

The Legalization of the Cannabis, as a social and economic strategy to strengthen the governments and producing countries



Victor Garzon B*

Oncologist Surgeon and Molecular Oncologist, Former director of the State Cancer Institute, Mexico

Received:  October 06, 2018; **Published:**  November 15, 2018

***Corresponding author:** Victor H Garzon-Barrientos, Oncologist Surgeon and Molecular Oncologist, former director of the State Cancer Institute, Member of the National Registry of Individuals and Entities in Science and Technology, Mexico

Mini Review

The fight against non-legal narcotics in the world is a race of resources and strength, but also of alternative strategies, such as those that should arise from the ideas of “reinventing” the national responses in this matter and “granting more voice to citizenship”, ideas that even when they are commonplace in the current collective ideology at least in Mexico and Latin America, they have not been able to conclude decriminalization and decriminalization, at least of Cannabis, as a non-harmful substance. Something that Mexicans in general face against the international perspective is the disenchantment and bad image of insecurity, projected in the mass media abroad, which can be mitigated with the decriminalization of some drugs that may have medical and industrial use, such as Cannabis which example. The market (legal and illegal) of narcotics is also governed by the laws of supply and demand, capital and surplus value. Legalizing this market implies:

- a) Leave it under the aegis of the State.
- b) Reduce the danger and acquisition risks for addicted consumers by reducing exposure to associated violence.
- c) The potential self-limitation of the market; the non-penalization of its processing, commercialization and consumption will not convert us into many consumers; Just as there is a genetic predisposition for alcoholism and obesity, there is a possible predisposition for addiction to this type of non-harmful narcotics [1].
- d) The self-limitation to consumption by means of the “social exposure of results”, when the population manages to perceive the results in view that were previously hidden and now, they

are able to see: road accidents due to lack of coordination, road killings, overdoses, sexual impotence, loss of cognitive functions, cardiovascular effects and decreased life expectancy, which no longer make the “forbidden” so attractive.

- e) The control and registration of addicts, to be able to enter social programs of economic-labour, psychological and social reintegration, avoiding their criminalization.
- f) The elimination of territorial competences of the bands, by allowing their sale openly in moderate quantities, considering that although currently illegal, this market continues to sell, because there are people who continue to buy, even if it is legalized, it will continue to do so but with less danger for them, and on the other hand in establishments that will allow the governments compensatory fiscal collection [2].
- g) The limitation of the domestic market for narcotics, through the creation of mixed funds from the specific collection of the State in this area and in a greater percentage by the free enterprise and private initiative that generate a program of “twin establishments” where next to the point of sale, there is another for the recovery, care and reintegration of addicts. No market grows indefinitely and infinitely, this market will be limited to consumer demand, which cannot be the whole of society.
- h) Independent citizen participation and civil organizations, in the proposal of a legislation that allows removing the psychological and social stigma of drug dependence, in such a way that the drug addict belonging to a sector of government, bureaucracy, public security or civil society, which is involved

in the actions of “correction” but “in a hidden way” has addiction or dependence, is not seen as a criminal, but as a sick person, whether they know it or not, and recovery groups should be encouraged structured as HIV-AIDS patients, or cancer patients. Non-stigmatization will make it possible to make the real dimension of the problem transparent, and to address the causes we suppose scientifically, medically and epidemiologically, in order to apply “correction from the root” programs [3].

i) The legalization could allow zonal or regional organization, reduce the risks of friction and violence, and in this way increase the fiscal collection of the State by means of heavily taxing the progressive consumption in quantity, and reduce the tax as the dose decreases, in such a way that a behavioural psychological “conditioning” is created. (recalling the prohibition in the 1920s in the United States) [4].

j) Finally, basic, clinical and pharmacological medical research is feasible, since marijuana (cannabis c.), for example, has analgesic effects on pain [5], anti-inflammatories, antiemetics (against vomiting), and even antineoplastic drugs, considered in some cases centres of oncological research in Europe as a potential drug against cancer, mainly the brain, and it is feasible to reduce the addictive effect that in sum, is even less than that of nicotine.

And as a corollary, this war as well as the Cold War between the former Soviet Union and the United States ended, not with

the victory of one side, but with the debacle of the paradigm, caused by the accumulation of internal differences and popular empowerment that ended literally with political and social dogmas of both sides, and in turn, as conceptual revolutions framed the definitive change in the social vision of each side. By analogy, in a war whose battlefield is transnational, and in all social strata, it is very difficult to win a side, and we have to learn, like Aníbal Barca driving to Carthage on Rome: “You can beat an army, but never a people”, the “reinvention” of the national response, should consider strategies that end the paradigm of war, because, I conclude quoting Tedd Dekker, “if we kill, we become like them, there is a time for war, and a time for peace”. And the time of the war is over, and it is time for peace [6].

References

1. World Health Organization (2018) WHO expert committee on drug dependence. Essential medicines and health products.
2. Dale Gieringer (2005) America's hundred years war on drugs: Centennial of the 1st congressional anti-drug law prohibiting Opium in the Philippines-March 3rd 1905-2005. Oakland, CA.
3. Legislative Lobbying, Kamii Yuku Collective, Guerrero State, Mexico.
4. Karl Polanyi (2001) The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time. Beacon Press, Boston.
5. The American Cancer Society (2015) Opioid pain medicines for cancer pain.
6. Victor Hugo Garzón Barrientos (2012) Legalization of drugs and public health. El Sur newspaper, p. 19.

ISSN: 2574-1241

DOI: [10.26717/BJSTR.2018.11.002044](https://doi.org/10.26717/BJSTR.2018.11.002044)

Victor H Garzon-Barrientos. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

Submission Link: <https://biomedres.us/submit-manuscript.php>



Assets of Publishing with us

- Global archiving of articles
- Immediate, unrestricted online access
- Rigorous Peer Review Process
- Authors Retain Copyrights
- Unique DOI for all articles

<https://biomedres.us/>