending all penalties for use/possess and cultivation for personal use 3) alternatives to publishment (ie. Diversion) 4) UN member states to remove penalization of drug possess as a treaty obligation, and 5) Explore regulatory models following decriminalisation.
LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy	2016	After the Drug Wars: Report of the LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy	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.
Goodwin, J.	2016	Public health approach to drug use in Asia: principles and practices for decriminalisation. International Drug Policy Consortium	This report describes the principles underpinning decriminalisation (describing both dejure and defacto separately) with a focus on regulation in Asia, and provides recommendations for designing and implementing decriminalisation models, guidance on program priorities for countries moving towards

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
			decriminalisation. The report does not address legalisation. Chapter 3 describes various mechanisms to divert people away from the criminal justice system, including the role of police, courts, prosecutors, and healthcare/community workers. Dejure decriminalization models can differ based on legal frameworks, police authority, judicial/administrative process, and sanctions for drug use, but do remove criminal sanctions for drug use/possess. A best practice model for them is one which the law is changed to remove all penalties (administrative and criminal sanctions), but do have regulations around use activities, and offer public health resources. Defacto decriminalization models have the following characteristics: use/possess is a criminal offence, but practice allows people to avoid penalties/conviction. Instead, there is no penalty or civil or administrative sanctions apply and/or are diverted.
EMCDDA	2015	Web Resource: EMCDDA Penalties for drug law offences in Europe at a glance	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.
Caulkins, J. P., Kilmer, B., Kleiman, M., MacCoun, R., Midgette, G., Oglesby, P., Pacula, R.L., & Reuter, P.H.	2015	Considering marijuana legalization: Insights for Vermont and Other Jurisdiction. 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".
Rolles, S & Murkin, G.	2014	How to Regulate Cannabis: A Practical Guide	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?'
Apfel, F.	2014	Policy paper 5. Cannabis: From prohibition to regulation World Health Communication Associates	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.
United Nations Human Rights Council	2015	Study on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights (No. A/HRC/30/65).	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	Ending the Drug Wars: Report of the LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy	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,

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
			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	Estimating public expenditure on drug-law offenders in prison in Europe. Lisbon, European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction.	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.
General Secretariat for the Special General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS)	2014	The OAS Drug Report: 16 Months of Debates and Consensus	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: 1. The drug problem needs to be addressed from a public health perspective. 2. Judicial reforms must be enacted to provide alternatives to incarceration. 3. Transnational organized crime is a major player in the drug problem. 4. It is essential to strengthen judicial and law-and-order institutions.
Pinto Coelho, M.	2013	Drugs: The Portuguese Fallacy and the Absurd Medicalization of Europe	This report provides a different assessment of the Portugese 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 quiet revolution: Drug decriminalisation policies in practice across the globe. London, Release.	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	Report on the drug problem in the Americas. Washington D.C., Organization of American States.	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.
Organization of American States: General Secretariat	2013	*Scenarios for the drug problem in the Americas 2013-2025.*	This report gives 4 stories of what is possible, even though there is no agreeance as to what 'should' happen, but does support the formation of policy and strategies, and an informed debate. The 4 scenarios – *Together, Pathways, Resilience, and Disruption* – provide a picture of how 'the drug problem' is understood, the response that is attempted, and opportunities and challenges to implementing such a response. 4 'scenarios' of what could happen to 'the drug problem':

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
			1) Together: strengthen the judicial and safety institutions and professionalization of the problem; partner with citizens; develop better success indicators. 2) Pathways: Try out and learn from alternative legal and regulatory regimes (starting with cannabis) 3) Strengthen community, public safety, health, education, employment through bottom-up programs created by local government, businesses, and NGOs 4) Abandon the 'fight' against drug production
Bewley-Taylor, D.	2012	Towards revision of the UN drug control conventions: The logic and dilemmas of like-minded groups. 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.
Room, Robin	2012	Roadmaps to Reforming the UN Drug Conventions, The Beckley Foundation	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	The UN drug control conventions: The limits of latitude. Transnational Institute/IDPC Series on Legislative Reform of Drug Policies Nr. 18	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	Drugs, Insecurity and Failed States: The Problems of Prohibition. 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	*Drug policy guide*, 2nd edn, 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.
Merkinaite, S.	2012	The war against people who use drugs: The costs. Eurasian Harm Reduction Network.	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	*Drugs without the hot air: minimizing the harms of legal and illegal drugs*, 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

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
			many illegal drugs, and whether addiction can be cured'.
Office of National Drug Control Policy (USA)	2012	*Principles of modern drug policy*, Office of National Drug Control Policy.	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.
Rolles, S., Murkin, G., Powell, M., Kushlick, D., & Slater, J.	2012	*The alternative World Drug Report: counting the costs of the war on drugs*, Transform Drug Policy Foundation, London	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.'
Room, R., & Reuter, P.	2012	How well do international drug conventions protect public health? *The Lancet, 279*(9810), 84-91.	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.
Rosmarin, A. & Eastwood, N.	2012	A quiet revolution: drug decriminalisation polices in practice around the globe. 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.
Strang, J., Babor, T., Caulkins, J., Fischer, B., Foxcroft, D., & Humphreys, K.	2012	Drug policy and the public good: Evidence for effective interventions. The Lancet 379, 71–83.	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.'
World Forum Against Drugs	2012	*Joint statement: For a humane and balanced drug policy, Stockholm 20 May 2012*, World Forum Against Drugs	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

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
			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.
Caulkins, J., Hawken, A., Kilmer, B., & Kleiman, M.	2012	Marijuana Legalisation: What everybody needs to know. Oxford University Press	This book provides a comprehensive overview of cannabis legalisation issues, including summary of the latest research in relation to cannabis use, cannabis production, risks, harms and benefits associated with cannabis use and full analysis of legalisation options. The concluding chapter is a short piece from each author about what they as individuals think about cannabis legalisation.
Caulkins, J., Kilmer, B., Maccoun, R.J., Pacula, R.L., & Reuter, P.	2012	Design considerations for legalizing cannabis: lessons inspired by analysis of California's Proposition 19. Addiction 107(5), p. 865-871. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21985069	This paper presents insights about the effect of legalization on production costs and consumption and highlights important design choices
Domosławski, A.	2011	*Drug policy in Portugal: the benefits of decriminalizing drug use*, Open Society Foundations, Global Drug Policy Program, New York	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.'
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	2011	Drug legalisation: an evaluation of the impacts on global society. Position statement December 2011	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.

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
(EURAD), World Federation Against Drugs (WFAD), Peoples Recovery, Empowerment and Development Assistance (PREDA) & Drug Free Scotland			
Global Commission on Drug Policy.	2011	War on drugs: Report of the Global Commission on Drug Policy 2011. Brazil: Rio de Janeiro.	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'.
Jelsma, M. (ed.)	2011	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, Geneva, 24-25 January 2011, Global Commission on Drugs	'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	Drugs and drug policy: what everyone needs to know, 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	Drug policy, harm and human rights: A rationalist approach. *International Journal of Drug Policy 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., &	2010	What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization	This paper describes an evaluation of the Portuguese decriminalisation regime

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
Stevens, A.		of illicit drugs? *British Journal of Criminology, 50*(1), 999-1022.	(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".
Nutt, D.J., King, L.A. & Phillips, L.D. on behalf of the Independent Scientific Committee on Drugs	2010	'Drug harms in the UK: a multicriteria decision analysis', *The Lancet*, 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.
Caulkins, J.	2010	Cost of marijuana prohibition on the California justice system. Working Paper Santa Monica, RAND Drug Policy Research Centre. WR-763-RC. http://www.rand.org/pubs/working_papers/WR763.html	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	Estimated cost of production for legalised cannabis. Working Paper Series. Santa Monica RAND Drug Policy Research Centre. WR-764-RC. http://www.rand.org/pubs/working_papers/2010/RAND_WR764.pdf	This paper estimates post-legalization production costs for indoor and outdoor cannabis cultivation as well as parallel estimates for processing costs.
Reuter, P.	2010	Marijuana Legalisation: What can be learned from other countries? Santa Monica, CA: RAND. http://www.rand.org/pubs/working_papers/2010/RAND_WR771.pdf	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.
Reuter, P.	2009	'Report 5: the unintended consequences of drug policies', in P Reuter & F Trautmann (eds), *A report on global illicit drug markets 1998-2007*, 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	*After the war on drugs: Blueprint for regulation*. London: Transform Drug Policy Foundation.	Outlines models of drug legalisation. Useful resource for considering all aspects of regulation options.
Costa, A.M.	2008	Making drug control 'fit for purpose': building on the	A landmark paper in which the author acknowledges that the current approaches

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
		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, E/CN.7/2008/CRP.17, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna	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: • Bringing public health "back to centre stage" • 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. • Mitigate the unintended consequences of the drug problem through crime prevention, harm minimisation, and the protection of human rights.
Meadowcroft, J. (Ed),	2008	*Prohibitions*. 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	Prohibition versus legalisation: Do economists reach a conclusion on drug policy? *Independent Review XI*(3), 417-433.	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	After the war on drugs: Tools for the debate. 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.
Bewley-Taylor, D. & Trace, M.	2006	*The International Narcotics Control Board: watchdog or guardian of the UN drug control conventions?,* 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	Evidenced based illicit drug policy: the potential contribution of economic evaluation techniques. *De Economist 154(4)*, 563-580.	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	*Effective drug control: Toward a new legal framework. Drug Policy Project*. Seattle, King County Bar Association.	This report argues that state-level regulation and control of psychoactive substances is a 'workable alternative' to prohibition.
Haden, M.	2004	Regulation of illegal drugs: an exploration of public health tools. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 15*(4), 225-230.	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	Illicit IV drugs: A public health approach. *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 93*(6), 431-434.	'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

Author(s)	Year	Reference and Link *(CNTRL + Click to proceed to source)*	Summary
			article is intravenous drugs, it draws some lessons from cannabis research.'
Dorn, N., & Jamieson, A.	2001	European Drug Laws: the Room for Manoeuvre - The full report. London: DrugScope.	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	Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times, and Places. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	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.
MacCoun, R., & Reuter, P.	1998	Drug Control. Reprinted from The Handbook of Crime and Punishment. Santa Monica, Drug Policy Research Centre, RAND.	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	Assessing alternative drug control schemes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *15*(3), 330-352.	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	*Against excess: drug policy for results*, Basic Books, New York, NY.	'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.'