

*Stanford University  
Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center  
Asia Health Policy Program*

*Working paper series  
on health and demographic change in the Asia-Pacific*

**Substance Abuse Policy in Thailand:  
Current Challenges and Future Strategies**

**Darika Saingam**, *Epidemiology Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Prince of  
Songkla University*

**Asia Health Policy Program working paper #45**

January 11, 2018

<http://asiahealthpolicy.stanford.edu>

For information, contact: Karen N. Eggleston (翁笙和)  
Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center  
Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies  
Stanford University  
616 Serra St., Encina Hall E311  
Stanford, CA 94305-6055  
(650) 723-9072; Fax (650) 723-6530  
[karene@stanford.edu](mailto:karene@stanford.edu)

## **Substance abuse policy in Thailand: Current challenges and future strategies**

Darika Saingam

Epidemiology Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University

**Corresponding author:** Darika Saingam,

Epidemiology Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University,

15 Kanchanavanich Road,

Hat Yai, Songkhla 90110,

Thailand,

Tel: +6674451165, Fax: +6674429754

E-mail address: [sdarika\\_t@hotmail.com](mailto:sdarika_t@hotmail.com)

**Running head:** Substance abuse policy in Thailand

**Word count:** 8,137 words (excluding abstract and references)

## **Abstract**

Substance abuse has been an important social and public health problem in Thailand for decades. The National Household Survey on Substance and Alcohol Use in Thailand, which has been conducted six times, shows that substance abuse has steadily increased. Extrapolated country-wide in recent data, the estimated number of people who have used at least one addictive substance at some time in their lives was 2,964,444 or 5.8% of the total population aged 12 - 65 years. Kratom, Methamphetamine, methamphetamine hydrochloride crystal (ice), and cannabis were the most prevalent substances of abuse.

Historical documentation and policy reports were used in this study. The objectives of this study were to complete a document review, determine the effectiveness of previous measures to control illegal substance abuse in Thailand, and consider options for the future.

Controlling illegal substance abuse in the future and minimizing total harm requires a delicate balance of efforts to reduce the prevalence, quantity, and harmful effects of substances. Drug policy interventions should be continually evaluated for their effectiveness. The strategies relevant to drug policy, apart from primary prevention, are health services for chronic drug users, reform of criminal sanctions against drug addicts, and legalization of kratom.

**Keywords:** substance abuse policy, Thailand

## I. Introduction

Substance abuse has been a critical social and public health problem in Thailand for decades. Every Thai government from 1999 to 2016 declared this problem a priority on the national agenda. Yet, although, government strategy and policy embrace strong control and suppression of substance abuse, the number of drug users, the quantities of seized drugs, the prisoners being held on drug charges, and the patients on drugs continue to increase.

More than 10 years ago, the Thai government declared a war on drugs and illegal substances in the hopes that one day Thailand would be free of them. Unfortunately, substance abusers increased from 2.5 million in 2007 to 2.9 million in 2016 (ACSARN, 2011; Kanato et al., 2016b). This increase is not unique to Thailand; for example, there is evidence of a similar escalation in substance abuse in China (Zhang & Chin, 2016) and in Vietnam (Windle, 2016).

Thailand has faced drug abuse problems both in rural areas and in the cities. Drug abuse and crimes can be linked to persistent social inequalities, migration, political and economic transformation, emerging cultures of excess, the growth of individualism and consumerism, a shift in traditional values, conflict and post-conflict societies, rapid urbanization, a breakdown in respect for the law, and the local drug economy. These causes are the same for rich and poor nations such as Brazil, Mexico, South Africa, the United States, and the United Kingdom (INCB, 2011).

Although the Thai government has dedicated human resources and a sizable budget to control drug use, it has become an increasingly severe problem. Many organizations are creating and developing programs, measures, and policies for dealing with substance abuse. However, loopholes in these policies have resulted in the corruption of officers and undercut the value of public health, created dilemmas for impoverished families experiencing drug

abuse, left human rights to be ignored, and bolstered negative stereotypes of drug users. Barriers to establishing successful policies on drug abuse in Thailand include limited access to data and data management, a lack of efficient and cost-effective measures and policies, and limited use of evidence-based research.

In order to generate a clearer picture of the measures and policies focused on solving substance-abuse problems, this review paper describes the impact of these policies over the past 15 years, determines the effectiveness of previous measures against illegal substances use in Thailand, and explores the feasibility of measures against illegal substances for the future. Historical documentation and policy reports were used in this study.

## **II. Supply situation**

For the past 40 years, the royal Thai government has recognized the severity of the problems of drug abuse and their long-term effects. Since these effects undermine the stability and economic development of the country, the Thai government has tried to control and reduce drug problems.

Thailand has strict laws penalizing offenders, but drug abuse remains rampant. Many border areas of Thailand are used as trafficking routes for both the import and export of illegal substances to the global market. Opium, heroin, and methamphetamine are still being smuggled at the Thai border. Methamphetamine, methamphetamine hydrochloride crystal (ice), and heroin are being produced by powerful minority groups in neighboring countries that have the potential for an unlimited production of illegal drugs. They have their own armies to protect their territories and factories producing illegal substances (ONCB, 2009). Meanwhile, West African illegal substance syndicates are actively involved in smuggling and trafficking illegal substances in Thailand and across the region (ONCB, 2013).

Kratom is a highly prevalent drug found in many drug seizures between 2007 and 2016. A methamphetamine-type stimulant (yaba) and cannabis are increasingly smuggled from neighboring countries. Methamphetamine hydrochloride crystal (ice) has been smuggled into the country via its border with Myanmar for domestic consumption. The trade in yaba, ice, kratom, and cannabis has increased over the past 8 years. It seems that although many traffickers have been arrested, they are continually replaced in even larger. Thailand is among the transit countries for heroin trafficking from the Golden Triangle to the global market. However, the amount of heroin seized in Thailand declined, from 776 kilograms (kg) in 2013 to 189 kg in 2016 (Table 1) (ONCB, 2007; 2008).

(INSERT TABLE 1 HERE)

### **III. Demand situation**

#### *Prevalence of illegal substance use in Thailand*

Illegal substance use impacts the physical and mental health of the Thai population and is an important cause of disease and premature death. According to the latest national household survey on substance use, in 2016 (Kanato et al., 2016b) among the Thai population aged 12 - 65 years (50.97 million people across the country) approximately 2.96 million or 58.16 per 1,000 people had used at least one kind of illegal substance. The estimated number of people who reported using one or more substances within the past 12 months was 1,425,342 (27.97 out of 1,000 people). Kratom, cannabis, yaba, 4x100, and ice were the most popular substances in use. Kratom and 4x100 were reported the most often, and most often in the southern region. If we compare the surveys from 2003, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2016, we observe that kratom was the most commonly used substance: 7.6, 8.1, 11.0, 8.4, and 16.6 out of 1,000 people used it, respectively. While yaba was most prevalent

in 2001 (24.5 of 1,000 people), its use decreased from 2007 to 2008, but increased again in 2016 (8.7 of 1,000). The use of cocaine, heroin, inhalants, opium, and ecstasy decreased, and ice and 4x100 emerged as their replacements (Table 2).

The prevalence of substance abuse is high, especially among Thai adolescents. From the results of the surveys conducted in 2007, 2009, and 2015, we find that the three most commonly used substances among males were cannabis (4.9%, 5.9%, and 2.5%), hypnotics (4.0%, 3.9%, and 1.2%), and the kratom 4x100 cocktail (2.9%, 3.1%, and 1.9%) or methamphetamine (2.1%, 3.0%, and 1.0%). The most commonly used among females were hypnotics (4.7%, 3.4%, and 1.2%), cough syrup (1.5%, 1.3%, and 6.6%), and anxiolytics (1.2%, 0.8% in 2009 and 2015) (Assanangkornchai et al., 2010; Paileeklee et al., 2016).

(INSERT TABLE 2 HERE)

#### *Prevalence of illegal substance use in Asian and European countries*

Cannabis, heroin, opium, methamphetamine, and ice are the major drug used in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). According to treatment data, in 2015 (Kanatao et al. 2016a) over 250,000 drug users in the ASEAN had accessed treatment. On average, 1.97 out of 1,000 people (ranging from 0.0004 in Lao PDR to 10.71 in Thailand) were cannabis users; 3.06 out of 1,000 (0.004 in Lao PDR to 16.76 in Vietnam) were heroin users; 0.74 out of 1,000 (0.04 in Singapore to 4.6 in Thailand) were opium users; 13.9 out of 1,000 (0.004 in Lao PDR to 121.6 in Thailand) were amphetamine-type stimulant (ATS) users; and 1.90 out of 1,000 were ice users. Over 50% of drug users who accessed treatment in Lao PDR, Vietnam, and Indonesia were opiate users; and the majority of those in Thailand, Brunei Darussalam, Philippines, and Singapore were ATS users.

According to the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA, 2014), among the estimated number of people who had used drugs in the European Union in the past year, 18.1 million (5.33%) adults aged 15 - 64 years used cannabis, 3.1 million (0.9%) used cocaine, 1.6 million (0.5%) used ecstasy, and 1.5 million (0.4%) used amphetamine. In addition, the result from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) in 2007 revealed that 19% of students aged 16 years in 35 European countries had used cannabis in their lifetime and 7% had tried one or more other drugs. Among these, 14% had used cannabis in the past 12 months. Non-prescribed lifetime use of tranquilizers or sedatives among students was most commonly reported in Poland, Lithuania, France, and Monaco (15%). Female students (8%) had co-used alcohol with pills (medicaments) more than male students (5%) (Hibell et al., 2009).

#### **IV. Impact of substance abuse**

Illegal substance abuse has had a notable impact on both public health and national security in Thailand. Since crimes related to illegal substance abuse have spread rapidly throughout the country, the Thai government has spent a substantial share of its budget each year to address this social problem. It was found that over 80% of all criminal cases in Thailand in 2013 were illegal substance related (ONCB, 2013).

The total number of illegal substance users/addicts who registered for treatment throughout the country was the highest in 2003 (480,711 substance abusers) but fell between 2004 and 2010. It peaked in 2012 (568,000), but decreased again in 2013 (416,873) and 2014 (303,501) (Fig. 1). Most of the illegal substance users/addicts were adolescents and young adults aged 15 - 24 years. Methamphetamine addicts were still the biggest group of drug patients in treatment centers. Most were skilled workers, agriculturists, and unemployed.

(INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE)



Injection drug use (IDU) is a high risk factor for the transmission of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) among injection drug user groups and their partners. The estimated number of HIV patients in 2015 in Thailand was 1,526,028. Among these, 6,759 were new cases and 20.5% were injection drug users (Bureau of epidemiology, 2015).

Since 2003, when the war on drug and illegal substances was announced, criminal gangs and drug syndicates have been suppressed and many major drug traffickers and drug dealers have been put in prison. According to data from the Department of Corrections (2008 - 2015), the number of drug-related arrests continued to increase year on year from 54.5% of total prisoners in 2008 to 71.1% in 2016 (Fig. 2). Most of the offences involved the sale of drugs and possession with the intent to sell. Methamphetamine featured in the highest number of cases, and most drug prisoners were older than 25.

(INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE)

## **V. The evolution of substance abuse policy in Thailand**

The majority of substance abuse is not concentrated in porous border areas, but is prevalent in every province, village, and community. There are many possible explanations for the emergence of serious substance abuse problems in Thailand, including the breakdown of once cohesive family and community structures, increasing urbanization, exposure to other cultures, and expansion efforts by Asian drug traffickers. Moreover, Thailand has been affected by economic recession, serious political conflict (for more than 10 years), high crime rates, unemployment, and poverty.

Thailand has exerted significant effort and developed many policies and work plans to control illicit substances. A clear and concrete policy was established in 1976 to prevent and

suppress the production and trafficking of illegal substances. The policy also afforded treatment and rehabilitation to drug users. Apart from those policies, the Royal Thai Government has encouraged the use of strict law enforcement and supported the King's project of reducing drug crops by supporting alternative crops, and increasing cooperation with neighboring and international countries. There are many lessons to be learnt from Thai efforts to control substance abuse, which include the following:

- Thailand opium poppy eradication programs have been operating since 1984.
- The Act on Measures for the Suppression of Offenders in an Offence Relating to Narcotics was enforced in 1992.
- The Money Laundering Control Act was enforced in 1999.
- The Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act has been in operation since 2002 with the aim of diverting people charged with drug consumption into treatment and rehabilitation instead of prison.
- In 2009, the National AIDS Prevention and Alleviation Committee resolved to approve a draft policy on harm reduction for people who use drugs, which had been proposed by the National AIDS Management Centre of the Department of Disease Control.
- In 2011, after parliament's review and approval, the draft policy was reviewed by the Council of State, which noted that the distribution of injecting equipment was in contravention of the Narcotics Act, and was perceived as "promoting drug use," which is a crime.

## **VI. What are the appropriate measures for controlling drug abuse in Thailand?**

Although the royal Thai government, its related organizations, and the Thai people hope that one day Thailand will be free from illegal drugs, no modern nation has been able to achieve a truly drug-free state, and increasingly, many nations are shifting from the rhetoric of a "war

on drugs” to a more pragmatic, public-health based balance of supply reduction, demand reduction, and harm reduction (INCB, 2016).

## 1. Supply reduction

Basically, to control supply, law enforcement and alternative development programs seek to keep prices high and reduce the availability of drugs by arresting traffickers/dealers and forcing suppliers to operate in inefficient ways (Babor et al., 2010).

### *a. In Thailand (past and present)*

In the period 1998 - 2000, the main strategies to reduce supply included the control of narcotic crops and narcotics law enforcement measures.

In 2003 - 2005, the strategy involved the total suppression of narcotic drugs and drug traffickers throughout the country, and aimed to reduce and stop drug production outside the country. Measures to suppress drug trafficking networks included the interdiction of drug smuggling, investigation, tracking and repatriation of assets, imposition of tax regulations, control of precursor chemicals, and cooperation with relevant countries (ONCB, 2003, 2004).

In 2006 - 2007, the policies of disconnecting drug demand from drug supply, and encouraging and motivating addicts (as patients in need of treatment), while punishing traffickers under the rule of law were implemented (ONCB, 2006).

This was followed by

“The Five-Fence Defensive Strategy” in 2009 - 2010, which involved the collaboration of both government agencies and civil society. Measures for controlling substance abuse were

integrated, with the aim of keeping drug addicts, drug dealers, and risk groups away from drugs (ONCB, 2009).

The “Kingdom’s Unity for Victory over Drugs” in 2011 - 2013 involved strict law enforcement and drug suppression policies to address the supply side of the drug cycle, the drug producers, drug traffickers, drug dealers, drug distributors, and drug couriers. The aim included solving 60,000 major drug cases, closing 8,000 cases of asset forfeiture, reducing drug trafficking by prison gangs, and imposing harsh punishments on corrupt officers. The King’s project for growing alternative crops was expanded in remote areas where opium was cultivated (ONCB, 2011, 2013).

In each period, the strategies focused on suppressing drug traffickers and trafficking networks, intercepting drug smuggling along the borders, controlling precursor chemicals, being on alert for new illegal drugs, improving narcotics control acts and associated laws, and fully cooperating with relevant countries, especially neighboring countries.

#### *Enforcement against dealers/traffickers*

In the period 1998 - 2013, narcotic law enforcement (Psychotropic Substance Act B.E. 2518 [1975]; Narcotics Act B.E. 2522 [1979]) was used as a major tool for the control of illegal substances. The confiscation of drug dealers’ assets was among the most powerful of law enforcement countermeasures, as it took away their belongings as well as the capital and funds used to facilitate criminal drug activities (ONCB, 2001).

#### *Enforcement against users*

Under the Narcotics Act 1979, the police are authorized to seize and arrest drug users, and conduct drug test using urine samples. In Thailand these do not assess levels of drug use,

dependence, or related risk behaviors; they also do not apply various gold standard instruments to the problem of assessing levels of drug dependence (Macdonald & Nacapew, 2013).

According to the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act 2002, drug user is an ill person; not a crime; and a person who needs to rehabilitate for bringing that person back to society. The following alleged offender to recover from narcotic addiction; (1) any person who is alleged to consume, consume and have in possession, consume and possess for the purpose of disposal or consume and dispose of the narcotics of category I, II or V in the character, type, category and quantity prescribed in the Ministerial Regulation; (2) any person who does not appear to be the alleged offender or to be prosecuted for other offences which punishable with imprisonment or to be under the imprisonment by judgment of court. The inquiry officials would transfer such people to court within 48 hours of identification of drug consumption or addiction. If the alleged offender is under 18 years of age, the inquiry officials would transfer this person to court within 24 hours. After being identified as drug user or addict, the court decides whether to transfer the offender to a rehabilitation or the detention center (as prescribed in the Ministerial Notification). After having considered the case, the court informs the Sub-committee of Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation (ONCB, 2007).

#### *Seizures, interdiction, and crop reduction*

The quantity of drugs seized is one indicator of the extent of drug use, and is one of the few relevant figures readily generated by official systems (MacCoun & Reuter, 2001).

Methamphetamine featured in the majority of drug seizures in the period 1998 - 2016; especially between 2008 and 2012, approximately 225.2 million pills of methamphetamine and 3,813 kg of ice were seized. Drug seizures are predicted to increase every year. Since the Thai government realizes that drug suppression is dangerous work, bribes are paid to

anybody who gives useful information and reports drug crimes to the police/official agency; rewards are also paid to officials to raise the quality of law enforcement in controlling the drug trade. According to one report, from 2008 to 2012, total of 344,509,318 baht (USD 9,843,123.37) of bribes/rewards were paid for 976,803 drug seizures (Jindasri, 2013).

This drug suppression situation might reflect something such as drugs have been still severe epidemics throughout the country and had hidden agenda of officials about the seizure' bribe/ reward. It is possible that large number of arrests, seizures of great quantities of drugs which usually show and make a statement in the news, and dramatically rising imprisonment rates have had an important symbolic effect (MacCoun & Reuter, 2001).

The indices of success for substance abuse measures and policies depended on the quantity of number of drug users who registered for treatment, drug traffickers, drug dealers, and illegal substance seizures. The reason why methamphetamine was used as an indicator of the drug trafficking trend in Thailand was that this drug has been seized in more quantities than any other drugs since the late part of the last decade (ONCB, 2007).

For drug interdiction measure, Thai government has continued to cooperate with neighboring countries has resulted in the prevention and suppression of cross-border smuggling of illegal substances, precursor chemicals, and equipment used for drug production.

Thailand opium poppy eradication programs which are carried out annually had an impact on the overall decline of opium production. Opium eradication has been conducted by the Royal Thai Army and ONCB since 1984 annually (ONCB, 2001).

The Royal Project Foundation is an initiative of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej. The Royal Project established the model of the development-lead drug crop replacement. The heart of this program is agricultural extension, or the process of introducing new and

improved temperate crops and farming methods to local farmers. There are many achievements of The Royal project such as opium elimination, hill tribe' poverty eradication, elimination of the slash and burn technique for cultivation, and environmental conservation. In 2013, the Royal Project supported nearly 200,000 people of nearly 38,000 families living in the highlands. It is widely agreed that this program to replace opium with legal cash crops is the most successful program of its kind in the world (UNODC, 2008; Royal Project Foundation of Thailand, 2013).

### ***b. Lessons for Thailand***

In Thailand the main measures to cope with drug suppliers and dealers included arrest, prosecution, incarceration, and confiscation. This resulted in overcrowding in the prisons.

As part of the 'war on drug' policy in 2003, in the first three months of the campaign there were 2,800 extrajudicial killings. In 2007, an official investigation found that more than half of those killed had no connection whatsoever to drugs (Human Rights Watch, 2008). The government used a system of bribes and threats to ensure that regional governors and police chiefs carried out the campaign. Officials who failed to meet their quotas faced dismissal. Those who brought in a "major drug dealer" dead or alive received a bounty of one million baht (23,600 USD). Terrified of being shot or killed, users/addicts chose to voluntarily submit to a course of boot-camp style rehabilitation (Ilchmann, 2003).

### ***From other nations***

Although the successful operations to disrupt trafficking organizations, have not lead to sustained reductions in drug availability, widespread crop eradication has not led to a reduction in the overall global drug production, including no correlation between the number of arrested drug users in a given country and trends in the prevalence of drug use (IDPC,

2012), there are many countries have efforts and sought various methods to address with those problems.

In US, 23 states have legal medical cannabis markets and 17 states have decriminalized the personal possession of cannabis for non-medical use (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).

The Boston model was applied to use in High Point city, North Carolina. Young dealers in the local drug market were gathered and their parents were contacted by the police including other people likely to influence them, and then approached the dealers with the information. The police made the dealers aware that they were at high risk of imprisonment if they continued their activities. This initiative resulted in fewer arrests after two years and a 25% decrease in violent and property crime (Caulkins & Reuter cited in IDPC, 2012).

In Switzerland, the government adopted a new drug strategy in 1994 that integrated public security, health, and social cohesion objectives, in line with the four pillars of prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and law enforcement. The policy involved prescribing opiates to treat dependence on opiates. This policy resulted in the decrease of problems related to drug use (Savary, Hallam & Bewley-Taylor cited in IDPC, 2012).

In 2001, Portugal removed criminal penalties for personal possession of all drugs and implemented a more health-centered approach that included proven harm reduction measures (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).

In 2009, the Czech Republic removed criminal penalties for personal drug possession, following an impact assessment that demonstrated the failings of previous punitive approaches (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).



*From research on effectiveness*

Drug courts and police drug diversion programs are alternatives to the criminal prosecution of drug users/addicts. This strategy which sends the drug offender to treatment rather than might be the best way to reduce overcrowding in prisons.

A *drug court* is a collaboration between the criminal justice and public health systems or so called drug-diversion strategies. It not only helps offenders avoid incarceration but also encourages their treatment and reintegration, through helping them effectively save money and break the drug-crime cycle (Rahman, 2013).

Drug courts have been in operation throughout the United States since 1989 in order to treat addicts under the supervision and orders of the court wherever required. Drug courts use the criminal justice system to address addiction through an integrated set of social and legal services instead of solely relying upon incarceration or probation (King & Pasquarella, 2009).

Apart from diverting offenders convicted of low-level drug offenses from the traditional criminal court system, there are many benefits to this program (observed in many studies and evaluations of drug courts), such as a decrease in rearrests and reconvictions, and cost savings due to a reduction in prison costs and health care costs (King & Pasquarella, 2009). Moreover, drug use and criminal behaviors substantially decreased when offenders participated in drug courts (Belenko, 1998).

According to an evaluation by the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC), the police drug diversion program in Australia can be considered a best practice. Police diversion interventions mostly revolve around education and treatment sessions for low level cannabis offenders (Ogilvie & Willis, 2009).

## Political and cultural barriers

Politicians and policy makers have believed that harsh law enforcement actions against those involved in drug production, distribution, and use can control the drug cycle and eventually achieve a drug free Thailand. Moreover, most politicians used the drug issue to promote their image as a hero who can stop the use of drugs in society.

Since government agencies are controlled by politicians, they cannot work independently or implement a drug policy based on proven data and the reality of the situation in each region of the country.

Incomplete data from documents and reports communicated via the public media show only one side of the coin, leading to misunderstandings. Since illegal drugs are pictured to be a horrible, disgusting, and dark side of society, the government does not freely co-operate with people in the community to address these problems.

The indices of success for measures and policies controlling substance abuse are the number of drug users who are registered for treatment, drug traffickers, drug dealers, and seizures of illegal substances. Those measures have resulted in the overcrowding of prisons and human rights' violations.

## 2. Demand reduction

### *a. In Thailand (past and present)*

In 1998 - 2000, the government mobilized the public to fight against drugs, increased pressure on drug criminals, and emphasized the importance of treatment and rehabilitation

by supporting the enhancement of the potential and efficiency of the existing treatment and rehabilitation centers. The narcotics control operations focused on preventing rather than solving the problem.

In 2003 - 2013, the strategies for demand reduction focused on reducing the number of substance abusers/addicts, and encouraging and motivating addicts who were patients in need of treatment. Appropriate treatments were provided to substance abusers/addicts in parallel with aftercare services to help them reintegrate into their own communities. Campaigns for re-establishing a positive attitude among the general public toward substance abusers/addicts were launched throughout the country in order to give them a second chance (ONCB, 2003, 2007, 2011, 2013).

In 2009 - 2010, the government provided sufficient and appropriate services for drug users. Methadone was put on the list of medicines accepted under universal coverage, and free methadone maintenance programs in 147 treatment centers throughout the country were provided by the Ministry of Public Health to patients who were drug addicts (ONCB, 2009).

### *Treatment*

Treatment and rehabilitation measures are important for a comprehensive substance abuse policy. This measure aimed at stopping drug addictions and treating and rehabilitating addicts until they could be reintegrated.

There are three drug treatment systems in Thailand; voluntary, compulsory, and correctional.

Drug treatment procedures under the public health system include screening and identifying drug users or addicts; providing information, advice, or brief interventions to those patients at low to moderate risk; and treatment, rehabilitation, and relapse prevention with an emphasis

on psychosocial intervention such as the Matrix model and the Fast model. Drug addicts with psychiatric comorbidity such as amphetamine psychosis are the responsibility of Psychiatric hospitals. In addition, military camps, temples, and mosques are used as alternative drug treatment and rehabilitation centers.

All drug addicts have equal opportunities to receive comprehensive treatment and rehabilitation. In order to offer them more job opportunities and reduce drug relapses, various skills and vocational trainings have been provided. Activities and campaigns have been carried out to encourage families and communities to have a positive attitude toward patients who have successfully undergone treatment and rehabilitation and create a positive environment for patients reintegrated into society (ONCB, 2003 - 2011, 2013).

However, the treatments for drug users/addicts do not differ by drug type, methods of drug use, and quantity of use (treatment for new drug users or regular drug users/addicts is similar). Efficient drug treatment therapy should therefore be integrated with appropriate treatment planning based on an individual's drug problems. A gold standard screening test should be conducted to classify the severity level of drug use/addiction before treatment.

After 2005, when 18% of relapse cases were reported (ONCB, 2005), no further relapse cases have been reported. in each year. Presently, follow-up programs have not been implemented and the efficiency of each drug treatment system has also not been evaluated.

### *Prevention*

In 1999 - 2013, the policy for the prevention of substance abuse centered efforts on schools, communities, the workplace, and special groups. The projects composed of (1) family, community, and school participation in activities related to prevention of drug abuse, (2) the aim to free villages and/communities of drugs, (3) control of narcotics in the workplace, (4)

support of anti-drug campaign activities to mobilize public awareness of the disadvantages of substance abuse, (5) estimations of substance abusers in the Thai population, (6) development of narcotics data systems at the provincial level and of fundamental narcotics data systems in villages/ communities, and (7) development of narcotics control measures in schools (ONCB, 1998 - 1999, 2001). The most important aspect of the policies and strategies for the prevention of illicit substances was cooperation among government organizations, non-governmental organizations/civil society, and health activists.

#### *b. Lessons for Thailand*

Many drug prevention programs in Thailand attempted to reduce the risk of drug use and were implemented throughout the country in specific areas and groups, especially among students. This was done through teacher training courses on counseling techniques; self-help groups; life skills education for the prevention of drugs and deviant behavior; sport competitions; the production and dissemination of print and electronic media materials on the prevention of drug abuse; and family, community, and school participation in projects concerning the prevention of drug abuse, for example, the Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program (DARE) (ONCB 1998 - 99, 2005, 2013). However, evaluations of these programs have not been reported.

In Thailand, students have been typically dismissed when teachers discovered them to be drug users. Those students had to find a new school while dealing with the stigma of being a known drug user. This kind of punishment started a criminal life cycle for these former students, and they became involved with drugs and gangs. Even if these students were accepted into a new school, they could relapse into drug abuse since they had not received drug treatment or counseling on behavior improvement.

#### *From other nations*

Many drug prevention programs being used in the United States focus on social skills, including psychological inoculation, normative education, and resistance skill training. These drug prevention programs include ALERT, classroom-centered intervention, life skills training, towards no drug abuse, cognitive behavioral skill intervention (CBI) and the Good Behaviour Game (GBG) (Botvin [2000] cited in Babor et al. [2010]). Social marketing interventions have been used in the past and are still used in the present, as in Thailand. This model is the most popular in preventing drug use among young people. These campaigns included the dissemination of anti-drug public service announcements via television and radio, and later via the internet and web pages. Among school-based interventions, the most popular one in the United States is the Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program (DARE). This program is based on the gateway theory of drug use, as well as the self-efficacy theory (IDPC, 2012).

In the United Kingdom, the well-known community-based intervention, the Positive Futures program, was implemented in 2000. This program utilized sport and other activities to engage adolescents who were identified as being at risk for initiating drug use. These programs have been expanded in many UK communities. The evaluation of these programs showed that after adolescents participated in the programs they improved their social relations, showed higher educational performance, and achieved a higher level of employment (Edmonds, Sumnall, McVeigh, Bellis, cited in IDPC, [2012]).

In the Islamic Republic of Iran, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have implemented prevention programs in schools, prisons, and workplaces as a way of reducing the impact of drug abuse and HIV on society. The programs composed of increasing local knowledge about risk factors and risk reduction and promoting leisure and sport activities to prevent new drug users and other drug-related activities (INCB, 2011).

*From research on effectiveness*

Although effective evaluation data of prevention programs and in-depth details of successful programs are rare, there are many countries that still believe that school-based prevention is the appropriate tool to prevent people from getting involved in drug abuse and drug-related activities.

DARE was implemented in the United States and more than 40 international countries, but the outcome of meta-analyses evaluations revealed that the program was ineffective (Ennett et al. 1994 cited in Babor et al., 2010; IDPC, 2012). Drug testing in schools was not only ineffective but also had negative effects such as reduced trust between pupil and teacher/staff (Yamaguchi et al., 1994 & McKeegany, 2005 cited in Babor et al., 2010). In addition, mass-media campaigns had no effect on drug use, although in some cases they were capable of raising awareness of the negative consequences of drug use (Babor et al., 2010).

Drug prevention programs that taught social and coping skills through classroom instructional activities reduced drug use significantly, but programs that simply conveyed didactic information about drugs and their effects had no effect on drug use (Babor et al., 2010). In addition, the programs that altered the classroom or school environment were more effective than those that tried to change individual behavior. The programs focused on improving school discipline and atmosphere, and strengthening teachers' classroom management skills (Manski et al. 2001 cited in Barbor et al., 2010).

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC, 2014) recommends that community-based treatment and care services for drug addicts are the most effective and low-cost methods. The interventions are concerned primarily with building skills that can be used toward community empowerment. The long-term results of these programs have

shown that they address the risk factors that lead to drug use, and strengthen the protective factors that reduce the risk of drug use and drug-related activities within a community (IDPC, 2012).

#### Political and cultural barriers

In Thailand, the stakeholders usually think that drug prevention is the duty of the Ministry of Education, while drug treatment is the responsibility of the Ministry of public Health; in reality, however, many agencies have to cooperate and work together. In addition, since most of the politicians and policy makers tend to promote a harsh message about the disadvantages and impact of drug use, many people perceive drug users as criminals who indulge in extremely wrong and bad behavior. Therefore, community-based prevention, treatment, and care are quite difficult to implement and expand.

### 3. Harm reduction

Harm reduction is based on the idea that drug abusers have the right to be safe and supported even if they are not ready or willing to abstain from illicit drug use. A harm reduction approach involves giving people who use drugs choices that can help them protect their health (Wolfe & Csete, 2015).

#### ***In Thailand***

##### *Needle exchange*

Needle and syringe programs (NSPs) were initiated in 1992 in three of the hill tribe villages in Northern Thailand. From 1992 to 1994, needle and syringe kits were provided by the government for vaccination and were subsequently distributed to people who inject drugs



(PWIDs) (Des Jarlais et al., 2013). On analysis of this program, it was found that the prevalence of HIV among PWIDs decreased from 33% in 1993 to 18% in 1995 - 1996 (Gray, cited in Des Jarlais et al., 2013).

In 2008, the Global Fund awarded a grant to the Population Services International (PSI) (which was the principal recipient and worked in partnership with a range of recipients including 10 civil society organizations) to reduce HIV transmission among PWIDs in Thailand under NGOs named O-Zone Foundation (o-zone is zone of option, zone of opportunity, and zone of outreach) what was titled the Comprehensive HIV Prevention among Most-At-Risk Populations by Promoting Integrated Outreach and Networking (CHAMPION)-IDU project.

The CHAMPION IDU project aimed to strengthen and scale-up HIV services among PWIDs, build an enabling environment, and produce strategic evidence, all with the ultimate goal of reducing the prevalence of HIV. The project was a peer-led initiative based on the evidence that peer-to-peer contact among PWIDs greatly enhances the receptivity of clients (WHO, 2004).

The project supported 13 drop-in centers and 10 satellite outreach networks in 19 of Thailand's 77 provinces. CHAMPION-IDU partners distributed sterile injecting kits containing an array of equipment and also recruited private-sector pharmacies to assist with the distribution of sterile injecting equipment. The CHAMPION-IDU project reached 17,889 PWIDs in total (PSI, 2015).

#### *Methadone maintenance*

Methadone has been available in Thailand for detoxification since 1979 and approved for Methadone maintenance treatment (MMT) since 2000 (Barrett & Perngpan cited in

Macdonald & Nacapew, 2013). It is included in the Essential Medicines list, and clinical guidelines for its use are available and its costs have been covered by the National Health Security Office (NHSO).

The enrollment into MMT was low among heroin users: an estimated 7% of PWIDs were enrolled in Opioid Substitution Therapy (OST) programs, and the drop-out rate was high. The World Health Organization (WHO), however, recommended that at least 40% of heroin users should be covered by OST programs in order to further HIV prevention. Barriers to this included the distance to the clinics, especially for clients living in remote areas. Only a few clinics provided takeaway doses of methadone and they only dispensed a maximum 350 milligrams (mg) per week (as per the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] notification) to clients to self-administer at their homes. The clinic staff were well aware that there might be some diversion of the methadone to others and that there was also the potential for injecting the methadone (Tyndall, 2011; Macdonald & Nacapew, 2013).

In 2013, the CHAMPION-IDU peer-led community-based methadone maintenance service was initiated in a small village in Northern Thailand and was operated by the O-Zone team. In the past, more than 100 people dependent on opioids had to travel everyday to get their methadone at the hospital, and the trip took them about six to eight hours. After the O-Zone team was trained, the staff picked up the methadone from the district hospital every day, drove up to the village, and provided it to clients. The community-based methadone delivery model in Santikhiri village represents the first peer-led clinical intervention implemented in a middle-income country (PSI, 2015).

### ***b. Lessons for Thailand***

For more than two decades most harm reduction programs have been developed and operated by civil society organizations. Even though they worked together with government

agencies, prisoners, and community and religious leaders, clients and workers of NSPs were regularly arrested and harassed by law enforcement. There were no legal instruments to protect them, and they faced stigma and discrimination in health care settings and in the community (PSI, 2015).

The main challenges for PWIDs included living too far from needle and syringe distribution outlets, pharmacies being closed, and being refused needles and syringes. Thai PWIDs who have been denied health care services were almost seven times more likely to avoid health services. The interpretation of the draft policy by the Council of State (that the distribution of injection equipment was in contravention of the Narcotics Act and perceived as promoting drug use), social taboos against drug users, and a lack of financial resources for drug-related health services have constrained the harm reduction program in Thailand (PSI, 2015; Macdonald & Nacapew, 2013).

Although, evidence from CHAMPION-IDU revealed that the distribution of sterile injection equipment, including needles and syringes, was feasible and did not lead to any significant negative consequences in Thailand (similar to the international experience), the coverage of NSPs remains low. One of the major barriers to scaling up the distribution of sterile injection equipment is that PWIDs are afraid to carry more than a few needles and syringes at a time; if caught with these on them, they might be compelled to do a urine test, or arrested (PSI, 2015; Macdonald & Nacapew, 2013).

The costs of MMT are covered by the NHSO but people who are employed and covered by the social security system are excluded. There are some clinics that charge patients for clinic costs even though the medication is free. For patients referred to MMT through a compulsory treatment order, tapered doses are provided free of charge, but long-term maintenance is not subsidized. In addition, no standardized guidelines for MMT are being

followed in Thailand. Some clinics require that clients fail the methadone detoxification before they are considered for maintenance. The methadone detoxification programs set patients up for failure by providing them with a low methadone dose over 15 - 60 days, which results in a high dropout rate during the rapid methadone tapers (Macdonald & Nacapew, 2013; Tyndall, 2011). Most of the methadone recipients relapsed into drug use while in treatment, and some were even harassed by the police near a methadone clinic (Urban Health Research Initiative of the British Columbia Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS and TTAG, 2012).

The current harm reduction programs in Thailand should be evaluated to help policy makers support, improve, and expand these programs throughout the country and help addicts access alternative drug treatment programs easily. Harm reduction should be the government's mission, and comprehensive harm reduction services for drug addicts should be a new provision strategy used by the Thai government. The strategy should be focused on population groups that are most at risk, including prisoners and those abusing drugs through injections.

#### *From other nations*

Harm reduction programs in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) have been run by civil society organizations in order to support and help people who use drugs. In 2008 Morocco and Lebanon adopted a harm reduction policy for OST. OST was initiated in Afghanistan, Lebanon, and Morocco and scaled up in Iran. NSPs were scaled up in Afghanistan, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, and Tunisia. Because of the political and security crisis prevailing in the region, these harm reduction programs were implemented at a slow pace in MENA (WHO, 2012; Aaraj & Jreij Abou Chrouh, 2016).

China and Vietnam have adopted large-scale opioid substitution and needle and syringe programs since 2004 (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).

Since 1999, Moldova has been considered a world leader in the provision of harm reduction services in prisons, including OTS and NSPs (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).

Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands have pioneered the development of pragmatic approaches to reduce the harm faced by PWIDs, by establishing NSPs, OSTs, heroin-assisted treatment programs, and supervised drug consumption facilities (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).

Sydney and Canada have medically supervised injection centers (Global commission on drug policy, 2014).

From research on effectiveness

Harm reduction services are a major component of global efforts to halt the spread of HIV. The four most effective interventions for HIV prevention, treatment, and care are NSPs, OST, HIV testing and counseling, and antiretroviral therapy (WHO, UNODC, & UNAIDS, 2012). According to evidence-informed HIV interventions, countries that have invested in harm reduction services have remarkably lowered HIV transmission among PWIDs (UNODC, 2014). Previous studies of the needle exchange program (NEP) for HIV prevention in many countries found that the program was useful in preventing the spread of HIV and had been effective in reducing risk behaviors among IDUs such as the United States, Canada, Bangladesh, China, Vietnam, Estonia, Thailand, and Taiwan (Des Jarlais et al., 2013; Des Jarlais et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2010).

#### 4. Legalization/ legal regulation of kratom

Kratom was first placed under regulatory control in Thailand in 1943 under the Kratom Act. Since kratom has been controlled for more than 70 years, the evidence regarding its effects on physical and mental health is scarce; severe problems related to pure kratom use have never been reported.

There have been a number of papers reporting the effects of kratom and its 25 alkaloids on various organs and its medicinal properties (Matsumoto et al., 1997; Thongpradichote et al., 1998; Chittrakarn et al., 2010; Tsuchiya et al., 2002; Watanabe et al., 1997; Yamamoto et al., 1999; Purintrapiban et al., 2011; Idayu et al., 2011). If high-dose mitragynine is used, its effects will be opium-like. At low doses, it has stimulant-like effects similar to the coca plant. Side effects such as anorexia and weight loss, which may be closely related to acid secretion, are known in persons who take kratom (Jansen & Prast, 1988). It also has a direct effect on skeletal muscle by decreasing the muscle twitches and has greater effect at the neuro-muscular junction than on skeletal muscle or somatic nerve (Moklas et al., 2008). Pattern and effects of kratom use have been reported elsewhere (Hassan et al., 2013; Saingam et al., 2013; Yusoff et al., 2016).

A new type of kratom called *4x100* or *the kratom cocktail* has emerged in the past 10 years, and it is more harmful to its users than traditional kratom. The kratom 4x100 cocktail is a mixture of boiled kratom leaves with other addictive substances such as codeine cough suppressant syrup, and illegal substances, with cola soft drinks. The users of this new kratom are predominantly teenagers or young adults who use it socially for fun or relaxation after work. Due to the government's dissemination of information to the public via the media about the 4x100 formula of ingredients and methods of use, the epidemic of new 4x100 users has increased rapidly. The previous study of 4x100 was reported elsewhere (Chittrakarn et al., 2012) and the long-term effects on health still need to be explored.

According to the statements from the US FDA related to the death associated with kratom (FDA, 2018), it is important to point out that most kratom users in Thailand chew its fresh leaves and this differs from its use in other countries such as Malaysia, US and European countries. Therefore, the policy intervention/implementation for this situation should be considered carefully. A clear warning message should be given to the public that, despite some benefits, kratom is addictive, and its use has disadvantages and side effects, especially when co-used with other substances.

Thailand should learn from Bolivia, where the government allows people to chew coca leaves. In 1961, the coca leaf was listed on the Schedule I of the UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs together with cocaine and heroin. In 2009, Bolivia's government restored the dignity and lawful right of its people to use the coca leaf for traditional and medical purposes by removing the coca leaf from the 1961 Single Convention. Presently, millions of people chew coca in Bolivia, Columbia, Peru and northern Argentina, and Chile (Blickman, 2014; Ayma, 2009).

Although the kratom leaf has an impact on health, its negative effect is less than that of alcohol and tobacco and many studies list the advantages of kratom use. Thus, legalizing kratom would not only show respect for the cultural tradition of chewing kratom leaves but also represent an important opportunity for Thai researchers to conduct research on the use of the kratom leaf in alternative medicine treatments, and would be a good chance for Thai agriculture to produce it as an herb or alternative medicine and to permit Thailand to export kratom-based products.

## **VII. Recommendations for effective substance abuse measures**

The framework for drug policy analysis includes (1) total harm that is, the number of users (prevalence) x average dose x average harm per dose; and (2) key tradeoffs for example, efforts to reduce substance use often increase levels of harm and doses. Minimizing total harm requires a delicate balance of prevalence reduction, quantity reduction, and harm reduction.

Drug policy interventions should be continually evaluated for their effectiveness. This requires systematic annual efforts to estimate the number of users (user surveys), consequences of use (e.g., hospital data), prices, enforcement, treatment, etc.

Thailand has a distinctive culture and some distinctive patterns of substance use (e.g., kratom). Nevertheless, Thailand can learn from research done in other countries, and other countries can learn from Thailand's experiences.

Apart from supporting civil societies who have worked on harm reduction, the government should draft provision strategies for comprehensive harm reduction services for drug addicts. The strategy should be focused on the population groups who are most at risk, including prisoners and those abusing drug injections.

Community-based treatment and care services for people affected by drug use are the most effective and low-cost methods for tackling the drug problem, and should be applied and implemented in Thai society. These could be alternative drug treatments until reintegration of the addict happens through cooperation with all sectors in the community such as family, school, religious place, hospital, etc.

Kratom should be legalized. Efforts to eradicate the kratom tree and the arrests of traditional kratom users should cease. More research on the benefits of kratom as a medication for



some diseases (such as diabetes, cough, diarrhea, etc.) and as a substitute for alcohol and other narcotic drugs should be conducted.

Mixing kratom with toxic substances should not be allowed. Strong law enforcement may be the most effective strategy to reduce and control kratom misuse among recreational users, among whom kratom use has only harmful effects on health. At the same time, it should be realized that one of the impacts of total control of kratom, including its traditional use, may have the effect of limiting the knowledge of traditional Thai medicine by restricting the opportunities for research, as well as disrupting the generally harmonious lifestyle of villagers.

### **Acknowledgments**

This study was supported by the Asia Health Policy Program at the Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, and a postdoctoral scholarship from the Asia Pacific Observatory on Health Systems and Policy (APO). Many thanks to Dr. Karen Eggleston for her supervision. Special thanks to Prof. Robert J. MacCoun and Prof. Sawitri Assanangkornchai for their suggestions. Ms. Jeralyn Reese's help in the editing of the first draft and her comments are highly appreciated.

## References

- Aaraj, E., & Jreij Abou Chrouch, M. (2016). Drug policy and harm reduction in the Middle East and North Africa: The role of civil society. *The International journal of drug policy*, 31, 168-171. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.03.002>.
- ACSARN (Administrative Committee on Substance Abuse Research Network). (2011). *Status of substance use 2011: National household survey, estimation of population related with substance abuse*. Bangkok: Institute of Health Research, Chulalongkorn University.
- Assanangkornchai, S., Mukthong, A., Samangsri, N., Pattanasattayawong, U., Intanont, T., Paileeklee, S., et al. (2010). *A surveillance of drinking behaviors and other health-risk behaviors among high school students in Thailand*. Songkhla: Administrative Committee for Substance Abuse Research Network, Prince of Songkla University.
- Ayma, E. M. (2009). Let Me Chew My Coca Leaves. Retrieved 25 February 2016 from [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/14/opinion/14morales.html?\\_r=2](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/14/opinion/14morales.html?_r=2).
- Babor, T., Caulkins, J., Edwards, G., Fischer, B., Foxcroft, D., Humphreys, K., et al. (2010). *Drug Policy and the Public Good*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Belenko, S. (1998). Research on drug courts: A critical review. *National Drug Court Institute Review*, 1(1), 10-55.
- Blickman, T. (2014). Coca leaf: Myths and reality. Retrieved 16 April 2016 from <https://www.tni.org/en/primer/coca-leaf-myths-and-reality>.
- Bureau of epidemiology. (2015). The situation of HIV patients and HIV infections in Thailand 2015. Retrieved 9 March 2016 from [http://www.boe.moph.go.th/files/report/20151126\\_87903337.pdf](http://www.boe.moph.go.th/files/report/20151126_87903337.pdf).
- Chittrakarn, S., Keawpradub, N., Sawangjaroen, K., Kansenalak, S., & Janchawee, B. (2010). The neuromuscular blockade produced by pure alkaloid, mitragynine and methanol extract of kratom leaves (*Mitragyna speciosa* Korth.). *Journal of ethnopharmacology*, 129(3), 344-349.

- Chittrakarn S, Penjamras P, Keawpradub N. (2012). Quantitative analysis of mitragynine, codeine, caffeine, chlorpheniramine and phenylephrine in a kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa* Korth.) cocktail using high-performance liquid chromatography. *Forensic science international*, 217(1-3),81-86.
- Department of corrections. (2008-2015). The number of prisoners in 2008-2015. Retrieved 5 April 2016 and 15 May 2017 from [http://www.correct.go.th/stat102/display/select\\_date\\_user.php](http://www.correct.go.th/stat102/display/select_date_user.php).
- Des Jarlais, D. C., Feelemyer, J. P., Modi, S. N., Abdul-Quader, A., & Hagan H. (2013). High coverage needle/syringe programs for people who inject drugs in low and middle income countries: a systematic review. *BMC public health*, 13, 53. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-53>.
- Des Jarlais, D. C., Arasteh, K., McKnight, C., Hagan, H., Perlman, D. C., Torian, L. V., et al. (2010). HIV infection during limited versus combined HIV prevention programs for IDUs in New York City: the importance of transmission behaviors. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 109(1-3),154-160.
- EMCDDA (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction). (2014). *European Drug Report: Trends and developments*. Luxembourg: Office of the European Union.
- FDA (U.S. Food & Drug Administration). Statement from FDA Commissioner Scott Gottlieb, M.D., on the agency's scientific evidence on the presence of opioid compounds in kratom, underscoring its potential for abuse. Retrieved 22 February 2018 from <https://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/ucm595622.htm>
- Global commission on drug policy. (2014). Taking control: Pathways to drug policies that work. Retrieved 5 April 2016 from [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/541b7c6de4b09a2902b6920d/t/58045b9e6a49634b9ec06582/1476680797301/AF\\_global\\_comission\\_Ingles.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/541b7c6de4b09a2902b6920d/t/58045b9e6a49634b9ec06582/1476680797301/AF_global_comission_Ingles.pdf).
- Hassan, Z., Muzaimi, M., Navaratnam, V., Yusoff, N. H., Suhaimi, F. W., Vadivelu, R., et al. (2013). From Kratom to mitragynine and its derivatives: physiological and behavioural

- effects related to use, abuse, and addiction. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews*, 37(2),138-151.
- Hibell, B., Guttormsson, U., Ahlstrom, S., Balakireva, O., Bjarnason, T., Kokkevi, A., et al. (2009). *The 2007 ESPAD Report: Substance use among students in 35 European countries*. Stockholm, Sweden: Modintryckoffset AB.
- Human Rights Watch. (2008). Thailand's "war on drugs". Retrieved 4 March 2016 from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2008/03/12/thailands-war-drugs>.
- Idayu, N. F., Hidayat, M. T., Moklas, M. A., Sharida, F., Raudzah, A. R., Shamima, A. R., et al. (2011). Antidepressant-like effect of mitragynine isolated from *Mitragyna speciosa* Korth in mice model of depression. *Phytomedicine : international journal of phytotherapy and phytopharmacology*, 18(5),402-407.
- IDPC (International Drug Policy Consortium). (2012). Drug policy guide. Retrieved 15 March 2016 from [http://filesserver.idpc.net/library/IDPC-Drug-Policy-Guide\\_2nd-Edition.pdf](http://filesserver.idpc.net/library/IDPC-Drug-Policy-Guide_2nd-Edition.pdf).
- Ilchmann, S. (2003). Thousands dead as a result of Thailand's "war on drugs". Retrieved 13 March 2016 from < <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2003/05/thai-m09.html>.
- INCB (International Narcotics Control Board). (2011). *Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 2011*. Austria: INCB, United Nations.
- INCB. (2016). *Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 2015*. New York: United Nations.
- Jansen, K. L., Prast, C. J. (1988). Psychoactive properties of mitragynine (kratom). *Journal of psychoactive drugs*, 20(4), 455-457.
- Jindasri, P. (2013). The investigation of drug bribe disappeared 230 million baht. Retrieved 10 July 2016 from <http://www.isranews.org/isranews-scoop/item/22944-99.html>.
- Kanato, M., Leyatikul, P., Choomwattana, C., & Thepwongsa, I. (2016a). ASEAN drug monitoring report 2015. Bangkok: Office of the Narcotics Control Board, Ministry of Justice.

- Kanato, M., Assanangkornchai, S., Charoenratana, S., Leyatikul, P., Aramrattana, A., Perngparn, U., et al. (2016b). *National household survey, estimation of population related with substance abuse*. Bangkok: Jaransanitvong Press.
- Kerr, T., Small, W., Buchner, C., Zhang, R., Li, K., Montaner, J., et al. (2010). Syringe sharing and HIV incidence among injection drug users and increased access to sterile syringes. *American journal of public health*, 100(8),1449-1453.
- King, R. S., & Pasquarella, J. (2009). *Drug Courts: A Review of the Evidence*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- MacCoun, R. J., & Reuter, P. (2001). *Drug war heresies: Learning from other vices, times, & places*. United Kingdom: Cambridge university press.
- Macdonald, V., & Nacapew, S. (2013). *Drug control and harm reduction in Thailand*. Retrieved 20 February 2016 from <http://fileserv.idpc.net/library/IDPC-briefing-paper-Thailand-drug-policy-English.pdf>.
- Matsumoto, K., Mizowaki, M., Takayama, H., Sakai, S., Aimi, N., & Watanabe, H. (1997). Suppressive effect of mitragynine on the 5-methoxy-N,N-dimethyltryptamine-induced head-twitch response in mice. *Pharmacology, biochemistry, and behavior*, 57(1-2),319-323.
- Moklas, M. A. M., Nurul Raudzah, A. R., Taufik Hidayat, M., Sharida, F., Farah Idayu N., & Zulkhairi A. (2008). A Preliminary Toxicity Study of Mitragynine, An Alkaloid from *Mitragyna Speciosa* Korth and its Effects on Locomotor Activity in Rats. *Advances in Medical and Dental Sciences*, 2(3),56-60.
- Ogilvie, J., & Willis, K. (2009). *Police drug diversion in Australia*. Retrieved 18 March 2016 from <https://ncpic.org.au/media/1941/police-drug-diversion-in-australia.pdf>.
- ONCB (Office of the Narcotics Control Board). (1998-1999). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 1998-1999*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2000). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2000*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.

- ONCB. (2001). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2001*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2003). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2003*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2004). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2004*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2005). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2005*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2006). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2006*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2007). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2007*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2008). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2008*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2009). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2009*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2011). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2011*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- ONCB. (2013). *Thailand Narcotics Control Annual Report 2013*. Bangkok: ONCB, Ministry of Justice.
- Paileeklee, S., Dithisawatwet, S., Thaikla, K., Jaroenratana, S., Chindet, A., Tantirangsee, N., et al. (2016). A Surveillance of alcohol, tobacco, substance use and health-risk behaviors among high school students in Thailand. Songkhla, Epidemiology Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University: Thailand Substance Abuse Academic Network, Thai Health Promotion Foundation.
- Purintrapiban, J., Keawpradub, N., Kansenalak, S., Chittrakarn, S., Janchawee, B., & Sawangjaroen, K. (2011). Study on glucose transport in muscle cells by extracts from

*Mitragyna speciosa* (Korth) and mitragynine. *Natural product research*, 25(15),1379-1387.

PSI (Population Services International). (2015). Champion-IDU: Innovations, best practices and lessons learned. Retrieved 25 March 2016 from <http://www.psi.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Small-CHAMPION-IDU-INNOVATIONS-BEST-PRACTICE-AND-LESSONS-LEARNED.pdf>.

Rahman, F. (2013). Alternatives to Criminal Justice: Drug courts, Drug Diversion, and Decriminalization. In F. Rahman, & N. Crofts (Eds.), *Drug law Reform in East and Southeast Asia* (pp. 245-251). Maryland: Lexington Books.

Royal Project Foundation of Thailand. (2013). Retrieved 25 August 2016 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jDrzX-WnEhU>.

Saingam, D., Assanangkornchai, S., Geater, A. F., & Balthip, Q. (2013). Pattern and consequences of krathom (*Mitragyna speciosa* Korth.) use among male villagers in southern Thailand: A qualitative study. *The International journal on drug policy*, 24(4),351-8.

Thongpradichote, S., Matsumoto, K., Tohda, M., Takayama, H., Aimi, N., Sakai, S., et al. (1998). Identification of opioid receptor subtypes in antinociceptive actions of supraspinally-administered mitragynine in mice. *Life sciences*. 62(16),1371-1378.

Tsuchiya, S., Miyashita, S., Yamamoto, M., Horie, S., Sakai, S., Aimi, N., et al. (2002). Effect of mitragynine, derived from Thai folk medicine, on gastric acid secretion through opioid receptor in anesthetized rats. *European journal of pharmacology*, 443(1-3),185-188.

Tyndall, M. (2011). Harm reduction policies and interventions for injection drug users in Thailand. Retrieved 11 March 2016 from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/26868/646420Revised00i0n0for0IDUs00final0.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). (2008). Sustaining Opium Reduction in Southeast Asia: Sharing Experiences on Alternative Development and Beyond. Regional

seminar, Global partnership on alternative development (GLOI44), December 15-17, 2008, Chiang Mai, Thailand.

UNODC. (2014). *World Drug Report 2014*. New York: United Nations.

Urban Health Research Initiative of the British Columbia Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS and Thai AIDS Treatment Action Group (TTAG). (2012). Evidence and recommendations from the Mitsampan community research project. Retrieved 5 March 2016 from <http://www.bccsu.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/mscopy-report-eng.pdf>.

Watanabe, K., Yano, S., Horie, S., & Yamamoto, L. T. (1997). Inhibitory effect of mitragynine, an alkaloid with analgesic effect from Thai medicinal plant *Mitragyna speciosa*, on electrically stimulated contraction of isolated guinea-pig ileum through the opioid receptor. *Life sciences*, 60(12),933-942.

WHO (World Health Organization). (2004). *Evidence for action: effectiveness of community based outreach in preventing HIV/AIDS among injecting drug use*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO.

WHO. (2012). MENAHRA - The Middle East and North Africa Harm Reduction Association: Best practices in strengthening civil society's role in harm reduction services. Retrieved 1 December 2016 from [http://applications.emro.who.int/dsaf/EMRPUB\\_2012\\_879.pdf](http://applications.emro.who.int/dsaf/EMRPUB_2012_879.pdf).

WHO, UNODC, & UNAIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV and AIDS). (2012). *WHO, UNODC, UNAIDS technical guide for countries to set targets for universal access to HIV prevention, treatment and care for injecting drug users 2012 revision*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO.

Windle, J. (2016). Drugs and drug policy in Thailand. Retrieved 30 February 2016 from <http://globalinitiative.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/windlethailand-final.pdf>.

Wolfe, D., & Csete, J. (2015). Harm Reduction. Retrieved 5 April 2016 from <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/harm-reduction-20151014.pdf>.

Yamamoto, L. T., Horie, S., Takayama, H., Aimi, N., Sakai, S., Yano, S., et al. (1999). Opioid receptor agonistic characteristics of mitragynine pseudoindoxyl in comparison with



mitragynine derived from Thai medicinal plant *Mitragyna speciosa*. *General pharmacology*, 33(1),73-81.

Yusoff, N. H., Suhaimi, F. W., Vadivelu, R. K., Hassan, Z., Rumler, A., Rotter, A., et al. (2016). Abuse potential and adverse cognitive effects of mitragynine (kratom). *Addiction biology*, 21(1),98-110.

Zhang, S. X., & Chin, K. L. (2016). A people's war: China's struggle to contain its illicit drug problem. Retrieved 30 February 2016 from <http://globalinitiative.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/a-peoples-war-final.pdf>.