

---

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock  
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 04:32:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 23:59spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42alcohol doesn't change everyone's personalities and isn't addictive to everyone. for example, i can have an occasional drink and not get addicted, not drive drunk, not steal to support my drinking habit. some people can't do that.

The same could be said for pot.

which is why i said above that the case for pot can be made without much objection from me  
Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#1 big business - many people from bar owners to waitresses to distillers would be out of business.

The potential is there for pot, too, as nations that have it legalized have shown. see above  
Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#2 taxes - government makes big cash off of alcohol(same to be said for cigarettes)

See above.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#3 the guys in charge don't want to stop drinking - can you imagine telling people like ted kennedy(when alive), tip oneill and joe biden that they can't drink anymore?

I'll ignore the snipe at democrats, there. Can't you leave Ted Kennedy alone even after his death?

no, i can't leave ted alone. not after the crap he tried to pull right before his death. trying to ensure that a democrat takes over his seat when just a few years ago he got the law changed because he was worried a then-republican governor would appoint a republican.

as for the fact that the three i mentioned are all democrats, probably a sub conscious thing. same can be said for newt gingrich, mike steele, lee terry and other republicans

Quote:

In any case, the people in charge speak for their constitutants. There (Rightly) isn't the public will to try prohibition again, as history has proven that it just doesn't work. This applies for Republicans, too; I don't see any of them pushing for heavily alcohol regulation.

gotta disagree there. tarp, stimulus package and health care debate all show that this isn't true.

Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#4 the relative ease of regulating and taxing alcohol over other illegal drugs

Care to expand on this?

it's easier to regulate cigarettes and alcohol because it's easy to put a tax stamp on both and put them in a convenience store. we know who's producing/importing them, and it's pretty much world

wide legal to sell them.

meth on the other hand is produced in the trunk of some moron's car. likely won't be sold on the shelves of your local grocery store, and isn't legal anywhere that i know of.

cocaine and heroin is mostly produced by drug lords in south america and afghanistan and even if America made them legal, other countries won't and the drug wars would continue.

---