



## Justifications for Decriminalizing Drugs

Theodor Ernst

Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany

Ted\_nal@uni-frankfurt.de

---

### **Abstract**

Drug decriminalization calls for reduced control and penalties compared to existing laws. Proponents of drug decriminalization generally support the use of fines or other punishments to replace prison terms, and often propose systems whereby illegal drug users who are caught would be fined, but would not receive a permanent criminal record as a result. A central feature of drug decriminalization is the concept of harm reduction.

Drug decriminalization is in some ways an intermediate between prohibition and legalization, and has been criticized as being "the worst of both worlds", in that drug sales would still be illegal, thus perpetuating the problems associated with leaving production and distribution of drugs to the criminal underworld, while also failing to discourage illegal drug use by removing the criminal penalties that might otherwise cause some people to choose not to use drugs.

In 2001 began treating use and possession of small quantities of drugs as a public health issue. This also decreases the amount of money the government spends fighting a war on drugs and money spent keeping drug users incarcerated. A number of countries have similarly moved to reduce the penalties associated with drug use and personal possession.

**Keyword:** *Drugs; Decriminalization; Penological*

### **Introduction**

Historically, the concept of drugs has been expanded, and various types of it, both natural and industrial, have been produced and introduced. By relying of their experience, human has found some useful effects of such drugs like relieving pain and reducing stress - although temporary, that is why they have maintained using it. However, it could not make others ignore its negative effects. In all countries, drug control policies often cost to the threat or use of criminal means. However, criminal acts devoted to this way are not helpful. Traditional view supports more intense punishments to achieve prevention and the maximum control. In contract with the traditional view, the scientific and modern experienced view has been represented that does not agree with type and intensity of punishments regarding drug use. The new view has accepted an approach fully different from the typical method, and has expressed tolerance to some of the current drug crimes. The two general categories of drugs are distinguished: soft and hard drugs.

According to the division above, some European countries sought to prevent the boundless use of hard drugs by society, especially youth and subsequently to keep them from the subsequent terrible effects,



in other words, to prevent changing the consumption pattern of low-risk drugs to high-risk ones. They have tried to decriminalize soft drug use so that in this way they can control hard drugs to some extent, too. Holland has been a pioneer in this field and practical experience of the country has been followed immediately in criminal policy of other European countries such as Italy, Belgium, Germany, and the UK.

### **The Concept of Soft Drug**

Soft drug is a type of drug with specific characteristics and is as opposite of hard drug. Soft drugs are those having the following three characteristics: its addictive level is low, the negative effects on human health are low, and the possibility of its therapeutic use is possible .

Some of the outstanding examples of soft drugs are marijuana, cannabis, and caffeine. The most important examples of hard drugs are heroin, cocaine and methamphetamine. In Iran, the Netherlands and the United States, soft drug concept is applied to the "cannabis".

### **Decriminalization History**

In the Netherlands, cannabis use as one of the light drugs types became apparent after World War II. Following the emergence of new phenomenon, drug law of the country in 1953 was reviewed and cannabis was added to the list of banned drugs. On this date, for the first time, cannabis was criminalized in the Netherlands (Hepler; 1972).

Use of excessive force by police in Amsterdam in response to the riots and student protests in 1966 led the implementation of regulations and laws to be largely influenced by the general tendency of the public. Thus, the position of the Netherlands in social issues was going to be adjusted. Some of the issues having more flexibility brought by the government were peaceful protest movements and the drug use. After this, the new policy of Netherlands was set on not being arrested because of carrying cannabis (Shapiro;1976).

In 1968, the National Federation of mental health organizations formed the Commission aiming to “explore the factors associated with drug use” and “suggesting reasonable policy”. The final report of the Convention was presented in 1971. This report presents an analysis of drug use in the Netherlands and then proposes new approaches to drug abuse: First, cannabis use and carrying a small amount of it should be removed immediately from the area of criminal law. Second, transportation and use of other drugs should be following misdemeanor temporarily in the realm of criminal law, but in the not too distant future, this will also be decriminalized. Third, those drug users who have encountered difficulties in this path should be given adequate treatment facilities (Hepler; 1976).

As the Commission, the State Commission under the Ministry of Health was established in 1968 and the final report of the commission was presented in 1972. The report emphasized on the distinction between acceptable and unacceptable risks of drugs and placed cannabis among drug with no significant health risk. The recommendations issued by the commission were largely effective in determining drug policy in the Netherlands and resulted in a change in the country's drug law in 1976 (Erez-Reyes; 1976).

In the United States, the first signs of cannabis use emerged in North America in the 17th century. In the years after 1800, cannabis was legal in nearly every state, the therapeutic use of this drug was common, and they were freely purchased from the pharmacy. In 1910 and after the Mexican Revolution in the southern fields of the United States, a great group of Mexicans migrated to the United States and brought recreational use of the drug for the residents of the country. From this time onwards, attempts began to ban the use of this material at the state level. At December 19, 1914, Harrison Narcotics Act was passed that was the first



anti-drug law in the US at the federal level. According to the law, carrying drugs such as cannabis was prohibited throughout the United States, except in therapeutic cases prescribed by a doctor.

Between 1938 and 1951 and after the adoption of the law on cannabis taxes, most states unified under the law on drugs and announced cannabis to be illegal. Cannabis was along with other types of drug and its consumption did not grow much. Between 1952 and 1962 in the United States, addiction aspect of cannabis was emphasized, and its use was the gateway to heroin use and subsequently, heavy penalties were devised for it.

In 1955, a Senate subcommittee listened to expert witnesses on drug abuse. After being convinced on this issue that the appropriate response to the problem of the sale and consumption of cannabis is imposing harsher penalties. In addition, it attempted to determine the minimum mandatory penalty and eliminate the possibility of the perpetrator using the suspension of punishment and probation. Moreover, the fine up to 20 thousand dollars was set for selling drugs, including cannabis according to the discretion of the judge. Many states follow the federal government's new laws to increase punishments imposed on cannabis. In some states, even Sentenced to selling cannabis to children were considered to deserve the death penalty (Smith; 1968).

From 1962 to 1972 can be considered in general as the years of reducing the penalties for cannabis use in the United States. In this era, the debate over the cannabis use and its health effects reached its peak. With the advancement of science, therapeutic characteristics and properties of cannabis use was more evident and studies yielded the result that at least, harmful health and social effects of this drug use have been vastly overstated. In this period, several social movements were formed aimed at protecting personal consumption of drugs, including cannabis such as protecting movement of free cannabis use, The Committee against marijuana prohibition, associations of citizens supporting enacting cannabis, community of acceptance of cannabis, and organization of reforming regulations related to cannabis NORML (Engelsman; 1988). By the end of 1972, in addition to the eight states, all states descended simple carrying of less than one ounce of cannabis as misdemeanors. In March of the same year, the National Commission was reported on Marijuana and Drug Abuse in which, it was proposed that offenses related to cannabis use should be exposed to decriminalization. Since then, several States of America began decriminalization of marijuana use.

### ***Ethical Considerations***

Respect for the privacy of individuals and their religious beliefs on one hand, and avoiding the labeling of consumers of these products are some of justification of human rights and ethical considerations on this topic.

### ***Materials and Methods***

In the present review-study, using keywords such as decriminalization, criminology as well as soft and hard drugs, we searched for the published articles and resources regarding this topic in both legal and medial domains, and then they were analyzed.

### ***Findings***

Those agreeing with decriminalization of cannabis use, use some reasons and justifications to prove their view, that some of them are pointed as the following:



## 1. Legal justifications

### 1.1. Penological Justifications

Often, to justify decriminalization of soft drug use, two popular Penological schools could be mentioned the first school of absolute justice and the second, social utilitarian school.

#### 1.1.1. *School of Absolute Justice*

According to the teachings of this school, if a behavior is morally unacceptable, punishing the act is necessary by itself. According to view of supporters of absolute justice school, with Immanuel Kant as its pioneer “if the crime act of the criminal has returned to himself, he cannot claim injustice to against him as a result of the execution of punishment. It is because violation of ethical rules by the offender in a criminal offense”. According to the view, even if the crime would not have a negative impact on other people, but for violating ethical rules, the perpetrator will be entitled to impose penalties. Therefore, the penalty should never merely be as a means to react against losses caused by the perpetrator's interests, but also a violation of ethical rules per se is punishable respectively. Since the drug use of any kind is evil, so consumers would be liable to capital punishment (Kandel; 1975).

However, this vision is now faced with problems. First, in the view, using drugs is considered as evil, but according to scientific studies and researches, soft drug use has not negative effect even on the consume. Second, immorality is a follow-up of the culture and tradition dominating the society. If a society tries to use a great deal of soft drugs, in the other word, using the mentioned drugs such as cannabis does not have moral and social evil, then immorality of such behaviors would be seriously doubted (Fergusson; 2000).

#### 1.1.2. *School of Social Utilitarianism*

According to the utilitarianism view of Bentham, punishment is considered as evil, by itself; therefore, it should only be used to prevent a greater evil. As a result, applying penalties that are useless, ineffective, without the benefit, and unnecessary is a great wickedness, itself, should be avoided. According to this view, punishment is unnecessary, when there is no evil that can be avoided by applying punishment. It is ineffective when it cannot lead to prevention or repeat of crime. It has no benefit when the detriment of the evil caused by the punishment is more than the benefit derived from its implementation. Finally, it is unnecessary when the evil (crime) prevention is feasible or more cost-effective without resorting to punishment. Regarding soft drug, paying attention to the four points is very important (Van Ours; 2003).

First, it is criminalization of soft drug use is unnecessary, because drug use (especially soft drug) belongs to one's personal space and it is not an evil that the law would prevent it. Second, it is ineffective. Numerous research and studies conducted on the role of penalty in prevention of soft drug use indicate that imposition of criminal sanctions has not been able to prevent drug use by addicts. Third, it has no benefit, because according to various studies and researches, the harm of soft drug criminal prohibition is more than the harms of using the drug. Fourth, it is unnecessary because experience has shown that prolonged punishment is slowest device while it is the most expensive tool to fight with soft Drug Abuse Control, there are better alternative methods such as the establishment of therapeutic-oriented courts, and recreation of consumers of these products will have a higher efficiency (Coffey; 2000).



## **1.2. Criminological justification**

### *1.2.1. Non-criminal nature*

According to this reasoning, problem of drug use, prior to being in the context of criminal law, is related to public health. Imposition of criminal sanctions for the first time was only to augment the position of health and treatment associated with these types of drugs, and it should basically be replaced with it. Use the weapon of legal penalty is justified only as the last tool, and in limited circumstances. Policy makers are required to change the criminal look at this problem, at least on some types of less risky drugs known as soft or light. In addition, given the nature of the matter, they must adopt policies in the context of public health (Green; 1984)

This change of view clearly has shown its importance in countries such as the Netherlands. Drug policies (related to illicit drugs, and narcotic drugs) of the country are on the basis of "separation of soft from hard drugs" and "implement of a plan to reduce the social harm". In this method, it is being attempted to deal with drug-related problems by applying health and treatment methods such as providing free condoms and injection needles, legal distribution of opium syrup and opening offices to quit addiction, the project performance was so extensive and impressive that has been copied by many countries, including Iran, even with exactly the same pattern (Merritt; 1981).

### *1.2.2. Increasing respect for the law*

According to soft Drug fans, if law declares soft drug use to be free, then who will allow themselves to violate the law? In the world today, government makes most offenses, but a plethora of citizens does not commit them. By banning the soft drug use, government has only increased potential criminals. By decriminalization of the use of these substances, crime risk of many citizens will be decreased and greater respect for the law will be provided (Merritt; 1981).

### *1.2.3. Tendency to commit prohibited acts*

In psychology, it has been truly accepted that human tends to do some acts that are prevented, and using illegal drugs is not an exception. Therefore, according to proponents of decriminalization, any attempt to persuade people not to consume soft drugs will be counterproductive. In this regard, there is a famous example: "Adam and Eve did not eat the forbidden fruit because of hunger but because they were prohibited from eating It." There are such words in religious literature of Muslim, too. A Hadith narrated by the Prophet said: "human is greedy and eager to what has been prohibited for him.

### *1.2.4. Preventing smuggling and black market of consumption*

Decriminalization of soft drug use will decrease the amount of profits of smuggler of this type of drugs. Illegal drugs and illegal drug trade along with price increase has become a very profitable profession. Basically, when there is a huge demand in society for certain product, and in fact the government has banned its trade, surely, to meet the needs of the community, there will be a black market of the goods.

Second, the existence of black market means there is a large demand for consumption of goods available in the market on one hand, and high profitability of selling the goods on the other hand. Having three factors of lack, demand and profitability will increase their smuggling that this will include a wide range of criminal behavior in the future. In the US, drug and illegal drugs smuggling estimated annual revenue of \$ 60 billion that this amount, sometimes, reaches to \$ 100 billion. In 10 states, cannabis trade is one of the most profitable trades; it has allocated the highest profitability to itself in the United States after trade of grains (Merritt; 1986).



Revenues from smuggling illegal drugs in the city of "Miami" is more of the proceeds from the sectors of tourism, exports, health care and all other legal businesses. Soft drug market in the United States has allocated 1.8 percent of the total global market of drugs to itself, and therefore, it has the first place. M.s 'Just Christie', a member of Bureau of national policy on drugs, associated with the White House says: "Every effort made to control the consumption of illicit drugs has no direct effect on price and even the easy availability of drugs such as cannabis" (Ibid; 1984).

Third, the indirect effect of such a prohibition is the result of its criminalization that the suppliers of these drugs wrap their post goods in expensive foil and sell them to youth in the price same as jewelry. Some of the young people who wish to earn a huge income without doing any constructive activity instigate this turbulent market. Of course, selling shoddy goods causes severe physical harm on consumers and will have serious criminal consequences. Decriminalization of soft drug use can be a bit efficient in this regard (Ibid; 1984).

### **1.3. Justifications of Human Rights**

#### *1.3.1. Respect for Privacy*

Based on the first justification, drug abuse is a personal problem. The consumer is caught in the trap of addiction and puts his health at risk because of a momentary pleasure. Therefore, the issue of drug use, rather than being a social problem, is a personal problem. It cannot be denied that government intervention to control the production and distribution of drugs, especially hard drugs, is necessary and even desirable, but it should be noted that the imposition of penal sanction for some styles of drugs, particularly partial and for personal use drugs is, in fact, intrusion of legislator privacy of individuals and their privacy violation. In countries supporting freedom and respect for individual rights and privacy of people, this will be more evident. Perhaps, that is why some countries have ignored and decriminalized transportation or consumption of small amounts of some drugs (often soft drugs such as marijuana and cannabis) or even at home cultivation for personal use. Countries such as Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland are included (Goldberg; 1979).

#### *1.3.2. Avoid labeling*

Undoubtedly, you know some people who have started their addiction from recreational use of drugs. Although, this group has a normal and common appearance, they are severely addicted to specific kinds of drugs, particularly light drugs. Imagine that this group is not willing to do any tests in order to avoid being labeled as addict, because of which their addiction will be determined. If special kinds of drugs would be decriminalized, it will be possible to not only motivate these people to do tests, but also the criminal labeling can be thrown away from them, and also their fear to refer to medial and cure centers will be removed. In total, decriminalization can be considered as a tool to exclude addicts from margins and include them in society (Crawford; 1979).

#### *1.3.3. Respect to Popularity*

In democracies, governments are elected by the citizens to implement the best programs to achieve human happiness. No doubt, since the governments are established by the people's vote, they should reflect the desires and demands of them. In our assumption, if a large number of citizens attempt to use some types of soft drugs, so fighting and criminalizing it will be barren. For example, citizens of more than 10 states, today more than decade ago, are calling for the decriminalization of soft drugs. Frustrer institution in Canada stating that the anti-drug policies have failed in general, is calling for legalization of drugs. Many Canadians demanded the release of opium and 90 percent of them believe that the therapeutic use of soft drug should prevail.



In the United States, particularly in recent years, significant increase of cannabis uses and tendency toward decriminalization of personal consumption has been observed. Many statistical agencies in this regard have made national surveys and have demonstrated growth in the popularity of the item. For example, according to the Gallup poll, about 44 percent of Americans agree with the decriminalization of cannabis use and 54 percent are the opposite of this. Supporters of decriminalization, based on the claim of the Institute, have allocated fixed figure 25% to themselves, since 70s to mid-90s, but that number reached to 31 percent in 2000 and in the first decade of the third century AD, it has been still growing. The latest statistics shows 44% agree with decriminalization of cannabis consumption (Merritt; 1986).

## 2. Medical justification

### 2.1. Justifications of Denying Pathogenicity

Many scientific studies and articles emphasize on the validity of the claim that cannabis use does not lead to physical and mental illness in individual consumer.

#### 2.1.1. Negation of Physical Diseases

Some of the most important diseases that are likely to arise as a result of cannabis use in individual are types of cancer, infertility, increased mortality and damage to the brain and memory effects. However, recent studies have shown that there is no association between regular consumption of cannabis and cancer.<sup>26</sup> One of the state studies on the long-term effects of Marijuana on lung concluded that recreational use of cannabis does not make any impairment in lung function. The systematic review based on data from 19 studies from 1966 to 2006 found out that there is no significant relation between smoking cannabis and lung cancer. The research was published in 2012 as a result of 20 years of research on pulmonary function and its relationship with cannabis use. The study noted, "Our findings indicate that recreational use of cannabis (smoking one cigarette per day for 7 years or 1 per week for 49 years) does not make any problem for pulmonary function. However, this study was able to estimate the effects of cannabis use on those whose consumption is not more than the amount stated"(Pletcher; 1961).

The idea of national science academy of America about the relation between cannabis and infertility is that "the capacity of sperms presents in testicles to fertilize female ovule has a reverse relation with cannabis use, but this amount of effect does not make any serious medical problems for reproduction". In addition, the studies conducted in Jamaica have shown that it does not seem marijuana use impairs the birth or delays growth among newborn children (Hayes; 1991). The results of studies that have tried to show that cannabis use during pregnancy has negative influence on development of the child after birth are a bit integrated. Tennes et al investigated the effects of cannabis use during pregnancy on infant growth after birth and 756 women, a third of them admit to cannabis use during pregnancy, were examined, and in the end they concluded that the appeared effects have been eliminated shortly after the infants' birth during their first year of life. Recently Day et al found that there is a relation between cannabis use by the mother during pregnancy and the mental and physical activities of the three-year-old children. His evaluated three-old-children of 655 women who admitted to cannabis use during pregnancy. Another study in this respect was conducted on the 6-year-old children confirmed findings of the first study. After studying other researches, Fried and Smith concluded that cannabis use by mothers during pregnancy has a little impact (if any effect) on the growth of the fetus and the baby's central nervous system (Day; 1994).

Many studies have been done on the impact of cannabis use on human intelligence and brain cortex. For example, according to a study conducted in 2002 in the Journal of the Canadian Medical Foundation "cannabis does not have negative long-term effects on general intelligence (Fried; 2003).



### 2.1.2. Negation of Mental Diseases

Regarding the relationship between cannabis use and mental illnesses such as schizophrenia, many studies have been conducted. Analysis in 2005 investigated several hypotheses about correlation of these two and found that there is no support for the hypothesis that cannabis can cause psychosis so that if it were not consumed, psychosis would not have occurred. However, to understand the relationship between cannabis and other types of psychotic patients, more studies are needed. Dr. Stanley Zamit from Birstole and Cardiff universities also reported, “Even if cannabis increases the risk of psychosis, most people using the drug do not get sick” (Degenhardt; 2001).

One of the studies has recently shown that Cannabidiol (main component of cannabis) can be effective as atypical antipsychotics abnormal in the treatment of schizophrenia. Other studies also supported the results (Leweke; 2009). They concluded that Cannabidiol in severe paranoid schizophrenia has antipsychotics properties .

The series of studies on long-term use of cannabis in the United States showed that Avolition syndrome is very rare among chronic consumers of the drug. Halika et al evaluated the symptoms of avolition syndrome among 100 consumers of cannabis having experienced using the drug for 6 to 8 years. They found out that only 3 people of the sample were suffering from avolition syndrome. Experimental research on long-term use of cannabis could also prove clearly that this substance does not have incentive effect on the consumer (Edwards; 1976).

Recently, by reviewing the arguments and evidence relating to the relationship between cannabis use and job performance in laboratory studies, stated field studies, Schwenk concluded that the relation between cannabis use and job performance is very low. He believed that prior to being aligned with the assumption of “a relationship between cannabis use and weak job performance”, the results are compatible with the assumption of “a relation between personality of cannabis consumers and poor job performance”.

## 2.2. Therapeutic Effects of Cannabis Use

### 2.2.1. Treatment of Cancer

In one study, conducted in 1988, 56 patients who were being treated by chemotherapy due to cancer were using cannabis treatment, out of which 78 percent of them have reacted positively to the mentioned treatment and symptoms of recovery were observed. In addition, according to medical staff, any negative consequences did not emerge as a result of cannabis use in this group of patients (Vinciguerra; 1988).

In a study in 1975 was conducted on a group of cancer patients who had chemotherapy. Some of patients stopped the treatment voluntarily, and started using cannabis by preparing it from black market. Interestingly, the Therapeutic effects of cannabis use in these patients were much higher than the other patients (Sallan; 1975).

Doctor Nelson, in an article entitled "The role of cannabis in appetite stimulation in cancer patients without appetite", with several experiments on patients with incurable cancer that the mentioned illness has advanced greatly in them destroying their appetite concluded that: «THC in cannabis has an effective role in this group of patients to stimulate food intake and consuming a small amount of the drug causes natural appetite of these people to be normal again"(Nelson; 1994).





### 2.2.2. *Treatment of HIV and Hepatitis*

One of the researchers in Hawaii in 1996 conducted a study on a group of people with AIDS. According to his research, 98 percent of AIDS patients were aware of the therapeutic effects of cannabis, and 37 percent of them use cannabis as a pain medication and preferred it more than other drugs available market (Grinspoon; 1995).

Dr. Abran et al, in his scientific research, concluded that there is not concern for damaging effects of cannabis use on the subjects. And according to the researchers, “our findings of investigating the effects of short-term cannabis use on patients with immunodeficiency disease showed a positive effect of taking the drug, of course, in this experiment, both groups taking THC and cannabis have gained weight gain as a result of the prescribed drugs. "(43) The findings of this study were confirmed by De Jong et al in 2005. According to the findings of the researchers, cannabis use can not only reduce or stop the growth of the disease in AIDS patients, but also can decrease painful side effects in patients taking this drug, and if it is inhaled (smoked), it will increase appetite and reduce nausea in the person (Abrams; 2007).

In 2007, Dr. Haney et al conducted other reviews in this regard. Findings of the study confirmed the accuracy of the results of previous studies. According to the mentioned study, cannabis use can increase appetite and weight of patients suffering from AIDS. In addition, using the drug can improve sleeping condition of the patients.

According to one of the studies regarding the role of cannabis use in treatment of Hepatitis C, 71 patients with the disease were selected. These patients were divided into two groups, the first group took the conventional treatments and the second group left the common treatment and started using cannabis. The results of this experiment were surprising. For those patients who were attempting cannabis consumption, improvement symptoms were three times higher than in the other groups. Based on this study, researchers concluded that increasing duration of treatment with cannabis would lead to recovery and health of the patients. Doctor Fisher et al, in the same year, conducted a similar study. The results of the study entitled "Treatment of hepatitis c and cannabis use among patients using illicit drugs" were released, in which the positive effects of cannabis use in the treatment of these patients has been possible (Fischer; 2006).

### 2.2.3. *Treatment of Glaucoma*

Regarding the effect of glaucoma, some researches have been conducted indicating that cannabis use decreases eyestrain and its consumers are less likely to get this disease. Based on these studies, cannabis use may protect eyesight of patients suffering from Glaucoma (Hepler; 1971).

### 2.2.4. *Suffering and Pain Relief*

Studies show that cannabis use, in particular, plays an effective role in relieving nerve pain resulted from AIDS, spasms and cramps and other pains and physical sufferings. It also decreases adverse effects of drugs for the treatment of incurable diseases. (49). Dr. Ellis et al organized a research titled “Smoking cannabis to treat pain in patients with AIDS” focusing on AIDS patients. According to him, "In conducted tests, cannabis use in patients with AIDS could reduce pain and discomfort. The cannabis not only relieves pain but also reduces the psychological effects of pain in the patient. Totally, as the result of cannabis use, both pains of the patient and his mental condition will be relived” (Ellis; 2009).



### 2.2.5. *Muscle Cramps*

Several studies indicate the effect of cannabis on the muscle cramps, and their treatment. For example, according to Zajicek studies, regular use of cannabis is effective in the treatment of pain caused by multiple sclerosis and muscle cramps for 61 to 95 percent.

### 2.2.6. *MS.*

Many formal studies are conducted on the effects of cannabis on improving MS, prevention of stroke and heart attack, muscle cramps and multiple hardening indicating the role of cannabis use on recovery of patients suffering from the diseases. Findings of Dr. Wade et al show that long-term use of cannabis in 82 weeks can decrease pain and side effects associated with MS, without making any other side effects for the patient.

### 2.2.7. *Nausea Reduction*

According to research carried out in the treatment of patients suffering from nausea, it was observed that 72% of cannabis users witnessed a mitigation of their disease. Researches of Layeegue et al in 2006, ended with publishing an article entitled "Prevention of nausea after Breast surgery in women" indicating that the consumption of cannabis or THC capsules can significantly reduce the number and the severity of the mentioned condition after chest surgery"(Zajicek; 2003).

### 2.2.8. *Weight Loss*

Some studies indicate weight loss, loss of appetite in obese patients as a result of cannabis use. According to a survey by Foltin et al entitled "The effect of inhaled cannabis on increase of appetite and weight gain of Man" published in 1988, it was stated that a number of normal volunteers without the disease attempted to use cannabis in order to investigate the effects of cannabis use on the increase of appetite and weight. According to the obtained results, fumigation of cigarettes containing cannabis with a very low dose of (2.3 per cent of THC) in regular time intervals could increase daily appetite up to 40%( Foltin; 1988).

### 2.2.9. *Reduction of Alzheimer.*

Research has shown that compounds in cannabis, especially THC, can reduce the severity and progression of Alzheimer in patients. Dr. Walther et al in their studies have proven it correctly. Some of the researchers such as Esposito have had a seal of approval on previous findings in their study (Esposito; 2006).

## **Conclusions**

The issue of decriminalization of the use of certain types of drugs known as light or soft drugs has a theoretical and practical background to a length of more than 50 years in countries such as the Netherlands and the United States. Some, by making a distinction between types of drugs with addictive degree and potential therapeutic use, believe that soft drug cannot be compared with some drugs such as heroin and crack, because they not only have a lower degree of addictive rate rather than heroin and crack, but also using it has some therapeutic benefits. Legally, decriminalization of soft drugs is proven by reasons and justification of human rights and criminology and penology, so that by considering the total medical and legal reasons and justifications, a tendency can be shown toward the issue of decriminalization in the mentioned manner.



## References

- Abrams DI, Vizoso HP, Shade SB, Jay C, Kelly ME, Benowitz NL. Vaporization as a Smokeless Cannabis Delivery System: A Pilot Study. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*. 2007.p. 82.
- Coffey, C., Lynskey, M., Wolfe, R. & Patton, G. C. Initiation and progression of cannabis use in a population-based Australian adolescent study, *Addiction*; 2000.p. 95 .
- Crawford, W., and Merritt, J. Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinol On Arterial and Intraocular Hypertension. *Int'l J. Clin. Pharmacol. And Biopharm*; 1979.p. 17.
- Day, N. L., Richardson, G. A., Goldschmidt, L., Robles, N., Taylor, P. M., Stoffer, D. S., Cornelius, M. D. & Geva, D. Effect of prenatal marijuana exposure on the cognitive development of offspring at age three, *Neurotoxicology & Teratology*; 1994.p. 16.
- Degenhardt L, Hall W, Lynskey M. Comorbidity between cannabis use and psychosis: Modelling some possible relationships. Technical Report No. 121. Sydney: National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre;2001. p.128.
- Donald Tashkin, M.D. Study Finds No Link between Marijuana Use and Lung Cancer., *Science Daily*; 2006.p.12.
- Edwards, G. Cannabis and the psychiatric position, in: Graham, J. (Ed.) *Cannabis and Health*, London: Academic Press; 1976. P.45.
- Ellis, R.J. Smoked Medicinal Cannabis for Neuropathic Pain in HIV: A Randomized, Crossover Clinical Trial, *Neuropsychopharmacology*; 2009.p. 34.
- Engelsman, E.L. Drug Policy in the Netherlands. Paper prepared for the American Embassy in the Netherlands, the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs; Alcohol, Drugs and Tobacco Branch; 1988. P. 37.
- Erez-Reyes, M., Wagner, D., Wall, M. and Davis, K. Intravenous Administration of Cannabinoids and Intraocular Pressure; 1976. P.87.
- Esposito, G. The Marijuana Component Cannabidiol Inhibits Beta-Amyloid-Induced Tau Protein Hyperphosphorylation Through Wnt/beta-catenin Pathway Rescue in PC12 Cells,” *Journal of Molecular Medicine*; 2006.p. 84.
- Fergusson, D. M. & Horwood, L. J. Does cannabis use encourage other forms of illicit drug use? *Addiction*; 2000.p. 95.
- Fischer, B. Treatment for Hepatitis C Virus and Cannabis use in Illicit Drug User Patients: Implications and Questions,” *European Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*; 2006.p. 18.
- Foltin, R.W. Effects of Smoked Marijuana On Food Intake and Body Weight of Humans Living in A Residential Laboratory, *Appetite*; 1988. P. 11.
- Fried PA, Watkinson B, Gray R. Differential effects on cognitive functioning in 13- to 16-year-olds prenatally exposed to cigarettes and marihuana. *Neurotoxicology and Teratology*; 2003.p 25.
- Goldberg, I., Kass, M. and Becker, B. Marijuana as a Treatment for Glaucoma. *Sightsaving Review*, winter issue; 1979. P.54 .
- Green, L. Marijuana Effects On Intraocular Pressure, *Applied, Pharmacology in the Medical Treatment of Glaucomas*; 1984. P.41.
- Grinspoon, L, J, and Doblin, R. Marijuana, the AIDS Wasting Syndrome, and the U.S. Government. *New England Journal of Medicine*; 1995.p. 333.
- Hayes JS, Lampart R, Dreher MC, Morgan L. Five-Year Follow-Up of Rural Jamaican Children Whose Mothers Used Marijuana During Pregnancy. *The West Indian Medical Journal*; 1991.p. 40 .
- Hepler, R. and Frank, I. Marijuana Smoking and Intraocular Pressure. *JAMA*; 1971.p. 411.
- Hepler, R. and Petrus, R. Experiences with Administration of Marijuana to Glaucoma. In *The Therapeutic Potential of Marijuana*; 1976. P.45.
- Hepler, R., Frank, I. and Ungerleider, J. Pupillary Constriction after Marijuana Smoking. *Am. J. Ophthalmol*; 1972. P.74.



- Kandel, D. & Faust, R. Sequence and stages in patterns of adolescent drug use, *Archives of General Psychiatry*; 1975.p. 32.
- Leweke, F. M.; Koethe, D.; Pahlisch, F.; Schreiber, D.; Gerth, C. W.; Nolden, B. M.; Klosterkötter, J.; Hellmich, M. Antipsychotic Effects of Cannabidiol". *European Psychiatry* ;2009. P.27.
- Merritt, J. Glaucoma, Hypertension, And Marijuana. *J. Nat'l Med. Ass'n*; 1982. P. 74 .
- Merritt, J. Outpatient Cannabinoid Therapy for Heterogenous Glaucomas: Guidelines for institution and maintenance of therapy. *Marijuana 84: Proceedings of the Oxford Symposium on Cannabis*; 1984. P.87 .
- Merritt, J., Crawford, W., Alexander, P., Anduze, A. and Gelbart, S. Effect of Marihuana on Intraocular and Blood Pressure in glaucoma.*Ophthalmology*; 1980. P. 87 .
- Merritt, J., McKinnon, S., Armstrong, J., Hatem, G. and Reid, L. Oral Delta-9-Tetrahydrocannabinol in Heterogenous Glaucomas. *Annals of Ophthalmology*; 1980. P. 12.
- Merritt, J., Perry, D., Russell, D. and Jones, B. Topical Delta-9-Tetrahydrocannabinol and Aqueous Dynamics in glaucoma. *J. Clin. Pharmacol*; 1981. P. 21 .
- Merritt, J., Shrewsbury, R., Locklear F., Demby, K. and Wittle, G. Effects of Delta-9-Tetrahydrocannabinol and Vehicle Constituents On Intraocular Pressure in Normotensive Dogs. *Research Communication in Substances of Abuse*; 1986. P. 7.
- Nelson, K. A Phase II Study of Delta-9-Tetrahydrocannabinol for Appetite Stimulation in Cancer-Associated Anorexia, *Journal of Palliative Care*; 1994. P. 10 .
- Pletcher, M. Association between Marijuana Exposure and Pulmonary Function Over 20 Years. *Journal of the American Medical Association*; 1961. P. 307.
- Sallan, S.E., Zinberg, N.E. and Frei, D. Antiemetic Effect of Delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol in Patients Receiving Cancer Chemotherapy, *New England Journal of Medicine*; 1975. P. 293.
- Shapiro, D. The Ocular Manifestations of the Cannabinoids. *Ophthalmological*; 1974. P. 168.
- Smith, D. E. Acute and chronic toxicity of marijuana, *Journal of Psychedelic Drugs*; 1968. P. 2.
- Tennes, K., Aritable, N., Blackard, C., BOyles, C., Hasoun, B., Holmes, L. & Kreye, M. Marihuana: prenatal and postnatal exposure in the human; 1985. P.56.
- Van Ours, J. C. Is Cannabis a Stepping-Stone for Cocaine? *Journal of Health Economics*; 2003. P. 22 .
- Vinciguerra, V. Inhalation Marijuana as an Antiemetic for Cancer Chemotherapy, *New York State Journal of Medicine*; 1988. P.82.
- Zajicek, J. Cannabinoids for Treatment of Spasticity and Other Symptoms Related to Multiple Sclerosis (CAMS Study): Multicentre Randomised Placebo-Controlled Trial, *The Lancet*; 2003. P. 362.

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).