People Lack Treatment for Pain f r Narcotics Prohibition

Ahasan R*

Department of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia

Introduction

Paradoxically, 80% are mostly in poorer countries, and their need for pain relief is heightened by a relative absence of curative care such as surgery, or treatment for both communicable and non-communicable diseases causing pain. ere are many reasons for this disturbing health inequity, but the fundamental, o en overlooked reason is the cumbersome, restrictive drug laws and policies that exist at international, national, and local levels [1]. We call the legal barriers fundamental because where laws forbid access to pain relief, that prohibition trumps all other reasons for the inequity. Two treaties contain the foundation for many national drug control laws, the 1961 United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, and the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances. Both these international laws are overseen by the International Narcotics Control Board, whose mandate is split awkwardly between promoting and controlling narcotic and psychotropic drugs and precursor chemicals [2]. On the one hand, International Narcotics Control Board is responsible to ensure that adequate supplies of drugs are available for medical and scienti c uses, but on the other hand, it is supposed to identify weaknesses in national and international control systems and to muster pressure on governments to stanch illicit uses of these same drugs. e International Narcotics Control Board is basically in the con icted position of both promoting and throttling the drugs it regulates [3]. Last year, the president of International Narcotics Control Board admitted that the two sides of his legal mandate are out of balance: while much attention goes to prohibiting the production, supply, and use of illicit controlled substances, equal emphasis has not been placed on the other fundamental objective of the treaties of ensuring that controlled substances are available for medical and scienti c purposes [4]. Credit must be given to International Narcotics Control Board for recognizing this problem, but it also cannot be overlooked that the imbalance is largely the International Narcotics Control Boards own fault. A system of annual estimates administered by the International Narcotics Control Board imposes legal limits on the amount of controlled substances that countries can lawfully import. us, while International Narcotics Control Board con cedes that th us, a country that consumed low amounts of drugs in previous years can become trapped in a cycle of reduced access in subsequent years, divorced from any epidemiological measure of actual clinical need [7]. Common sense holds that such large per capita di erences between rich and poor countries cannot correspond accurately to the epidemiological prevalence of clinical pain. We twice wrote International Narcotics Control Board requesting it explain the methods used in deriving and ensuring the quality of its annual estimates, but received no reply [8].

Some argue that the International Narcotics Control Board system of estimates should not be blamed for causing any health inequity, because the Single Convention allows countries to revise and supplement their annual estimates of controlled narcotics when needed. at argument, however, lacks evidence [9]. If annual estimates were really so exible, then surely in its long ago year history at least some poor countries would have revised estimates cient to meet clinical needs. Yet the data show that not even a single low-income country, not even those having generalized epidemics of HIV/ AIDS and ably furnishing antiretroviral treatment, now possesses more than a derisory quota under law for furnishing pain treatment [10].

Acknowledgement

None

Con ict of Interest

None

References

1. Nadler SF, Weingand K, Kruse RJ (2004) The physiologic basis and clinical applications of cryotherapy and thermotherapy for the pain practitioner. Pain Physician US 7:395-399.
2. Trout KK (2004) The neuromatrix theory of pain: implications for selected non-pharmacologic methods of pain relief for labor. J Midwifery Wom Heal US 49:482-488.
3. Cohen SP, Mao J (2014) Neuropathic pain: mechanisms and their clinical implications. BMJ UK 348:1-6.
4. Mello RD, Dickenson AH (2008) Spinal cord mechanisms of pain. BJA US 101:8-16.
5. Bliddal H, Rosetzsky A, Schlichting P, Weidner MS, Andersen LA, et al. (2000) A randomized, placebo-controlled, cross-over study of ginger extracts and ibuprofen in osteoarthritis. Osteoarthr Cartil EU 8:9-12.
6. Barbhaiya M, Costenbader KH (2016) Environmental exposures and the development of systemic lupus erythematosus. Curr Opin Rheumatol US 28:497-505.
7. Birnesser H, Oberbaum M, Klein P, Weiser M (2004) The Homeopathic Preparation Traumeel® S Compared With NSAIDs For Symptomatic Treatment Of Epicondylitis. J Musculoskelet Res EU 8:119-128.
8. Ozgoli G, Goli M, Moattar F (2009) acid, and ibuprofen on pain in women with primary dysmenorrhea. J Altern Complement Med US 15:129-132.

***Corresponding author:** Ahasan R, Department of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia, Tel: 01096658236, Email: ahasanr123@gmail.com

Received: 28-Jul-2023, Manuscript No.JPAR-23-111451; **Editor assigned:** 31-Jul-2023, PreQC No. JPAR-23-111451(PQ); **Reviewed:** 14-Aug-2023, QC No. JPAR-23-111451; **Revised:** 18-Aug-2023, Manuscript No. JPAR-23-111451 (R); **Published:** 25-Aug-2023, DOI: 10.4172/2167-0846.1000533

Citation: Ahasan R (2023) People Lack Treatment for Pain for Narcotics Prohibition. J Pain Relief 12: 533.

9. Raeder J, Dahl V (2009) Clinical application of glucocorticoids, antineuropathics, and other analgesic adjuvants for acute pain management. CUP UK: 398-731.

10. Assessment of pain: types, mechanism and treatment