
Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [xpTek](#) on Sat, 03 Feb 2007 00:11:43 GMT

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

Sorry I haven't been able to address this post. Been busy with life and such.

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

I'm not for unrestricted access, which is what we have now, at all. I'd be in favor of the government providing addicts with safe and regulated doses of drugs and encouraging them to join programs to help manage their addictions. An alcoholic doesn't have to worry about overdosing on Everclear when he thought he was drinking Bud Light. A heroin addict does. Why? Because the government mandates that the alcohol content be listed right on the bottle. The manufacturer also has a vested interest in delivering a consistent product. There's no such control in the illegal market -- products may not be cut the same from batch to batch, or may be unknowingly cut less this time because they went through two people instead of the normal four. A professional lab also produces more consistent yields with less toxic contamination than your average clandestine lab in someone's basement. The chemists usually have better training and purer chemicals as well. Remember that heroin was available "over the counter" at most general stores in the 1800s and there wasn't an epidemic of heroin users dropping dead then. Why? It was regulated.

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43: 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.

I believe he was referring to the death caused by the unregulated substances addicts have to turn to.

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43: 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.

Drugs started out illegal? What? It's very similar to the prohibition of alcohol in every respect. Huge crime rings, unregulated products killing users, etc.

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43: 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!!!")

Yeah, because the right to put a substance in your body is sure a lot to ask for.
