

---

Subject: Re: Drugs ARE NOT bad

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 23:13:56 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Wed, 21 November 2007 17:54cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 21 November 2007 15:45warrantoTell you what, if you can guarantee me that whenever ANYONE gets high or drunk that they will not, under any circumstances, affect those around them during the term that they are impaired, then I will agree that it should be made legal.

So you're wanting it to remain illegal for the simple fact that a minority of people would impede on the rights of others? Great idea!

Well, I should apologies then... I didn't realize your right to do what you want when you want automatically trumps my right not to be affected by it.

I also didn't realize you were all for legalizing drunk driving (only a minority of people do that), minor theft (only a minority of people do that) and even spousal abuse (only a minority of people do that). After all, if you want your argument about not letting the minority dictate the law to hold, then you are forced to acknowledge that ANY law where only a minority of the people act against that law should be abolished.

Theft and abuse are illegal, regardless. Once you do the act, you've impeded on someone else's rights. If you drink alcohol or smoke marijuana, you're not necessarily going to impede on the rights of others unless you walk out into the public and make a spectacle of yourself.

My argument isn't that a law where only a minority of people commit should be abolished. That's far from what I'm getting at, and either you're knowingly playing semantics, or you're just simply not understanding it.

It has nothing to do with a minority of people breaking the law. It has everything to do with allowing people to do an act even though there are people that are going to do something stupid as a result of the act. It's not the act itself that's impeding on the rights of others.

---