
Subject: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 03:29:30 GMT

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

Discuss.

The American-led "War on Drugs". Is it justified, or is it a crackdown on civil liberties and personal freedom?

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [u6795](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 03:33:38 GMT

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

Somewhat both.

Too many people go to jail for smoking pot when it's really not a big deal at all - pot is completely nonaddictive and has no long term effects or negative effects at all.

However, other more serious drugs do need to be controlled (IE Heroine, crack, etc.)

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 03:43:51 GMT

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

u6795 wrote on Wed, 11 June 2008 04:33Somewhat both.

Too many people go to jail for smoking pot when it's really not a big deal at all - pot is completely nonaddictive and has no long term effects or negative effects at all.

However, other more serious drugs do need to be controlled (IE Heroine, crack, etc.)

In agreement with this mother fucker.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 06:36:08 GMT

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

they should be legal imho, just strongly controlled sales like tobacco and alcohol are (at least, in the UK)

would also be a good idea to have drug tests for people claiming welfare etc and if they test positive, welfare gets cut off. but then, I'm of the philosophy that welfare should be cut off after a brief period anyway

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 07:05:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Legalize marijuana, crack down on everything else.

Edit: no pun intended.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 09:58:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I read on the paper that long term use of Marijuana leads to shrinking of the brain, part of it anyway. Then again, I'll try to find the source.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 12:32:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Long term usage of nicotine leads to A LOT of negative health effects. Alcohol can destroy your liver if you drink enough of it over a long period of time. Eating too much sugar can give you diabetes and fuck you over.

Just because something is not healthy does not mean it should be criminalized. It's up to the responsibility of the individual on how they treat their bodies. If someone wants to destroy their life of a drug (be it alcohol, tobacco, pot, cocaine, etc...), let them do it.

Plus, if you legalize it, you can regulate it, and it becomes A LOT safer to use, and you see a rapid decline in gang violence.

If history has taught us anything, and I don't think anybody can say it hasn't, it has taught us that human nature doesn't change. If you take something away from people, they will find a way to get it. In that process, some very corrupt people (perhaps even moreso than our politicians) rise up and make it possible to fill the void. The prohibition of alcohol is a prime example of how such policy lead to increased violence and no slowing down of the consumption of alcohol. Once prohibition was repealed, organized crime suffer big time.

Personally, I believe in John Mill's Harm Principle. Only when someone impedes on the rights of someone else should they suffer any sort of punishment. It makes no sense to punish someone that has lived their lives to their own accord.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 12:33:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

d/c

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 15:07:05 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 11 June 2008 06:32 Long term usage of nicotine leads to A LOT of negative health effects. Alcohol can destroy your liver if you drink enough of it over a long period of time. Eating too much sugar can give you diabetes and fuck you over.

Just because something is not healthy does not mean it should be criminalized. It's up to the responsibility of the individual on how they treat their bodies. If someone wants to destroy their life of a drug (be it alcohol, tobacco, pot, cocaine, etc...), let them do it.

Plus, if you legalize it, you can regulate it, and it becomes A LOT safer to use, and you see a rapid decline in gang violence.

If history has taught us anything, and I don't think anybody can say it hasn't, it has taught us that human nature doesn't change. If you take something away from people, they will find a way to get it. In that process, some very corrupt people (perhaps even moreso than our politicians) rise up and make it possible to fill the void. The prohibition of alcohol is a prime example of how such policy lead to increased violence and no slowing down of the consumption of alcohol. Once prohibition was repealed, organized crime suffer big time.

Personally, I believe in John Mill's Harm Principle. Only when someone impedes on the rights of someone else should they suffer any sort of punishment. It makes no sense to punish someone that has lived their lives to their own accord.

Heh, unfortunately when does it come down to not harming someone? When every single person that could be affected by the action consents. Not to mention still requiring the consent of those unable to (legally) give consent. The right to do what you want in your house? Sure, go for it. The right to do it when your kids will be within the range of effect? Can your kids truly consent to you smoking up in the house while they can still be affected by it?

I highly doubt that people smoking outside would have the consent of every single person who walked within range of the individual doing the act.

Mill's Harm Principle is a good basis. You just have to do the work to decide what harm has the potential to come from it, and whether or not anyone in range of the effect will truly consent. Not only during what happens during the act, but what happens during the prolonged effects of the act (be it what you do while high/drunk, etc... or if smoking, how long it hangs around in the air)

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 15:28:02 GMT

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

There's plenty of times where doing drugs does not have any effect on anybody else. I've smoked salvia in controlled areas where I didn't impede on anybody else's rights. I have been drunk in public where I didn't cause any problems. There is no reason why I should have to be considered a criminal in either situation because I did no harm to anybody.

Sure, there are plenty of ways you can abuse the drugs to where it harms other. However, you can harm others while sober, as well. It's just a matter of personal responsibility. Be respectful towards others. If you are careful in what you do, you minimize harm for others, and there should be no reason why people can't live their lives to their own accord.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 15:56:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:I've smoked salvia in controlled areas where I didn't impede on anybody else's rights

Quote:I have been drunk in public where I didn't cause any problems

Now its the bold parts that are important.

Can you say the same of everyone else who smoked salvia or been drunk in public?

I highly doubt it. Therefore it be punishable if you do.

There is a difference between legalizing (or decriminalizing, which is just a de facto legalization. I'll simply use "legalization" to mean both terms) something and letting a crime go unpunished because no harm has been done. It does not have to be legal, but simply understood that if used responsibly, no punishment will happen.

Of course, if you are going to smoke pot outside, it would require the consent of everyone who walks by, or else a harm has occurred.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 16:06:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's basically what I've been trying to say. However, the only law that needs to be enacted is behaving in a manner that impedes on the rights of others. You don't have to criminalize a substance to criminalize the act of impeding on the rights of others.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 16:13:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unfortunately at this point it gets down to semantics.

Rhetoric question here, but what is easier?

1. Enforcing the behavior of individuals to not to commit acts before they are done, not to mention done while in the legally-contentious realm of diminished capacity.
 2. Keeping the materials that cause the harmful acts out of the hands of people.
-

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 16:24:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You just have to take the good with the bad. If you go with #2, you have to draw a line at some point in what you take away from people because everything and anything can be harmful whether they're used with malicious intent or done accidental. People won't be responsible for their actions if you give them an out, so the only thing you can truly do and not diminish the sense of responsibility in society is to leave people to their virtues and vices and punishes those that impede on the rights of others.

Again, the Harm Principle at work. I see no reason why my liberties should be diminished because other assholes are not careful. Plus, respect for the law diminishes when you take away too many things.

"If you have ten thousand regulations you destroy all respect for the law." - Winston Churchill

and

"The spirit of the law is greater than the law itself." - Winston Churchill(?)

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 16:38:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ideally, I agree. And this is why I mentioned it comes down to semantics.

As far as the law is concerned, its not that easy.

One of the main complaints is that it is expensive to keep things enforceably illegal when people will use them anyway. Its just as tough to monitor people's behavior (if not MORE difficult).

This may look to be slightly like a straw-man argument, but it works when looked at in the right way. Just to take the alcohol prohibition example: It didn't work very well as people would get it any way they could, but it was far easier to manage (legally speaking) than without the prohibition. Now, without the prohibition we have drunk driving, public intoxication resulting in harmful acts,

violence at home, bar brawls, etc.

The point being that it is easier to manage the prohibition of something (despite the people not agreeing and black-market crime being successful, etc) than it is to manage people's behaviour. With the prohibition (narrowing the viewpoint for the sake of this topic to crimes related to the prohibited substance, and not those that aided in purchasing the substance [ie. theft of money]) the only people affected by the crime aspect of the black-market were those who WANTED the substance, and those bystanders who had no desire to "break the law" were left untouched (yes, I'm sure there were some exceptions). However, with prohibition no longer in effect, the list of people affected by the resulting acts of someone else getting drunk keeps getting longer.

Manage the source - harmful acts not happening is possible at the expense of unrest and underground behaviour.

Manage the people - harmful acts not happening is impossible and can only punish after the act has already been done.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [SSADMVR](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 17:07:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Make it legal, give it away for free and just watch the average IQ skyrocket due to OD's. This will also be a good solution to the overpopulation problem.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 17:10:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The fact is that the police force is a reactionary force. By criminalizing something, the police force becomes a prevention force. Just because a substance *may* cause a person to do something, that person can do it WITHOUT that substance. I can drive recklessly while sober. I can bump into people and start fights at home or in bars without a drop of alcohol in my body. Punish THOSE actions and not the catalysts for them because the catalysts are numerous.

It's, also, not fair to use drunk driving in the post-prohibition world, though. I mean, when prohibition was in effect, it was the 1920s and 1930s. The number of cars on America's streets today is 229 MILLION cars. That's 79.6% of the population. The number was a mere fraction of that during the 1920s and 1930s. Not to mention how much faster cars go and the difference in speed limits.

It just makes no sense for me to be punished when I've done no harm to others. Plus, it's a fraction of the users that cause any problems. Of course, when you have an increase in something, there's going to be more instances of something negative, even while the percentages may actually go down.

If you have 10 planes, and one crashes, that's 10%. If you have 500 crashes and 10 go down, that's 5%, yet the crashes increased by 1000%.

Not to mention that violent crime goes down when things are decriminalized because black markets no longer have a stranglehold of the market and can't get away with murder, literally.

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [SSADMVR](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 17:15:23 GMT

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

SSADMVR wrote on Wed, 11 June 2008 12:07Make it legal, give it away for free and just watch the average IQ skyrocket due to OD's. This will also be a good solution to the overpopulation problem.
