
Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 15:10:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43 Yes, lets let something that is highly addictive and causes all sorts of health-related problems. The solution is most definitely unrestricted access.

He then associated the "persecution" of drugs to... wait... "persecution"? Ah, yes... another attempt at using big words with bad meanings to help his viewpoint. Heck, for a parent not to allow a child to stay up as late as he wants is persecution. Even better is me not being paid \$500,000 a month to sit around and do nothing.

"Persecution", by definition is "The act or practice of persecuting on the basis of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or beliefs that differ from those of the persecutor. " By my work place not allowing me to be paid what I BELIEVE I should be paid is persecution. I Believe I should be paid that \$500,000... no... \$1 Billion dollars an hour. How dare they persecute me? I should sue!

Sounds ridiculous, doesn't it? I thought so to.

Anyways, he was talking about "persecution" (heck, why don't we just call it the torture of substance users as well?) and relating that to the prohibition of alcohol. The only reason that didn't work was because of the history behind alcohol consumption, and the fact they were making something that was legal, illegal. Drugs, on the other hand, STARTED OUT illegal. It is currently nothing like the prohibition of alcohol, as none of the factors are the same. Though, admittedly, it does make for an attractive argument simply because both groups were not getting something they wanted. (cue the crying baby screaming "I WANT, I WANT, I WANT!!!")

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1937_Marijuana_Tax_Act

Yeah... that's what LED to the criminalization of marijuana in America. Yeah... started off illegal? I don't think so.
