
Subject: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Fri, 12 Jan 2007 23:31:04 GMT

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

Who questions the US laws against marijuana? Whether in the US or another country, should it be illegal?

I just want to see what you guys think of this issue.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Fri, 12 Jan 2007 23:51:53 GMT

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

They can't make their damn mind up in the UK, it's a joke - we get some really good strong weed over here and loads of people smoke it, they keep upgrading and downgrading its classification from almost legal, to serious punishments for dealing.

It should be legal no doubt, it's no worse than alcohol for sure and as such should have similar regulations implied on it, no smoking in public apart from licenced areas etc, Holland has the right idea, it should be a personal choice if people want to have a few joints to chill out and relax.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [fl00d3d](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 01:57:47 GMT

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

That's exactly how I feel. It's a natural herb that is used to intentionally alter your mind. In many ways its better for you than alcohol and in many ways it would be absolutely no issue if properly regulated.

I think it should be legalized, but regulated: such as 21+ to purchase, no underage dealing/selling, restrictions on where you can do it, and restrictions on re-sale/quality/distribution.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 02:12:58 GMT

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

Personaly I don't smoke it, But Iv'e seen kids aged about 10? 11? Smoke this stuff day after day..

I don't mind people smoking it, Aslong as they keep it away from me and my house, i'm cool with it..

Were I live weed is huge..everyone smokes it, But meh..

As mexican said, Our government can't make there mind up, lol

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 02:23:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If it was made available, the government would tax the shit out of it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 02:25:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Those cigarette taxes really do get annoying. Thank God I'm quitting (again).

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Caveman](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 02:38:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Weed by itself is much more safe then beer however, when you mix it with ciggys (like most people do) it then becomes alot more bad for you because of the crap in the tobacco. If the government over here made it legal, yes it would get taxed like hell and since its very easy to get weed now 'n' days the government would lose alot of money. So therefore it becomes illegal again, and the process starts over again.

I use to smoke it everyday untill I realized how much money I was actually spending on it per week. It was crazy amount. I thought my tabacco habbit was expensive.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 02:46:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you need drugs to get high and relax, then there is something really fucked up with you.

I and many others can enjoy myself without having to take any shit.

As always, drugs are for losers, whatever the effect it has on the body.

Only time you should be taking drugs is when you got a medical problem.

But anyhow, for the ones who do take, hurry up and overdose already, dont need selfish people that in this world.

^-^

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:16:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IWarriors wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 21:46If you need drugs to get high and relax, then there is something really fucked up with you.

I and many others can enjoy myself without having to take any shit.

As always, drugs are for losers, whatever the effect it has on the body.

Only time you should be taking drugs is when you got a medical problem.

But anyhow, for the ones who do take, hurry up and overdose already, dont need selfish people that in this world.

--

"Yes it should be illegal -- but I shall give no reason."

Just say that. We don't want to hear, nor do we care about your patronization.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [SeargentSarg](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:19:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why get high of weed if you can get high of gaming all day?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:19:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why not do both?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [xptek](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:30:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IWarriors wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 21:46If you need drugs to get high and relax, then there is something really fucked up with you.

I and many others can enjoy myself without having to take any shit.

As always, drugs are for losers, whatever the effect it has on the body.

Only time you should be taking drugs is when you got a medical problem.

But anyhow, for the ones who do take, hurry up and overdose already, dont need selfish people that in this world.

--

Do you support the prohibition of alcohol as well?

Also, there's quite a few interesting studies that show that Marijuana is much less harmful to the body than we thought. (link)

And just so you know, you can't overdose on Marijuana. Alcohol, on the other hand...

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:33:19 GMT

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

IWarriors wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 20:46If you need drugs to get high and relax, then there is something really fucked up with you.

I and many others can enjoy myself without having to take any shit.

As always, drugs are for losers, whatever the effect it has on the body.

Only time you should be taking drugs is when you got a medical problem.

But anyhow, for the ones who do take, hurry up and overdose already, dont need selfish people that in this world.

--

Do you drink? Do you get tipsy or drunk ever? Why do you need to be? Isn't that just the same thing as what you're saying?

Replace your whole post with beer. Let's try it.

Quote:

If you need beer to get high and relax, then there is something really fucked up with you.

I and many others can enjoy myself without having to take any shit.

As always, beer are for losers, whatever the effect it has on the body.

But anyhow, for the ones who do take, hurry up and kill someone drunk driving already, dont need selfish people that in this world.

Personally I don't do drugs. Now if you don't drink and you agree with what I'm saying, then sorry for the accusation. If you do drink then stop being a hypocrite.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:38:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Darkknight... :thumbsdown:

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:40:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 21:38Darkknight... :thumbsdown:

awww im hurt

Personally I think you should legalize the shit.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:41:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

passes a new bill.

>:P

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [xptek](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:43:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 22:38Darkknight... :thumbsdown:

There's nothing wrong with people choosing not to do drugs.

I do so responsibly and it's fine, but I can certainly understand why some people don't want to take the legal risk.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:44:34 GMT

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

taxes on it really wouldn't be a problem and you could guarantee the quality of the weed as well as having a decent choice of strains - I pay £20 for an 8th or 3.5g about 90% of that will be profit to various dealers, the government wouldn't charge that much by a mile and all the additional funding would support huge amounts of additional funding for the nhs, advice and support for users and regulating the sales of it, with a fair chunk left for the government to piss up the wall on nothing.

A note in a different direction here, the tax on british cigarettes is enough to pay for the ENTIRE nhs bill four times over, so don't moan at smokers when they need to use it's services.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:44:52 GMT

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

I agree. That's not what the thumbsdown was toward. I just didn't care for his post at all.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:48:33 GMT

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

z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 22:44I agree. That's not what the thumbsdown was toward. I just didn't care for his post at all.

:thumbsdown:

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 03:57:45 GMT

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

MexPirate wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 22:48z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 22:44I agree. That's not what the thumbsdown was toward. I just didn't care for his post at all.

:thumbsdown:

Well he reiterated Ty's idea, just assumed the guy drinks, and phrased what he wrote to show the guy's suspected hypocrisy in a horrible way.

I know there was no reason to attack him, and I don't really know why I did. I'm sorry. I guess I'm just a little too tired. ^_^

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 04:04:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 21:44l agree. That's not what the thumbsdown was toward. I just didn't care for his post at all.

yes cause you think i copied the other one. look at the time dude. we replied at exactly the same time with the same thoughts

well i did say sorry if the guy doesnt drink.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 04:08:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But you still assumed. Anyways...sorry.

Get back on topic.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 04:11:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 23:08But you still assumed. Anyways...sorry.

Get back on topic.

tis true i did assume and thats wrong but still the point is if you drink but say drugs are bad then your a hypocrite. thats all i was trying to say.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [SeargentSarg](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 04:51:51 GMT

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

No one can really stop under age drinking, smoking, etc. There are always going to be loop holes in buying these things.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 05:12:38 GMT

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

And your point is?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 06:20:31 GMT

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

marijuana's cool but it gets boring

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 06:46:15 GMT

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

z310 wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 21:16IWarriors wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 21:46If you need drugs to get high and relax, then there is something really fucked up with you.

I and many others can enjoy myself without having to take any shit.

As always, drugs are for losers, whatever the effect it has on the body.

Only time you should be taking drugs is when you got a medical problem.

But anyhow, for the ones who do take, hurry up and overdose already, dont need selfish people that in this world.

--

"Yes it should be illegal -- but I shall give no reason."

Just say that. We don't want to hear, nor do we care about your patronization.

If you dont want to hear or care then shut the fuck up. Its a public forum and we are allowed to state our opinion. Tough shit if its not what you want to hear.

No matter what, its an illegal substance, abide by the law or face the consequences. Until its made legal, do as IWarrrior says, overdose on it and save the Judicial system a fortune. Some of you WILL move onto harder drugs for a better kick. So start worrying now. Possible jail time later!! Die early and save me a fortune.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 06:52:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

let's all overdose on marijuana

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 08:17:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 01:52let's all overdose on marijuana

you got yourbody wieghts worth?
And either way, youd green out and pass out anyways.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 08:17:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SeargentSarg wrote on Fri, 12 January 2007 22:51No one can really stop under age drinking, smoking, etc. There are always going to be loop holes in buying these things.

Oh damn right. If there's a will there's a way.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Hex](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 08:51:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Long term toking will cause you health problems

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 09:37:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who need to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 11:17:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not cause cigarettes and alcohol (both hard drugs) are legal that soft drugs should be.

It rather raises questions about cigarettes and alcohol. Too bad no government has the balls to limit their use big time. Well, the French government did raise the price of cigarettes a lot in a short period and it did have a good effect. Unlike the Belgian government which raises with cents just to avoid regular income flowing away.

I work in health sector and I can tell one thing: dying of tobacco isn't pretty at all.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 14:08:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 05:17It's not cause cigarettes and alcohol (both hard drugs) are legal that soft drugs should be.

It rather raises questions about cigarettes and alcohol. Too bad no government has the balls to limit their use big time. Well, the French government did raise the price of cigarettes a lot in a short period and it did have a good effect. Unlike the Belgian government which raises with cents just to avoid regular income flowing away.

I work in health sector and I can tell one thing: dying of tobacco isn't pretty at all.

They are imposing massive anti smoking bans in virtually all public areas accross the world, America has been hit by this along with ireland and the UK will be following suit, think some areas of europe have also implemented things like this.

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who _need_ to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

I play a lot of poker, for us smoking is half of it everyone I know that plays poker also smokes weed, it's where I usually pick up at games. Smoking and poker have gone together since the old western movies. Many people feel it improves their game.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 16:12:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37 Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who _need_ to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

You're not a hypocrite cause you don't drink and get drunk. Some go out every weekend and get plastered but then criticize those who do drugs. I drink occasionally. I used to drink a lot but got alcohol poisoning. I'm very selective now on what I'll drink and only every now and then.

I just don't like people who say drugs are bad but have other vices just as bad or worse.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 18:47:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37 Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who _need_ to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

Have to agree with this, I dont drink much myself.

But there is a big difference between alcohol and drugs, one is socially acceptable and the other is not, also alcohol can be good for you if you dont over do it, like one glass of red wine is good for your heart.

Alcohol is used for medical reasons, for cleasing wounds, back before pain killers, doctors used to give it to the people they work on to numb the pain.

Further back you go, alcohol was the only other drink other then water in some civilizations and communitys and everyone had it, from babys, kids and to adults.

Alcohol is only bad if you overdo it, like everything elas if you overdrink or overeat something, you can harm yourself, you can even kill yourself on water if you drink enough of it in one day, I believe I read it takes 160 pint size glasses to do that.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 18:50:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

puddle_splasher wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 01:46If you dont want to hear or care then shut the fuck up. Its a public forum and we are allowed to state our opinion.

He is allowed to say that -- just as much as I'm allowed convey my opinion of what he should of said.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 18:51:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Could people who are for or against it please elaborate to their fullest extent?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 18:55:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I will still stick with my beer, twice a week, after work.

Never have I had any inclination to try any drugs. Seeing the effects on my mates was enough to stop anyone. Yes! They thought they could control it, how wrong they were.

Smoking! Never touched cigarettes either. My parents both smoked and my Mother died of lung cancer. Yes it was tobacco related.

We all think we know our limitations. Little do we really know.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 19:36:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i think people should be able to make their own choices.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 19:59:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IWarriors wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 13:47Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who need to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

Have to agree with this, I dont drink much myself.

But there is a big difference between alcohol and drugs, one is socialy acceptable and the other is not, also alcohol can be good for you if you dont over do it, like one glass of red wine is good for your heart.

Alcohol is used for medical reasons, for cleasing wounds, back before pain killers, doctors used to give it to the people they work on to numb the pain.

Further back you go, alcohol was the only other drink other then water in some civilizations and communitys and everyone had it, from babys, kids and to adults.

Alcohol is only bad if you overdo it, like everything elas if you overdrink or overeate something, you can harm yourself, you can even kill yourself on water if you drink enough of it in one day, I believe I read it takes 160 pint size glasses to do that.

Since when is everything that's "socially acceptable" the better choice? It wasn't "socially acceptable" to shelter blacks along the underground highway. It wasn't "socially acceptable" for women to work. It isn't "socially acceptable" for homosexuals to be who they are. Society doesn't always get everything right...

I'm sure you've heard of "medicinal marijuana". I'm pretty sure the word "medicinal" implies that it IS used in the medical field. I'm too lazy to research, but I'm sure xptek will fill you in on the

medicinal advantages of marijuana.

The only reason why they drank alcohol because it was more sanitary than water.

As it's been proven and said more than once, you cannot overdose on marijuana...

No, I don't smoke pot, and I don't promote the usage of drugs. I just think that it's always a good idea to be informed with reliable information instead of being fed Propaganda Pie.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 20:03:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The #1 thing I hate about my mom: She only cares about social acceptance.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 20:26:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In my experience alcohol leads to far worse behaviour than weed does. I can't remember the last time I got high and put a hole in the wall.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 20:43:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 13:59IWarriors wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 13:47Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who need to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

Have to agree with this, I dont drink much myself.

But there is a big difference between alcohol and drugs, one is socially acceptable and the other is not, also alcohol can be good for you if you dont over do it, like one glass of red wine is good for your heart.

Alcohol is used for medical reasons, for cleasing wounds, back before pain killers, doctors used to give it to the people they work on to numb the pain.

Further back you go, alcohol was the only other drink other than water in some civilizations and communities and everyone had it, from babies, kids and to adults.

Alcohol is only bad if you overdo it, like everything else if you overdrink or overeat something, you can harm yourself, you can even kill yourself on water if you drink enough of it in one day, I believe I read it takes 160 pint size glasses to do that.

Since when is everything that's "socially acceptable" the better choice? It wasn't "socially acceptable" to shelter blacks along the underground highway. It wasn't "socially acceptable" for women to work. It isn't "socially acceptable" for homosexuals to be who they are. Society doesn't always get everything right...

I'm sure you've heard of "medicinal marijuana". I'm pretty sure the word "medicinal" implies that it IS used in the medical field. I'm too lazy to research, but I'm sure xptek will fill you in on the medicinal advantages of marijuana.

The only reason why they drank alcohol because it was more sanitary than water.

As it's been proven and said more than once, you cannot overdose on marijuana...

No, I don't smoke pot, and I don't promote the usage of drugs. I just think that it's always a good idea to be informed with reliable information instead of being fed Propaganda Pie.

sufferers of Multiple Sclerosis use cannabis purely for medicinal purposes to ease immense pain. The people who grow the cannabis for them and turn it in to cannabis cream or chocolate risk being convicted of dealing, despite giving the cannabis away to people genuinely in need of it.

Check here for more info on thc4ms: <http://www.thc4ms.org.uk/>

Watch the documentary if you have time, it's pretty interesting viewing

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 20:51:05 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37 Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who need to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

Good idea. Marijuana laws in Arizona are very strict and unnecessary. (linkage)

IWarriors wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 13:47Further back you go, alcohol was the only other drink other than water in some civilizations and communities and everyone had it, from babies, kids and to adults.

I'd like to point out that this was also the case with Marijuana, and that it also has a lot of documented medical use.

Personally, I'd rather smoke than fill my body with a socially acceptable toxin. (I don't drink, BTW).

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 21:11:55 GMT

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

MexPirate wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 14:43j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 13:59IWarriors wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 13:47Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 03:37Funny this came up... I just had to give a speech to my poker players tonight because I've heard that some of them are doing marijuana outside my house at breaktime. I basically told them that I don't know what I ever said or did to imply that it was OK to bring illegal drugs anywhere near my house.

I also drink only once or twice a year and never to drunkenness, so don't call me a hypocrite. I think people who need to get high or drunk to have a good time are pathetic. I swear some people think that a party without drinking can't be fun. Lame, lame, lame.

Have to agree with this, I dont drink much myself.

But there is a big difference between alcohol and drugs, one is socially acceptable and the other is not, also alcohol can be good for you if you dont over do it, like one glass of red wine is good for your heart.

Alcohol is used for medical reasons, for cleasing wounds, back before pain killers, doctors used to give it to the people they work on to numb the pain.

Further back you go, alcohol was the only other drink other than water in some civilizations and communities and everyone had it, from babies, kids and to adults.

Alcohol is only bad if you overdo it, like everything elas if you overdrink or overeate something, you can harm yourself, you can even kill yourself on water if you drink enough of it in one day, I believe I read it takes 160 pint size glasses to do that.

Since when is everything that's "socially acceptable" the better choice? It wasn't "socially acceptable" to shelter blacks along the underground highway. It wasn't "socially acceptable" for women to work. It isn't "socially acceptable" for homosexuals to be who they are. Society doesn't always get everything right...

I'm sure you've heard of "medicinal marijuana". I'm pretty sure the word "medicinal" implies that it

IS used in the medical field. I'm too lazy to research, but I'm sure xptek will fill you in on the medicinal advantages of marijuana.

The only reason why they drank alcohol because it was more sanitary than water.

As it's been proven and said more than once, you cannot overdose on marijuana...

No, I don't smoke pot, and I don't promote the usage of drugs. I just think that it's always a good idea to be informed with reliable information instead of being fed Propaganda Pie.

sufferers of Multiple Sclerosis use cannibis purely for medicinal purposes to ease immense pain. The people who grow the cannibis for them and turn it in to cannibis cream or chocolate risk being convicted of dealing, despite giving the cannibis away to people genuinly in need of it.

Check here for more info on thc4ms: <http://www.thc4ms.org.uk/>

Watch the documentary if you have time, it's pretty interesting viewing

Thats true which is fine, as its fine as its for medical reasons.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 21:18:31 GMT

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

Why shouldn't recreational use of marijuana be legal, IWarriors?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2007 23:42:12 GMT

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

z310 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 15:18Why shouldn't recreational use of marijuana be legal, IWarriors?

Already said.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 00:18:28 GMT

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

IWarriors wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 18:42z310 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 15:18Why shouldn't recreational use of marijuana be legal, IWarriors?

Already said.

No, you provided a few insightful statements like "they should hurry up and overdose already," but you still have yet to tell us why you think any government has the right to tell you what you can't/can put in your body.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 01:04:57 GMT

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

lol Not really, IWarriors.

You're saying the drug should be illegal because most people won't have reason enough to use it - but that's idiotic when you defend alcohol. Most people will have the same reason to blaze to drink, recreation.

They both have health plus and minuses too, so don't say: "But alcohol can be good for you and weed can't."

Many drugs that are legal because they pose no or little enough threat to society, like caffeine, alcohol, and tobacco. Sometimes those drugs need to be regulated to belittle the threat they create to under-weigh society's needs. The government doesn't straight-out ban them because they don't need to, and doing so anyways would take away rights most of society feels they should have. They don't want a revolution.

Research marijuana and you'll find that it should be one of those drugs. In my opinion, alcohol is worse than it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 01:35:03 GMT

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

tobbaco isn't a drug.

i know someone from school that takes pot because he says it makes his music sounds better, he said there was no way of describing it. hes not all like "OMG I TAKE WEED IM SO COOL".

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 01:48:03 GMT

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

Tobacco is too a drug...

WikipediaA drug is any biological substance, synthetic or non-synthetic, that is taken for non-dietary needs. It is usually synthesized outside of an organism, but introduced into an organism to produce its action. That is, when taken into the organisms body, it will produce some effects or alter some bodily functions (such as relieving symptoms, curing diseases or used as preventive medicine or any other purposes).

Tobacco relaxes you as well as act like an appetite suppressant. It's a drug.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 02:02:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 20:04Many drugs that are legal because they pose no or little enough threat to society, like caffeine, alcohol, and tobacco. Sometimes those drugs need to be regulated to belittle the threat they create to under-weigh society's needs. The government doesn't straight-out ban them because they don't need to, and doing so anyways would take away rights most of society feels they should have. They don't want a revolution.

minus "that".

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 02:37:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 01:48Tobacco is too a drug...

WikipediaA drug is any biological substance, synthetic or non-synthetic, that is taken for non-dietary needs. It is usually synthesized outside of an organism, but introduced into an organism to produce its action. That is, when taken into the organisms body, it will produce some effects or alter some bodily functions (such as relieving symptoms, curing diseases or used as preventive medicine or any other purposes).

Tobacco relaxes you as well as act like an appetite suppressant. It's a drug.

bah, our school teachers always said that it isn't, it is the nicotine. again, it is the nicotine that "relaxes" although in actual fact it causes you to be unrelaxed.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 02:52:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 19:35tobbaco isn't a drug.

i know someone from school that takes pot because he says it makes his music sounds better, he

said there was no way of describing it. hes not all like "OMG I TAKE WEED IM SO COOL".

I remember a few years back someone was trying to ban all songs from that radio of bands who did drugs. I was like my God!! There goes my rock music.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 02:52:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 19:48Tobacco is too a drug...

WikipediaA drug is any biological substance, synthetic or non-synthetic, that is taken for non-dietary needs. It is usually synthesized outside of an organism, but introduced into an organism to produce its action. That is, when taken into the organisms body, it will produce some effects or alter some bodily functions (such as relieving symptoms, curing diseases or used as preventive medicine or any other purposes).

Tobacco relaxes you as well as act like an appetite suppressant. It's a drug.

If you're addicted to tobacco, Then yes, when you're stressed out, It feels like a smoke can relax you.

If you don't smoke and your stressed out, and have a cig, You will most probably caught your lungs out then feel any more relaxed.

a cigarette has 100's of chemicals that kill you than relax you. lol

tobacco is from the plant so it could relax you, not exactly sure on that one.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 02:58:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 12:51Could people who are for or against it please elaborate to their fullest extent?

This is one of the reasons i say make it legal. Anyone remember what prohibition did to our crime rate and then what happen once lifted.

This article just shows what happened after prohibition was inacted.

http://library.thinkquest.org/04oct/00492/Crime_Rate.htm

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:00:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

it only relaxes you because you are stressed because of withdrawal symptoms. from the very first ciggy, your body wants more nicotine. if you don't give it what it wants you get stressed and hartbeat goes up, when you give it nicotine it fulfils its demands thus relaxing. alot of people would feal better not smoking, but meh. as long as people don't smoke near me i don't really care.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:04:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 21:00it only relaxes you because you are stressed because of withdrawal symptoms. from the very first ciggy, your body wants more nicotine. if you don't give it what it wants you get stressed and hartbeat goes up, when you give it nicotine it fulfils its demands thus relaxing. alot of people would feal better not smoking, but meh. as long as people don't smoke near me i don't really care.

My father was addicted to ciggs. Glad he stopped, but it doesn't bother me if you smoke, do drugs or drink. It's not up to me to tell you what to do with your body and i don't think its the governments job either.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:07:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Darkknight wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 03:04but it doesn't bother me if you smoke, do drugs or drink. It's not up to me to tell you what to do with your body and i don't think its the governments job either.

exactly what i say to people who say "OMG IM SMOKING, IM SO COOL"

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:19:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high. I have an uncle who was a drug addict (he's dead now, thank goodness)... he was in and out of jail from early teens for breaking into people's houses and stealing shit to sell. Having marijuana illegal at this point is a strong deterrent, allowing everyone over 18 to use it would encourage more people to take up the habit.

Everyone I've ever seen on weed has been a lazy fuck who doesn't want to do anything. And then there was this guy I used to know who got drunk and high on January 5, 2000 and shot a 40 year old mother of two in the face with a pistol, killing her... and all she was doing was delivering him a pizza.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:23:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm against Cigarettes, Alcohol, and Drugs. You shouldn't need any of these things and they are a detriment to society. Combine the three and you have the reason why most people die rapped up into one explanation.

That is all.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:30:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 21:19The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high. I have an uncle who was a drug addict (he's dead now, thank goodness)... he was in and out of jail from early teens for breaking into people's houses and stealing shit to sell. Having marijuana illegal at this point is a strong deterrent, allowing everyone over 18 to use it would encourage more people to take up the habit.

That's kinda my point about prohibition.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 03:32:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 21:19The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high. I have an uncle who was a drug addict (he's dead now, thank goodness)... he was in and out of jail from early teens for breaking into people's houses and stealing shit to sell. Having marijuana illegal at this point is a strong deterrent, allowing everyone over 18 to use it would encourage more people to take up the habit.

Everyone I've ever seen on weed has been a lazy fuck who doesn't want to do anything. And then there was this guy I used to know who got drunk and high on January 5, 2000 and shot a 40 year old mother of two in the face with a pistol, killing her... and all she was doing was delivering him a pizza.

Were not talking about skag heads or crack whores here, you don't see people committing violent crimes to get their weed fix, for one they would be too lazy for anything like that and getting high on weed is still cheaper than getting drunk despite high prices.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 04:53:36 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 20:19: The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high. I have an uncle who was a drug addict (he's dead now, thank goodness)... he was in and out of jail from early teens for breaking into people's houses and stealing shit to sell. Having marijuana illegal at this point is a strong deterrent, allowing everyone over 18 to use it would encourage more people to take up the habit.

Everyone I've ever seen on weed has been a lazy fuck who doesn't want to do anything. And then there was this guy I used to know who got drunk and high on January 5, 2000 and shot a 40 year old mother of two in the face with a pistol, killing her... and all she was doing was delivering him a pizza.

I have a friend who smokes Marijuana all the time. He is one of the laziest people I know. He finally got a job, but only so he can pay for his Marijuana, and he wastes every single penny on the stuff. Such a waste. He is a lazy ass as well. He's very smart, as a matter of fact, he doesn't do any of his school work, yet he can pass all his tests with C's or better, and mostly A's. But what is the point? He doesn't do his work and fails out of school. He wastes all his money on a drug that does no good for him at all. A pathetic waste.

Gbull wrote: I'm against Cigarettes, Alcohol, and Drugs. You shouldn't need any of these things and they are a detriment to society. Combine the three and you have the reason why most people die rapped up into one explanation.

That is all.

Exactly. You shouldn't have to do drugs to have fun. If you have to do drugs to have fun, you must be a boring person, get a life. Aside from that, there is no real point in wasting money on something that will only make you "feel good" for a small amount of time. You could be using your money for better things to better yourself in life instead of being that pathetic person who relies on drugs to have fun, feel good, and pass time.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:16:52 GMT

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

Dave Anderson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 23:53 I have a friend who smokes Marijuana all the time. He is one of the laziest people I know. He finally got a job, but only so he can pay for his Marijuana, and he wastes every single penny on the stuff. Such a waste. He is a lazy ass as well. He's very smart, as a matter of fact, he doesn't do any of his school work, yet he can pass all his tests with C's or better, and mostly A's. But what is the point? He doesn't do his work and fails out of school. He wastes all his money on a drug that does no good for him at all. A pathetic waste.

Do you feel that your anecdotal evidence justifies the prohibition of Marijuana along with the consequences that go with it?

Dave Anderson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 23:53 Exactly. You shouldn't have to do drugs to have fun. If you have to do drugs to have fun, you must be a boring person, get a life. Aside from that, there is no real point in wasting money on something that will only make you "feel good" for a small amount of time. You could be using your money for better things to better yourself in life instead of being that pathetic person who relies on drugs to have fun, feel good, and pass time.

Some people feel that you shouldn't waste time on the Internet to have fun. Who the hell are you to dictate what someone else does during their free time?

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:19 Everyone I've ever seen on weed has been a lazy fuck who doesn't want to do anything.

Keep in mind that you've probably seen plenty of people that smoke weed and aren't lazy as fuck. Sure, there are always extremes, but majority of cannabis users that I know hold down a full time job, raise families, and attend college/high school. I manage to smoke on a weekly basis while working 40+ hours a week, going to school, and finding time for a social life.

--

I can't understand why several people in this thread keep suggesting that all drug users need a drug to have fun. Can someone please explain the logic behind this incorrect conclusion?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:23:02 GMT

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

Quote: Do you feel that your anecdotal evidence justifies the prohibition of Marijuana along with the consequences that go with it?

No, I am not justifying the prohibition of Marijuana. I have other friends who use Marijuana for a pain killer, that, I agree with. What I disagree with is when people use it for enjoyment. However, I can care less if they use it or not, it is their life, as long as they don't smoke it around me.

Marijuana has good uses, its just too bad that people abuse it. That is when I disagree with it. You make it legal, it gets abused even more. Keep it illegal, at least it is "somewhat" controlled. And I use that term loosely.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:25:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm still wondering why you care about what someone is doing in their free time when it's none of your business at all.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [jd422032101](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:29:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Agrees with 'xptek'.

I believe people should have a choice to use "Marijuana" Inside of there homes. I know of many people that use marijuana and they act like every one else and have normal life.

(Post count +1)

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:29:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

xptek wrote:I'm still wondering why you care about what someone is doing in their free time when it's none of your business at all.

Dave S. Anderson wrote:However, I can care less if they use it or not, it is their life, as long as they don't smoke it around me.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:41:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave AndersonHowever, I can care less if they use it or not, it is their life, as long as they don't smoke it around me.

Then why input your opinion on this issue if your ultimate excuse for not supporting your argument is that you don't care if people smoke it?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 05:44:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because z130 wanted opinions.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 06:37:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310...and GTFO of this thread, please.

It was a mistake to start this thread on these forums...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 06:44:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:19The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high.

Marijuana isn't addictive, so there's no problem there.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 06:50:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alex wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 21:52If you're addicted to tobacco, Then yes, when you're stressed out, It feels like a smoke can relax you.

If you don't smoke and your stressed out, and have a cig, You will most probably caught your lungs out then feel any more relaxed.

a cigarette has 100's of chemicals that kill you than relax you. lol

tobacco is from the plant so it could relax you, not exactly sure on that one.

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:00it only relaxes you because you are stressed

because of withdrawal symptoms. from the very first ciggy, your body wants more nicotine. if you don't give it what it wants you get stressed and hartbeat goes up, when you give it nicotine it fulfils its demands thus relaxing. alot of people would feal better not smoking, but meh. as long as people don't smoke near me i don't really care.

Have either of you ever smoked a cigarette?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 07:36:55 GMT

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

z310 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 23:37z310...and GTFO of this thread, please.

It was a mistake to start this thread on these forums...

You ask for peoples opinions, then you tell them to get out of your thread if you don't like what they have said. That doesn't make sense.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 07:49:39 GMT

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

z310 wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 00:50Alex wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 21:52If you're addicted to tobacco, Then yes, when you're stressed out, It feels like a smoke can relax you.

If you don't smoke and your stressed out, and have a cig, You will most probably caught your lungs out then feel any more relaxed.

a cigarette has 100's of chemicals that kill you than relax you. lol

tobacco is from the plant so it could relax you, not exactly sure on that one.

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:00it only relaxes you because you are stressed because of withdrawal symptoms. from the very first ciggy, your body wants more nicotine. if you don't give it what it wants you get stressed and hartbeat goes up, when you give it nicotine it fulfils its demands thus relaxing. alot of people would feal better not smoking, but meh. as long as people don't smoke near me i don't really care.

Have either of you ever smoked a cigarette?

Actualy i'm smoking one right now, Why? Does that make be a bad person?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 09:14:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 06:50Alex wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 21:52If you're addicted to tobacco, Then yes, when you're stressed out, It feels like a smoke can relax you.

If you don't smoke and your stressed out, and have a cig, You will most probably caught your lungs out then feel any more relaxed.

a cigarette has 100's of chemicals that kill you than relax you. lol

tobacco is from the plant so it could relax you, not exactly sure on that one.

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:00it only relaxes you because you are stressed because of withdrawal symptoms. from the very first ciggy, your body wants more nicotine. if you don't give it what it wants you get stressed and heartbeats goes up, when you give it nicotine it fulfills its demands thus relaxing. alot of people would feel better not smoking, but meh. as long as people don't smoke near me i don't really care.

Have either of you ever smoked a cigarette?

yes, i will never do it again.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 09:39:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 19:35tobacco isn't a drug.

i know someone from school that takes pot because he says it makes his music sound better, he said there was no way of describing it. hes not all like "OMG I TAKE WEED IM SO COOL".

Sounds like his music is bad in everyones ears but he thinks its better as hes flying high as a kite.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 10:12:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 07:44Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:19The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high.

Marijuana isn't addictive, so there's no problem there.
It is highly mentally addictive.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 15:52:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Let's just ban it all. Anything I think is bad for YOU we should ban from YOU using it.

Have you ever seen the movie Demolition Man? You're who he is fighting against.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 18:13:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

puddle_splasher wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 04:39gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 19:35tobacco isn't a drug.

i know someone from school that takes pot because he says it makes his music sounds better, he said there was no way of describing it. hes not all like "OMG I TAKE WEED IM SO COOL".

Sounds like his music is bad in everyones ears but he thinks its better as hes flying high as a kite.

No musician has ever made good music while on drugs.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 18:54:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Anderson wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 02:36z310 wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 23:37z310...and GTFO of this thread, please.

It was a mistake to start this thread on these forums...

You ask for peoples opinions, then you tell them to get out of your thread if you don't like what they have said. That doesn't make sense.

I'm asking for opinions that make some sense. I'm sorry if you couldn't figure that out...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 19:02:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 05:12z310 wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 07:44Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:19The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high.

Marijuana isn't addictive, so there's no problem there.
It is highly mentally addictive.

You can be addicted to anything mentally. You don't see people going around stealing/killing for some ice cream.

Only insane people will be going around stealing/killing for some weed on account of their addiction.

I know somebody that is addicted to it. She has only been able to go three days without getting high, but that's because she has really easy access to it. If she couldn't get it, she wouldn't steal or kill for it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 19:07:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 12:13puddle_splasher wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 04:39gamemodding wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 19:35tobbaco isn't a drug.

i know someone from school that takes pot because he says it makes his music sounds better, he said there was no way of describing it. hes not all like "OMG I TAKE WEED IM SO COOL".

Sounds like his music is bad in everyones ears but he thinks its better as hes flying high as a kite.

No musician has ever made good music while on drugs.

i gotta ask what you listen to then because it isnt rock n roll

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sun, 14 Jan 2007 19:08:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was being sarcastic.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 01:30:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Beatles would have sucked without drugs

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 03:43:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MexPirate wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 19:30The Beatles would have sucked without drugs

Hahaha

Thats true! Lucy In The Sky With Diomands!

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 08:56:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Darkknight wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 09:52Let's just ban it all. Anything I think is bad for YOU we should ban from YOU using it.

Have you ever seen the movie Demolition Man? You're who he is fighting against.

Because nobody can tell you what is and isn't good for you. Like your parents. Or your doctor.

I ate some ice cream once. I felt all weird and saw Jesus. I also got fired from work for coming in full of ice cream.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 12:55:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I thought Dave made an okay point...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 13:17:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 20:02Goztow wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 05:12z310

wrote on Sun, 14 January 2007 07:44Crimson wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:19The problem I see is the things that drug addicts do in order to get the financial means to pay for their high.

Marijuana isn't addictive, so there's no problem there.
It is highly mentally addictive.

You can be addicted to anything mentally. You don't see people going around stealing/killing for some ice cream.

Only insane people will be going around stealing/killing for some weed on account of their addiction.

I know somebody that is addicted to it. She has only been able to go three days without getting high, but that's because she has really easy access to it. If she couldn't get it, she wouldn't steal or kill for it.

So you say that if she couldn't afford it anymore, she wouldn't sell anything to get her joint?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 15:48:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Mon, 15 January 2007 07:17
So you say that if she couldn't afford it anymore, she wouldn't sell anything to get her joint?

No-one mentioned "sell" and if you mean sell, then further elaborate.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 16:17:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By selling, he means giving away an asset. In a rather extreme case, he may mean prostitution. It's not unheard of for women to sell themselves to obtain what is needed to fulfill their drug fixes.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 16:32:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

for pot? haha

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 16:47:10 GMT

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

I ment like selling a ring, mobile phone or something. Not selling her body.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 16:52:20 GMT

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

Still pretty ridiculous. It's not hard to stop smoking weed even if you have been every day for a year.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 17:56:41 GMT

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

totally true, I smoked pretty much every day for 18 months then stopped instantly for 6 months before picking it up again.

It was just a change in lifestyle and it wasn't hard to give up - I could have got hold of it at any time if I had the desire to.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [SargentSarg](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 18:03:01 GMT

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

Well, from my own experiences, I don't know why anyone would be "addicted" to it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 18:24:27 GMT

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

xptek wrote on Sat, 13 January 2007 22:25 I'm still wondering why you care about what someone is doing in their free time when it's none of your business at all.

If it's on their own time, more power to them.

The minute it starts affecting those around them, then there is a problem.

ie. Unpleasant to be around because it stinks, driving, taking care of those who can't take care of themselves. Just a few examples of what I mean by affecting those around them.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Romaner](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 18:30:46 GMT

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

hmm well where should i start, i got like 15 posts i want to respond to lol dont want to quote them all. anyways i was about 16 when i tried my first joint, and pretty much have been doing it ever since. to tell you the truth no matter what it is i can do it better high on weed than drunk. like some1 already said there are pros and cons to doing both, personally i would have to say that if i were to drink everyday i would be much worse than to blaze or toke everyday. i have never seen any1 kill for weed, i have seen people steal for it or steal it, but again its a personal preference thing its who those people are. they dont do it because they get the shakes or withdrawal symptoms they just do it cause they are theives and will steal. in a sense i guess you could say that you can overdose on weed, its called green out, when you get sick puke and your skin turns greenish color. thats pretty much as bad as smoking tons of weed will do to ya. yes smoking weed does make you lazy thats no lie, but what about drinking? it might not make you lazy but it will make you unable to do most stuff anyways. when i was like 17-18 my mom told me that smoking weed on its own isnt that bad, but she said it would seperate people. some would try it and never want to do it again, some will try it an be fine using just weed to get high, and others the mojority will move on to other drugs to get better high. good thing i caught myself before i went further. i mean i did try a few other drugs like mushrooms or hashish, but i never went into the chemically made drugs (like produced in a lab) i just tried the natural ones. also to whoever said that you got some really got weed in UK... lets just say you are wrong, the shit here in canada is way better, B.C. bud all the way man. how do i know lets just say last winter a buddy of mine that lives in UK got to try the stuff we smoke here... i leave it to your imagination how... no he didnt come here, and i didnt go there. lets just say that even now whatever you want can still get there by mail

now im not a genius but i never did any homework in school or when i went to post secondary, and i smoked weed quite often during that time and still got my 75-90% marks in all subjects. i know im not addicted to it, because i quit for 5 months after graduation because i thought i would get tested for it when i find a job, but here i dont so its all good lol. and i would never steal rob or kill any1 for it, its hard not to smoke it here in canada cause every1 does and you get a fine only if you have more than like 30grams so its all good cause i never have that much and i dont sell it so im safe. if i get caught with it they will just take it away or now they tend to stomp on it and rub it into the ground lol. anyways all i can say is if you smoke it or you dont, killing stealing and robbing is up to you weed will have nothing to do with that. cant say the same about alcohol. also weed really is a gateway for some do go into harder drugs but you know what, its not the weeds fault its those people that wanted to keep on going and never stopped.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 21:43:42 GMT

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

SpyGuy246 wrote on Mon, 15 January 2007 03:56l ate some ice cream once. I felt all weird and saw Jesus. I also got fired from work for coming in full of ice cream.

...ok? That's getting off from what I used the ice cream thing to convey.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 21:47:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Mon, 15 January 2007 08:17: So you say that if she couldn't afford it anymore, she wouldn't sell anything to get her joint?

She wouldn't do much to get a joint if she couldn't afford one.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 23:14:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd like to see a benefit of smoking Marijuana even on a recreational basis. I'd bet money the cons would devastate the pros. No amount of word twisting can change that. Have I ever taken drugs? Do I see things the way you do? The answer is no. However, all I know is that I'm going to have children someday. The last thing I want in their atmosphere is drugs. I'd prefer Alcohol and Cigarettes stricken from it as well, but hey, I don't have a choice in the matter.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2007 23:40:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The benefits don't matter to me, and the cons probably do devastate the pros. I just feel that marijuana should be licit, just as alcohol and tobacco are.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 00:07:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gbull, i would have to say that i hope my kids never do either one of the three. but the thing is that marijuana smoke is less toxic to you than tobacco is, and if you are worried about drugs in the atmosphere how do you feel about all of that pollution in the atmosphere. it really depends to what extent you drink to consider it better than weed. if you are an alcoholic it is much worse than being a pothead. i mean sure smoking it makes you lose brain cells and your memory is going out the window, but if you are an excessive drinker, you got the liver, kidneys, stomach to worry about and did i mention you still lose brain cells? let's just say this if it was up to me i would rather have a pothead for a son, than an alcoholic. and smoking well that's another issue, some say that if you smoke weed you smoke cigarettes, not true i know over 2 dozen people that don't smoke but still do weed.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 00:18:24 GMT

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

Brain cells aren't destroyed by drinking, according to some research. But when you drink (more than moderately?), brain cells are damaged - although the damages seem to be reversible with abstinence - to create poor function.

Also, smoking doesn't produce toxins to kill brain cells like alcohol. Memory does seem to go out the window when you chronically smoke, though. That also goes away with abstinence.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 10:10:41 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Mon, 15 January 2007 10:17By selling, he means giving away an asset. In a rather extreme case, he may mean prostitution. It's not unheard of for women to sell themselves to obtain what is needed to fulfill their drug fixes.

Thats the whole point I was asking you to elaborate on.

Prostitution for some weed, lol.

Perhaps for crack but weed?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 15:20:42 GMT

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

puddle_splasher wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 04:10gbull wrote on Mon, 15 January 2007 10:17By selling, he means giving away an asset. In a rather extreme case, he may mean prostitution. It's not unheard of for women to sell themselves to obtain what is needed to fulfill their drug fixes.

Thats the whole point I was asking you to elaborate on.

Prostitution for some weed, lol.

Perhaps for crack but weed?

I smoked it when I was a kid. Some lady I mowed lawns for would pay me by smoking a joint or two with her. She was my favorite client

Only reason I don't now is because of the drug testing at work. If I ran my own place hell ya I would.

side note

It's illegal now to own a business in the state of Ohio and allow smoking in your place. You own it, but you don't. Wonder what is the next thing to strip owner's rights away from what they can do in their own place of business.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 16:03:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well here they are proposing a bylaw, that would make it illegal to smoke in any rental or owned property if it is an apartment or a condominium/townhouse. basically they want to disallow smoking in any living place that is not a house. the proposed bylaw is even going to restrict smoking on balconies or backyards if you live on the first floor, or have a condo. personally i dont smoke at home, once in a blue moon i will go outside and have one but very rarely. but this bylaw seems outrageous, if it passes there will be alot of money spent to enforce this (its not going to be easy) i mean how can you prevent some1 from smoking inside their own home without entering it. anyways just another stupid thing the city of Edmonton is trying to do... if somehow they make smoking in a car illegal i dunno what im going to do, since here its not exactly warm for 8 months of the year. oh and those of you living in calgary watchout they might bring it there aswell

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 16:16:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm glad that the smoking ban has finally gone through here in Calgary. (No smoking in restaraunts or bars. Casinos and bingo halls start next year.)

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 16:46:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah we had it for 2 years now i believe, dont mind it that much to tell you the truth, i know some bartenders and waitresses and they used to have problems breathing at the end of the night in bars and restaurants they worked in, and its really unfair to subject people like that just because you choose to smoke...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 16:54:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:and its really unfair to subject people like that just because you choose to smoke...

and that is one of my main points against pot. What someone does in their own home is none of my business. But if it starts to affect me, then I say it should be removed. Be it smoking, or pot.

It's my belief that the only reason smoking isn't completely banned is because it is far too ingrained in society (aside from the large amount of income it generates for the Government). Had it been banned before that occurred, I don't think there would have been a problem with the thought of smoking being banned.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 17:26:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 09:54Quote:and its really unfair to subject people like that just because you choose to smoke...

and that is one of my main points against pot. What someone does in their own home is none of my business. But if it starts to affect me, then I say it should be removed. Be it smoking, or pot.

It's my belief that the only reason smoking isn't completely banned is because it is far too ingrained in society (aside from the large amount of income it generates for the Government). Had it been banned before that occurred, I don't think there would have been a problem with the thought of smoking being banned.

ok well we agree on the fact that smoking should be banned from public places, but on the street, car, home i think it should be allowed. and i think same should go for weed. because you are not forced to inhale it if i smoke in in open space like the street, you can walk around its not like most will blow smoke in your face and if they do that then thats a personal issue not due to smoking.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 18:28:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I know a few people who smoke/have smoked weed- for the most part, those in my circle of friends who do it keep it under control and out of the way. They only occasionally do it, and when they do they make sure that they won't be driving or anything afterwards. They never try to hook the non-smokers into joining, and they always change afterwards just so we won't have to smell it on them.

I've also seen people take it to an extreme, however. My roommate first semester last year was the original chronic pothead- he smoked every day and was constantly scraping the bottom of the

barrel for money to buy his next fix. He was so out of it most days that I would actually have to wake his sorry ass up so he didn't miss class. I'm pretty much the only reason he didn't flunk out of school, and I kept wondering at the time why I didn't just let him do so because he had no regard whatsoever for anyone or anything around him.

I thought differently about weed back in high school. I'd never want to try the stuff myself, but I honestly couldn't give less of a shit who does anymore. It's no different than alcohol- it won't fuck you up if taken in moderation. It's the people that can't control their intake who wind up with- and become- problems because of it.

I don't think it should be illegal. I think it should come under the same regulations that govern alcohol (i.e. can't be used in public, can't be sold to minors, etc.). People who want to smoke weed are gonna smoke weed regardless of whether it's legal or not, and it's a waste of time and taxpayer money to pursue that particular drug when there exist far more dangerous and damaging substances. I'd rather see weed legal and have law enforcement spend more time hunting down cocaine, meth, heroin, and the other "hard" drugs.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 18:37:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Romaner wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 10:26warranto wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 09:54Quote:and its really unfair to subject people like that just because you choose to smoke...

and that is one of my main points against pot. What someone does in their own home is none of my business. But if it starts to affect me, then I say it should be removed. Be it smoking, or pot.

It's my belief that the only reason smoking isn't completely banned is because it is far too ingrained in society (aside from the large amount of income it generates for the Government). Had it been banned before that occurred, I don't think there would have been a problem with the thought of smoking being banned.

ok well we agree on the fact that smoking should be banned from public places, but on the street, car, home i think it should be allowed. and i think same should go for weed. because you are not forced to inhale it if i smoke in in open space like the street, you can walk around its not like most will blow smoke in your face and if they do that then thats a personal issue not due to smoking.

Sorry, I don't enjoy cutting across the street just so someone can enjoy their cigarette. I'm allergic (or highly sensitive) to the smoke. Even small amounts cause me to have difficulty in breathing. Large amounts and I'm on the ground, throwing up and nearly unable to breath.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 20:26:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ok then dont you already have to cut corners to begin with? i mean not for most streets but around the downtown area im sure there are tons that smoke on the street you cant tell me there is no1 there like that. also weed is different kind of smoke, if you are alergic to tobacco smoke it does not mean you are allergic to weed smoke.. they are comletely different. i actually know a person that is pretty much the same as you he is very sensitive to cigarette smoke, if i smoke in the car i have to air it out for an hour or more before he can get in, but he still smokes weed and it does nothing to his astma and his allergies

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 20:40:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My neighbours smoke pot on rare occasions... it affects me the same way. (Though perhaps the stench of it may have more to do with it than the actual smoke itself)

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 21:13:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well then i guess it all comes down to personal issues, you want the smoke off your street since you cant handle it, i want to smoke on the street because i wont smoke at home, good thing we got democracy

ps. weed should still be legal

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 23:32:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think I've ran into a decent case against the drug being legal yet... >_>

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 16 Jan 2007 23:45:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's a bit of a line between freedom to do something and freedom from something. Usually, the former stops where the latter begins.

The way I see it, you should have the right to smoke yourself stupid however often you want, whenever you want. However, I should have a right to walk down the street without having to inhale whatever it is you're smoking. Especially so in the case of weed, which has more immediate effects than causing lung cancer (for the record, I think that folks shouldn't be allowed

to smoke regular cigs in public either). The smoke from the weed has the ability to get whoever walks past it buzzed, and because of that nobody should have the right to do it where others must walk past it. I don't see why a person smoking weed should be allowed to stand out where people have to smell it and deal with their stoned ass.

Weed should be legal, but it should NOT be legal to smoke it in public places, and it should also NOT be legal to go stumbling out in public while you're high off it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [z310](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 01:23:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh I guess.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 03:04:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 18:45 There's a bit of a line between freedom to do something and freedom from something. Usually, the former stops where the latter begins.

The way I see it, you should have the right to smoke yourself stupid however often you want, whenever you want. However, I should have a right to walk down the street without having to inhale whatever it is you're smoking. Especially so in the case of weed, which has more immediate effects than causing lung cancer (for the record, I think that folks shouldn't be allowed to smoke regular cigs in public either). The smoke from the weed has the ability to get whoever walks past it buzzed, and because of that nobody should have the right to do it where others must walk past it. I don't see why a person smoking weed should be allowed to stand out where people have to smell it and deal with their stoned ass.

Weed should be legal, but it should NOT be legal to smoke it in public places, and it should also NOT be legal to go stumbling out in public while you're high off it.

This.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 03:22:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 17:32 I don't think I've ran into a decent case against the drug being legal yet... >_>

And you won't, because you don't see it from the perspective of someone who does think it should

be illegal. I've told you mine, and I personally believe they're right. I've heard yours, and they are valid points, but I still think that people confuse legal with acceptable. To me, smoking it is unacceptable.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 03:54:14 GMT

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

Correct me if I'm mistaken (I've never smoked anything and don't plan to), but whenever I hear about pot smoking, I always hear about the high. To me, "high" implies a dramatic change in one's perception very quickly. Yes, alcohol does the same thing and I believe that term originated as a synonym of "drunk." However, I know it's possible to drink small amounts of alcohol and NOT get high. I've done it myself and have been around/heard about others who have. I have yet to hear of or experience, however, someone smoking small amounts of pot and not getting high.

People often drink alcohol without the intention of getting drunk and often have no trouble doing so. Are there many people who smoke pot with the intention of not getting high and are successful in doing so? (an actual query)

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 03:59:40 GMT

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

A business owner should have the right to allow smoking. Cigarettes are not illegal. If you don't like the smoke don't visit the business. No one is holding a gun to your head forcing you into a place that allows smoking.

You own the land you should have every right to allow a LEGAL substance on your property.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 04:00:38 GMT

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

If you have shitty weed (which I've recently had the luck to come across myself) you can smoke a lot without feeling much of anything.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 05:06:34 GMT

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

Smoking hemp?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 06:15:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But why would people smoke shitty weed?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 09:13:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 00:15But why would people smoke shitty weed?

Usually when weed in general is in low availability. The shitty stuff which was not previously smoked/sold is all that's left in any bulk.

Also, you can avoid getting too high by limiting the size of a joint. For example, rather than using 3 skins - which is an international standard for sharing with friends - you can use 1 skin and that will half the amount you would get with three skinned joint.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 14:12:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Darkknight wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 20:59A business owner should have the right to allow smoking. Cigarettes are not illegal. If you don't like the smoke don't visit the business. No one is holding a gun to your head forcing you into a place that allows smoking.

You own the land you should have every right to allow a LEGAL substance on your property.

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessable to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 14:20:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 08:12

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessible to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

Take the UK as the example. Private "mens clubs" still have the no-smoking ban, to protect its members. We pay to use the establishment but why should I have to breathe the passive smoke?

I mean its not as if I piss in your ash-tray and say "Here, have the end product of my beer".

But thats what we have to put up with, the end product of smoking, we have to breathe it, no option.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 14:43:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

puddle_splasher wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 14:20warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 08:12

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessible to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

Take the UK as the example. Private "mens clubs" still have the no-smoking ban, to protect its members. We pay to use the establishment but why should I have to breathe the passive smoke?

I mean its not as if I piss in your ash-tray and say "Here, have the end product of my beer".

But thats what we have to put up with, the end product of smoking, we have to breathe it, no option.

Whao!!, My brother tells me he smokes like 40 cigs in 20 different clubs on friday nights, Not including pubs. D:

I guess the law hasn't took affect in liverpool.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 14:55:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 09:12Darkknight wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 20:59A business owner should have the right to allow smoking. Cigarettes are not illegal. If you don't like the smoke don't visit the business. No one is holding a gun to your head forcing you into a place that allows smoking.

You own the land you should have every right to allow a LEGAL substance on your property.

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessible to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

No... if it was a public establishment then businesses like bars couldn't have bouncers standing in the front turning away people they don't want in the club. It's NOT a public establishment.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 15:03:07 GMT

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

Even though you can limit the size of the joint and the amount of weed you take in, it sounds so far to me that it'll still have the mind altering effect. Which brings me to my point...that basically, it seems harder to use marijuana in moderation than alcohol. Deducing from the information I've gotten so far, pot gets you high(er?) more quickly than alcohol with comparable effects. But maybe I'm mistaken.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Romaner](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 15:41:46 GMT

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

ok well first of all you dont have to smoke the whole joint if you dont feel like it lol. second thing is who smokes weed and plans on not getting high?? mayb pirate lol, but i mean its like smoking a cigarette and not wanting the nicotine...

and yes drinking is different because sometimes i want to drink for the taste of it, not to get drunk. and sometimes i drink just to get drunk, but with weed its different you smoke it to get high or you just dont....

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 15:50:34 GMT

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

That's about what I expected to hear, actually. And that's why I'm against legalizing weed.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 15:52:53 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 07:55warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 09:12Darkknight wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 20:59A business owner should have the right to allow smoking. Cigarettes are not illegal. If you don't like the smoke don't visit the business. No one is holding a gun to your head forcing you into a place that allows smoking.

You own the land you should have every right to allow a LEGAL substance on your property.

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessible to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

No... if it was a public establishment then businesses like bars couldn't have bouncers standing in the front turning away people they don't want in the club. It's NOT a public establishment.

Heh, and this is what I get for trying to use the common terms, rather than legal terms.

By "public" I mean ones that are not "authorized (wrong word, I know) for exemptions to laws. Private establishments can discriminate, choose who can be a member, etc. Bouncers can not. They most likely do it, but they skirt around the law by trying to come up with reasonable excuses as to why the alleged discrimination was allowed.

On the other side, just to bring in another argument, is the employee factor. Many of the employees of bars are quite glad about the new law banning smoking, and fully endorse it. So that more or less puts the business in a bind. If the employees want it, then what can be done except go along with it?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 16:03:54 GMT

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

Well then, the government is bullshit. The government has too much power over its people. Nowhere, and I mean NOWHERE should the government have say whether or not a business has the right to say whether or not a business can allow or disallow smoking in THEIR establishment.

Whether or not they can, it's absolute bullshit.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 16:05:53 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 09:52j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 07:55warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 09:12Darkknight wrote on Tue, 16 January 2007 20:59A business owner should have the right to allow smoking. Cigarettes are not illegal. If you don't like the smoke don't visit the business. No one is holding a gun to your head forcing you into a place that allows smoking.

You own the land you should have every right to allow a LEGAL substance on your property.

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessible to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

No... if it was a public establishment then businesses like bars couldn't have bouncers standing in the front turning away people they don't want in the club. It's NOT a public establishment.

Heh, and this is what I get for trying to use the common terms, rather than legal terms.

By "public" I mean ones that are not "authorized (wrong word, I know) for exemptions to laws. Private establishments can discriminate, choose who can be a member, etc. Bouncers can not. They most likely do it, but they skirt around the law by trying to come up with reasonable excuses as to why the alleged discrimination was allowed.

On the other side, just to bring in another argument, is the employee factor. Many of the employees of bars are quite glad about the new law banning smoking, and fully endorse it. So that more or less puts the business in a bind. If the employees want it, then what can be done except go along with it?

That's right just go along with it. Don't fight back. Wonder what the next thing to come is that attacks business owners on what they can and cannot do.

Correct me if I'm wrong but didn't the people who are happy there is a lift on smoking start that job with smoking there. It was there choice to work there with smoke. If I own a bar and I allow smoking its your choice to work there, to go there, to visit there.

And it's not the employees who keep the business going. It's the patrons who keep the place running so that the employees have some where to be employed at.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 16:21:12 GMT

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

SpyGuy246 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 10:50 That's about what I expected to hear, actually. And that's why I'm against legalizing weed.

So smoking weed would be OK if people only did it because they liked the taste of smoking it (which I do more than I enjoy the taste of alcohol)? What's wrong with smoking weed to get high? When you smoke pot you do reach an altered state faster than alcohol, but it doesn't last nearly as long nor is it as incapacitating.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 16:27:09 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 10:21 SpyGuy246 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 10:50 That's about what I expected to hear, actually. And that's why I'm against legalizing weed.

So smoking weed would be OK if people only did it because they liked the taste of smoking it (which I do more than I enjoy the taste of alcohol)? What's wrong with smoking weed to get high? When you smoke pot you do reach an altered state faster than alcohol, but it doesn't last nearly as long nor is it as incapacitating.

lol i hate the taste of beer, lets outlaw it. I also hate peaches lets outlaw that to

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 17:21:07 GMT

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

Smoking weed to get high is like drinking beer to get drunk. It's abusing the substance. And while you can drink in moderation, it's harder to smoke in moderation.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 17:29:21 GMT

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

Why is it abusing the substance?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 18:09:25 GMT

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

Alex wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 08:43puddle_splasher wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 14:20warranto wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 08:12

It's a public establishment. Meaning it has to be accessible to ALL of the public. Which is why laws like this are allowed to come into effect.

If it were a private establishment, then I could see your argument.

Take the UK as the example. Private "mens clubs" still have the no-smoking ban, to protect its members. We pay to use the establishment but why should I have to breathe the passive smoke?

I mean its not as if I piss in your ash-tray and say "Here, have the end product of my beer".

But thats what we have to put up with, the end product of smoking, we have to breathe it, no option.

Whao!!, My brother tells me he smokes like 40 cigs in 20 different clubs on friday nights, Not including pubs. D:

I guess the law hasn't took affect in liverpool.

I live in Scotland not England.

The law is changing in England. Possibly July at the latest will see the UK as a whole, having smoke-free pubs.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 18:35:03 GMT

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

Because much of what I've heard in favor of it says that it has medicinal purposes. If you're not using it for medicinal purposes, why are you using it?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Romaner](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 20:13:40 GMT

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

well to tell you the truth i use it because i want to, there is no good reason for most to do it. but there are alot of things we do for no good reason so does that mean we should not do them just because we dont have a good reason? like there is no good reason to even have one drink of

alcoholic beverage. there is no good reason to drive a 13mpg muscle car, but lots do it... and i wont even mention those that drive a truck in the city when they never need anything towed or hauled, but they still do it. why not make that illegal? all im saying is if weed was to be legalized and there would be laws to using it just like there are for alcohol what would be the harm to it? like not smoking in public no smoking and driving and not to be high in public (to some extent) like if you are so high you dont even know what your name is and where you are going then that should be disallowed in public, but if you want to get some herb and go home and smoke it till you start drooling from your mouth why should that be illegal? or if you want to smoke a joint and go to a movie whats the harm in that?

i mean unlike alcohol i have never seen or heard about it making any one violent all it does is it relaxes you and makes you forget about your ongoing stress in life, for some period of time. and yes i did start smoking it during a hard time in my life, im not about to say what exactly but it was pretty much the only thing that got me through some tough times, times where i would prob be seeing a counsellor about but i figure this was probubly cheaper lol. and i know most will say well you can relax without smoking weed, and i do that too but some times that is the only thing that calmes me down.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 20:38:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:i mean unlike alcohol i have never seen or heard about it making any one violent

Ask Crimson, she has a story for you.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 20:58:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, with my ex you have to add in the fact that he was drunk AND high and mere hours away from pointing the gun at his own head. He was literally getting his last meal delivered before he planned to go to a motel and shoot himself in the head. (A motel, because he lived in an apartment under his dad's house and didn't want him to have to deal with the cleanup)

The worst thing I have seen with weed, however, is that people who are on don't care about the consequences of their actions. I hate to use this same guy as an example, but he was, at this time, one of the assistant managers at the Domino's Pizza where we all worked. (I was the manager)

So, he had gone outside for one reason or another and those of us in the store locked the door so he couldn't get back in. It was stupid and funny because he had a key to the door in his pocket. But, instead of unlocking the door, he took this huge rock we used to prop the door open and hurled it over and over at the big steel door, leaving several dents in it. I don't know what he was thinking, but he obviously wasn't considering the consequences of his actions (such as the owner

discovering it and making him pay for it out of his \$6.50 an hour paycheck).

People who are high just act so relaxed and calm that I seriously doubt they could seriously react to something that needed them to be alert.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 22:12:24 GMT

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

because all of that was a direct result of smoking a joint

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Romaner](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2007 23:36:20 GMT

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

crimson i get your point, but it sounds to me that this ex of yours had alot of stuff going on with him and weed was just the tip of the iceberg. yes smoking weed does make you loose your judgement for a period of time, but it all depends on how you handle yourself when you are high on it. and how much you consume. i mean for me prob .4 of a gram would be enough to get high to the state of relaxation, and 1 gram would prob make me not think straight anymore. but i never get violent or do stupid shit (i do say stupid shit sometimes when im really stoned but thats about it). plus again age is a factor, how old was your ex when all this was going on, how mature was he to begin with. i mean if you are immature and inconsiderate of others then smoking weed would only make you worse. plus just like alcohol some people are just not cut out for it and should not use it. unfortunately those are the people that usually end up using it more and more till they get completely out of control. also i play ren when im high (thats why my join mesage says intoxicated at work lol), and i react pretty fast i would say. having said that i would never get high before or during work cause i really cant fuck up or its going to be a very big mess.

and since you said it was a 6.50\$ an hour job for an assistant manager i would say you guys were pretty young back then.

also no offense but i hope you pick them better now if you know what i mean.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 00:19:11 GMT

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

On a positive note. In my higher (AP by American standards I think) English class there is a girl who smokes weed before she studies (she studies for 3 hours a night). She was telling me it helps her get in a relaxed state for absorbing the information. She gets full marks for most of her work as well.

I once got stoned and crunched through a page of fractions in maths in half the time it would have

taken me normally.

And weed does impair judgement, but not in a reckless sense. It'll make you more nervous about certain things, make you think over a choice before you make it. Think twice about who might be on the phone. Judgement can be returned to a sober stage when high through experience.

Despite that fact I like weed and use it regularly sometimes (with month gaps in between). I'm not sure if I want to see it legalized. There is something quite attractive about it being illegal, like a forbidden art if you catch my drift.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [FiresFriend64](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 01:24:20 GMT

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

swed, all stoners know what i mean

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 01:33:48 GMT

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

I like my horrible short-term memory.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [z310](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 02:02:40 GMT

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

tzarmind wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 19:19 There is something quite attractive about it being illegal, like a forbidden art if you catch my drift.

That goes away after your mom catches you doing it. >_<

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 03:04:21 GMT

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

z310 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 18:02 tzarmind wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 19:19 There is something quite attractive about it being illegal, like a forbidden art if you catch my drift.

That goes away after your mom catches you doing it. >_<

I know the feeling. My mom found my pipe i made in shop class lol.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 04:19:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i have never been caught,just cause when i was raised my parents considered it a bad drug, so i knew i better not get caught. but now what are they gonna do lol

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 11:27:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tzarmind wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 18:19In my higher (AP by American standards I think) English class there is a girl who smokes weed before she studies (she studies for 3 hours a night). She gets full marks for most of her work as well.

I once got stoned and crunched through a page of fractions in maths in half the time it would have taken me normally.

And weed does impair judgement, but not in a reckless sense. It'll make you more nervous about certain things, make you think over a choice before you make it. Think twice about who might be on the phone.

1) Could she have a so called "Photo-graphic mind" or a higher level of intellegence? This would account scientifically for the higher marks.

2) You do not state if your crunching was correct?

3)Nervous! More like paranoia and that leads to a lot of nasty schnitzel.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 12:07:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

FiresFriend64 wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 19:24swed, all stoners know what i mean
Hope you ready for the next episode

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Thu, 18 Jan 2007 20:06:58 GMT

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

puddle_splasher wrote on Thu, 18 January 2007 05:27tzarmind wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 18:19In my higher (AP by American standards I think) English class there is a girl who smokes weed before she studies (she studies for 3 hours a night). She gets full marks for most of her work as well.

I once got stoned and crunched through a page of fractions in maths in half the time it would have taken me normally.

And weed does impair judgement, but not in a reckless sense. It'll make you more nervous about certain things, make you think over a choice before you make it. Think twice about who might be on the phone.

1) Could she have a so called "Photo-graphic mind" or a higher level of intellegence? This would account scientifically for the higher marks.

2) You do not state if your crunching was correct?

3)Nervous! More like paranoia and that leads to a lot of nasty schnitzel.

1) I think it's something to do with her studying for 3 hours a night. She just uses Tetrahydrocannabinol for relaxing herself and allow increased concentrate on her studying.

2) They were all correct.

3) It can make you paranoid as well, but that's controllable. I meant nervous in the context of "I'm too nervous to drive to the shop incase I crash the car in my current altered state of reality and perception"

Also the paranoia shouldn't have hugely negative effects other than said person feeling uncomfortable for the duration of the high.

And on another note, I don't really like most of this stupid stoner culture that most teenagers on the internet are part of. This includes people who think they are part of the Rastafari movement.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 04:10:11 GMT

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

As an American, I should have the right to put ANYTHING that I want into my body. Anything else is Bullshit.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 06:33:17 GMT

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

mjfabian wrote on Thu, 18 January 2007 22:10As an American, I should have the right to put ANYTHING that I want into my body. Anything else is Bullshit.

nice 1, penn and tellers bullshit show is great.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 07:06:02 GMT

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

I challenge any of you who are against pot to watch this and refute it. its only 30 min long. I doubt you will watch it though.

I kinda like the end when they show government funded pot patients lol Also no one has ever died from pot smoke.

Some of you here though sound just like Bob Wiener

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 10:32:48 GMT

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

I watched about 10 minutes in. That wasn't biased at all ... Let's make everything that doesn't seemingly hurt people legal! Teachers should be able to have sex with their 14 year old students who want to have sex with them too, because they both want it and it isn't hurting anyone right? Let's allow people to walk naked in the streets and fornicate in alleyways! Let's all drive 100mph in a 55 and it'll be okay because we haven't hurt anyone yet! Guys, that excuse is played, and frankly it's boring.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [xptek](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 13:25:08 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 05:32I watched about 10 minutes in. That wasn't biased at all ... Let's make everything that doesn't seemingly hurt people legal! Teachers should be able to have sex with their 14 year old students who want to have sex with them too, because they both want it and it isn't hurting anyone right? Let's allow people to walk naked in the streets and fornicate in alleyways! Let's all drive 100mph in a 55 and it'll be okay because we haven't hurt anyone yet! Guys, that excuse is played, and frankly it's boring.

The slippery slope argument has been played before.

We're talking about Marijuana here. Not legalizing statutory rape.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 14:06:23 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 04:32I watched about 10 minutes in. That wasn't biased at all ... Let's make everything that doesn't seemingly hurt people legal! Teachers should be able to have sex with their 14 year old students who want to have sex with them too, because they both want it and it isn't hurting anyone right? Let's allow people to walk naked in the streets and fornicate in alleyways! Let's all drive 100mph in a 55 and it'll be okay because we haven't hurt anyone yet! Guys, that excuse is played, and frankly it's boring.

Try watching the whole thing before commenting on the whole video

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 14:09:05 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 05:32I watched about 10 minutes in. That wasn't biased at all ... Let's make everything that doesn't seemingly hurt people legal! Teachers should be able to have sex with their 14 year old students who want to have sex with them too, because they both want it and it isn't hurting anyone right? Let's allow people to walk naked in the streets and fornicate in alleyways! Let's all drive 100mph in a 55 and it'll be okay because we haven't hurt anyone yet! Guys, that excuse is played, and frankly it's boring.

A teacher having sex with her student is statutory rape. That won't be legalized.

People walking in public and fornicating in public is public indecency. It imposes on others' rights to not be forced to see that in public domain.

Driving 100 in 55 is imposing on others' rights. It has the potential to seriously injure or kill others. A person smoking pot in the comfort of their own home doesn't.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 14:41:24 GMT

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

Quote:A teacher having sex with her student is statutory rape. That won't be legalized.

Exactly my point. It's morally not the right thing to do, therefore it's illegal. Morally, at least in my

eyes Marijuana is bad. However, people are stupid and will do as they please.

<http://www.marijuanaaddiction.info/harmful-effects-of-marijuana.htm>

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 15:00:41 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 09:41Quote:A teacher having sex with her student is statutory rape. That won't be legalized.

Exactly my point. It's morally not the right thing to do, therefore it's illegal. Morally, at least in my eyes Marijuana is bad. However, people are stupid and will do as they please.

<http://www.marijuanaaddiction.info/harmful-effects-of-marijuana.htm>

Okay, so then you don't drink coffee or pop, do you? Any energy drinks?

Caffeine should be morally wrong, then. So should alcohol. Hell, anything that changes your perception, how your body reacts should be immoral, then. Gatorade, Red Bull, and Coca-Cola should all be banned. Morning coffee? That's immoral, too.

Honestly, I think that drinking caffeinated beverages is more immoral than smoking marijuana. You're putting a lot of synthetic crap into your body. You can also die of an overdose of caffeine. Caffeine shuts down your central nervous system.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 15:52:59 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 04:32I watched about 10 minutes in. That wasn't biased at all ... Let's make everything that doesn't seemingly hurt people legal!

Apparently you didnt watch it because that isn't what they said. They said I should have the legal right to put anything into my own body.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 15:53:12 GMT

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

Here's one way to look at it: If you can offer something to a child in good faith, then it's not immoral. If I offered pop to say a 6 year old nephew, I wouldn't feel bad at all. Sure, they may get a bit hyper, but that's all. Would you feel good offering a Marijuana Joint to a 6 year old? I know I sure wouldn't. The thing that I think people who want Marijuana legalized forget, or possibly don't

care about, is the children. If this was a fairytale adult-land, I wouldn't give a rats ass if you want to be a degenerate window-licking pothead in your own home.

If you put that into a child's atmosphere, then they'll think it's okay to do.

Quote:Apparently you didnt watch it because that isn't what they said. They said I should have the legal right to put anything into my own body.

According to the video, the law hasn't stopped you before, so what's stopping you now? If this war on drugs is losing, then sit down right in front of a police officer and light one up.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 15:57:51 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 09:53Here's one way to look at it: If you can offer something to a child in good faith, then it's not immoral. If I offered pop to say a 6 year old nephew, I wouldn't feel bad at all. Sure, they may get a bit hyper, but that's all. Would you feel good offering a Marijuana Joint to a 6 year old? I know I sure wouldn't. The thing that I think people who want Marijuana legalized forget, or possibly don't care about, is the children. If this was a fairytale adult-land, I wouldn't give a rats ass if you want to be a degenerate window-licking pothead in your own home.

If you put that into a child's atmosphere, then they'll think it's okay to do.

Quote:Apparently you didnt watch it because that isn't what they said. They said I should have the legal right to put anything into my own body.

The law hasn't stopped you before, so what's stopping you now?

Beer and ciggs are legal. Apparently those who smoke or drink beer don't care about the little 6 years olds

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 15:58:44 GMT

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

Those are immoral in my eyes. By the way...you haven't offered beer or cigarettes to a 6 year old have you? I updated my post before I saw you quoted btw.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 15:59:30 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 09:58 Those are immoral in my eyes. By the way...you haven't offered beer or cigarettes to a 6 year old have you?

no i havent. and beer and ciggs are legal so whats your point?

so are you saying if pot is legal all of a sudden my judgement goes out the window and I'm going to offer beer and cigs and pot to 6 year olds?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:02:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 10:53 HIf this war on drugs is losing, then sit down right in front of a police officer and light one up.
Just because they will arrest you doesn't mean the 'war' is working. How about prohibition? Police still arrested you for possession, but it's obvious that Prohibition failed.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:02:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, I'm saying it's immoral if you can't offer what you're eating/drinking/*doing*(<--as in a drug) to a child unless of course if by a medical reason.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:02:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cigarettes are only legal because of their history. Had we known now what we know then (and cared enough then as we do now) Tabacco would not have become legal. It's very difficult to stop people from having things when it has been ingrained in our history so well.

As for alcohol, I have no problem giving it to a six year old... in small doses. Heck, I may not drink now but when I was around six, my grandfather would give me the odd beer-cap full of beer.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:12:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 11:02 Cigarettes are only legal because of their history. Had we known now what we know then (and cared enough then as we do now) Tobacco would not have become legal. It's very difficult to stop people from having things when it has been ingrained in our history so well.

As for alcohol, I have no problem giving it to a six year old... in small doses. Heck, I may not drink now but when I was around six, my grandfather would give me the odd beer-cap full of beer. Yeah, my dad gave my brother and me some beer when we were young. Not a lot, obviously, but we still were given beer.

Also, gbull, realize that morality is subjective. It is NOT objective. It's different for each person. I obviously disagree about the morality of alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana. Who says that you're correct? Who gives you, or anybody else, the right to hold me to YOUR moral standards?

I don't smoke marijuana, but if I did, I would be cautious enough to not smoke in front of a 6 year old. I wouldn't have marital sex in front of a 6 year-old, but does that make sex immoral? No...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:16:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here you go Gbull. You and others like you on this thread. If it were up to you the movie Demolition Man would be reality not Sci-Fi.

Society:

California of 2032 is neo-puritan: everything that isn't deemed good for you is bad for you, and everything bad for you is illegal.

Cigarettes, non-educational toys, gasoline, red meat, cursing, and contact sports have all been banned.

Sex has been outlawed as dangerous and unclean. People are no longer used to touching each other. It's all virtual sex.

Cars can drive themselves, and have "secure-foam" that erupts during a crash. Can't have our citizens driving themselves they could kill someone.

Is this Science Fiction or Reality? Seems like the perfect world for some on here.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:22:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In other words..

"If you don't allow the drug to become legal, society as we know it will collapse!!!"

Interesting view point.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:25:19 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 11:22In other words..

"If you don't allow the drug to become legal, society as we know it will collapse!!!"

Interesting view point.

I think his point is that by restricting freedoms, society will collapse.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:28:00 GMT

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

Heh, I know. But if he can take other people's viewpoints and twist them to extremes, I should be able to as well

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:45:03 GMT

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

I didn't say that my morality standards were right, but I do have a high standard of morals. I'm passing my opinion, not judgment. Also, I don't think that it's fair that you're mocking my point of views when you're trying to gain sympathy for yours.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:45:30 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 10:28Heh, I know. But if he can take other people's viewpoints and twist them to extremes, I should be able to as well

you mean like if pot was legal all of a sudden people would be rushing to give 6 year olds a joint?

I was just showing how extreme you can take this. I wouldnt give a 6 year old ciggs or beer now and its legal. So if pot were legalized Gbull all of a sudden will rush out and give a 6 year old pot???

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:47:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You need to read my posts, no where did I say people would give 6 year olds joints. I said in my eyes, if you can't give it to a 6 year old in good faith then it's immoral.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:47:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 10:28Heh, I know. But if he can take other people's viewpoints and twist them to extremes, I should be able to as well

no but i am pointing out that your using what if's to try and prove why pot should remain illegal.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:49:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 11:45I didn't say that my morality standards were right, but I do have a high standard of morals. I'm passing my opinion, not judgment. Also, I don't think that it's fair that you're mocking my point of views when you're trying to gain sympathy for yours. I didn't say you were passing judgment. You agree that marijuana should remain illegal, right? If so, then your argument for it being illegal because it's immoral is invalid. Morality is subjective.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:49:50 GMT

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

lol i gotta go to work.

I should have the legal right as a human not just as an american to put into my own body anything i want to.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:53:55 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 09:49gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 11:45I didn't say that my morality standards were right, but I do have a high standard of morals. I'm passing my opinion, not judgment. Also, I don't think that it's fair that you're mocking my point of views when you're trying to gain sympathy for yours.

I didn't say you were passing judgment. You agree that marijuana should remain illegal, right? If so, then your argument for it being illegal because it's immoral is invalid. Morality is subjective.

My argument is invalid anyways, as is yours unless you're planning on changing the law.

It's my opinion that Marijuana is immoral. I understand it's subjective, but opinions typically are.

Time to go get the fiancee. Later.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 16:57:03 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 11:53j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 09:49gbull wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 11:45I didn't say that my morality standards were right, but I do have a high standard of morals. I'm passing my opinion, not judgment. Also, I don't think that it's fair that you're mocking my point of views when you're trying to gain sympathy for yours.

I didn't say you were passing judgment. You agree that marijuana should remain illegal, right? If so, then your argument for it being illegal because it's immoral is invalid. Morality is subjective.

My argument is invalid anyways, as is yours unless you're planning on changing the law.

It's my opinion that Marijuana is immoral. I understand it's subjective, but opinions typically are. My whole argument is that because the legality of marijuana is a moral issue, it should be made legal. Nobody has the right to tell ANYBODY what their morals should be (and I'm not saying you are).

People, once a certain age, are responsible for themselves. That's a judgement call THEY have to make, not the government. Until what someone does imposes on the rights of other, the government has no place to interfere.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 22:52:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You naysayers are missing the point. This isn't about the harmful effects marijuana will have on my body, or the fact that tobacco and alcohol, two legal substances, do more damage to your body than marijuana. This isn't about morals, because everyone has a different view of what is morally right and what is morally wrong. Gbull, just because you think something is immoral doesn't mean you have the right to impose that view on other people.

This is about the freedom to do whatever the hell you want providing it does not cause any harm to other people. If I feel that I want to put something into my body, then there is no real reason that I shouldn't be able to. If I harm others while doing so, then charge me for the actual crimes that I've committed, not this extra narcotics bullshit.

Marijuana should be legalized so we can get rid of drug dealers and gang violence associated with drugs. You know why people don't get killed in mob wars over alcohol? Because it's legal.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 22:58:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Erm... gang violence and drug deals encompass more than just pot...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 23:38:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yea they do, but drugs (including cannabis) finance crime globally, if that money was going to the government in tax instead then everyone would be a lot better off - (apart from the criminals, who at higher levels crimes usually spread past drug dealing. Not suggesting all drugs should be legal, but people are going to buy these drugs whether they are legal or not, by making them illegal it simply means that the money goes to the drug dealers rather than governments taxing the shit out of it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 23:43:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 17:58Erm... gang violence and drug deals encompass more than just pot...

That's why I'm an advocate of ALL substances being legalized and regulated. Potentially dangerous substances like cocaine, crack, LSD, etc. shouldn't be in the hands of people who

won't distribute them responsibly. And besides, helping curb gang violence would only be one of the many benefits from substance legalizing.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 20 Jan 2007 07:04:03 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 10:57

My whole argument is that because the legality of marijuana is a moral issue, it should be made legal. Nobody has the right to tell ANYBODY what their morals should be (and I'm not saying you are).

Its morally wrong to kill in cold blood, IMHO, but hey!! thats subjective, lets make it legal and kill at will.

I want to drink and drive, its also subjective, lets make that legal, as I dont want to use a taxi on a night out.

Oh, I need some money, rob a bank, its subjective as to who owns the money, the bank or the insurance company.

No one has the right to tell us what to do, lets make everything legal. Well sorry to inform you that you are wrong.

Its because of people like you that society needs rules. I am afraid that you lost the right to decide legalities when you elected your Government to speak and vote internally on your behalf.

Dont even come back with the retort that you are underage or that you dont vote.

Get on with life. Weed IS illegal, tough schnitzel.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 20 Jan 2007 16:33:37 GMT

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

you're a fuckin idiot

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 20 Jan 2007 16:37:03 GMT

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

puddle_splasher wrote on Sat, 20 January 2007 02:04j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 10:57

My whole argument is that because the legality of marijuana is a moral issue, it should be made legal. Nobody has the right to tell ANYBODY what their morals should be (and I'm not saying you are).

Its morally wrong to kill in cold blood, IMHO, but hey!! thats subjective, lets make it legal and kill at will.

I want to drink and drive, its also subjective, lets make that legal, as I dont want to use a taxi on a night out.

Oh, I need some money, rob a bank, its subjective as to who owns the money, the bank or the insurance company.

No one has the right to tell us what to do, lets make everything legal. Well sorry to inform you that you are wrong.

Its because of people like you that society needs rules. I am afraid that you lost the right to decide legalities when you elected your Government to speak and vote internally on your behalf.

Dont even come back with the retort that you are underage or that you dont vote.

Get on with life. Weed IS illegal, tough schnitzel.

Uhh... all of those things you've said... THEY IMPOSE ON EVERYBODY ELSE'S RIGHTS. THAT'S WHY THEY'RE ILLEGAL. SMOKING MARIJUANA DOESN'T IMPOSE ON OTHERS' RIGHTS. THAT'S WHY DRINKING ALCOHOL IS LEGAL, BUT DRIVING DRUNK IS NOT.

STOP BEING SUCH A FUCKING TOOL.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 20 Jan 2007 17:48:16 GMT

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

We aren't talking about harming others. We are talking about what I can do with my own body. If what I'm doing hurts someone then you punish me for that.

Cigarettes:

I don't smoke cigarettes. Why? Because I tried it once hated the taste in my lungs. Cigarettes are legal but I'm not out doing it just cause I can, but if I ever wanted one I could have one without robbing someone or going underground to get one. If I do get one and blow smoke in your face then I'm violating your rights but me just smoking it for myself isn't harming anyone but me and that's my right to do so whether you agree to it or not.

Alcohol:

I used to drink heavily then got alcohol poisoning and had to stop. I got very sick from it. I

can't even stand the smell of it that much anymore but I still have the occasional fluff drinks like the wine coolers or amaretto sours. I never once got behind the wheel of a car after drinking even the smallest amounts. Now if I want to drink something I can. If I want to drink and drive that's illegal and should be because I'm now imposing my rights on you. If I want to grab a drink for myself I have every right to do so whether you think I should or shouldn't.

Alcohol is legal and has been for sometime now but you don't see me out giving it to kids or killing someone just to get a drink if I wanted one.

Pot:

I don't smoke it now because of work. If it were made legal I'd have one or two. Some of you here seem to be in a panic mode that if pot is made legal all fabric of society will collapse and sound minded individuals will be running out to give the first 6 year old we see a joint.

If I want to smoke a joint and it only effects me I should be allowed to do so without having to go to some punk on the street and paying for crime basically to have one. It's my right to put into my own body what I want to whether you like it or not. I don't tell you what music you can listen to don't tell me what I stick in my own body. If by smoking pot that causes me to harm you then you punish the crime not the drug.

If someone shoots someone else do we punish the gun or the act of killing someone else? You violated someone else's rights but holding the gun or having a gun itself is not a crime. If you drink and drive are you punished for just drinking or is it for drinking and driving. If not then police need to be busting down all the bars and peoples homes just like in prohibition days.

Just because something is made legal doesn't mean all hell is going to break lose? Its already breaking lose with it being illegal if you haven't noticed.

What I do to my own body is only my business and no one else's whether you think its morally right or not. If I impose anything on you then that's wrong but I should have every legal right to do with me as I want as long as I don't harm anyone else. And before you go on spouting about morals again I believe one of those morals are do not judge other people lest you be judged.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 20 Jan 2007 17:57:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some folks get illegal and immoral mixed up, and start to thing that something's legal standing is directly associated to how right or wrong it is.

j_ball pretty much nailed it on the head- murder, drunk driving, robbing banks, all those things are both illegal and immoral. They violate the rights of other people besides the person committing the act, therefore they are wrong. Laws exist to protect the common folk from other people who would take away or violate their rights.

Laws do NOT exist to tell people what they can and cannot do with their own bodies. Having a beer or smoking a joint does nothing to violate the rights of anyone besides the person consuming the substance, provided they do it where the use of that substance is welcome.

Legislated morality is one of the biggest problems facing our nation (and the whole world, for that matter); you can see its effects in everything from videogames to that stupid proposal for a marriage amendment. The government has NO right to tell its citizens what they may or may not do with regards to their private lives; government exists only to protect the people from other people, not from themselves.

All that said, I don't support the legalization of hard drugs, such as heroin or cocaine- the reason for that is simple: there isn't a person around who can control those addictions. Whenever someone becomes addicted to hard drugs it typically leads to them becoming more violent. They will do anything for their next fix after a point, up to and including destroying their families, stealing, and committing murder.

That isn't the case with weed. There are certainly cases of people who let their habit get way out of control, but you may find cases of people who did that with alcohol as well. Pot, IMHO, is a waste of a person's money, body, and time, but it's not my place or anyone else's to tell someone they can't use it if they really want to. Weed, unlike hard drugs, just doesn't do enough damage on its own to push a person over the edge into being a threat to the people around them.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 21 Jan 2007 01:54:27 GMT

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

Finally found a speech that sums up all of my feelings on the "war on drugs."

I love you, Christian Michel.

Should drugs be prohibited?

To begin this conference, I would like to recount a true story. From January 1919, American Catholic priests were required to obtain authorisation from the Federal administration to buy Communion wine. Prohibition had begun. During twelve long years, the production, trade and consumption of alcoholic drinks was totally prohibited in the United States. Very soon, there mushroomed numerous, ostensibly Christian, sects for the purpose of celebrating, with administrative dispensation, the Holy Communion in both kinds. Observers noted the remarkable zeal which the faithful showed in taking consecrated wine.

The by-passing of the prohibition law was not limited to a few wily individuals. The mafia, used to operating illegally, seized this superb opportunity to diversify their income, traditionally linked to gambling and prostitution. Illegal distilleries proliferated throughout the country. Hastily produced, with no regard to hygiene, their products often drove the consumer to folly or blindness, but which left him with no recourse. Other gangs, targeting wealthy customers, smuggled quality spirits from

Europe. Bootleg money corrupted the State to the very top. One remarkable example is that of Joseph Kennedy, founder of the dynasty which gave the country a president and several senators: After making a fortune in the fraudulent importation of alcohol, he got himself appointed head of the powerful and prestigious Stock Exchange Commission by those very politicians he had for so long kept in his pay.

The most tragic consequence of Prohibition was, of course, the spectacular increase in murder. As they could not go to court, the gangs sorted out their disagreements by street fighting and killings which still haunt the memories of cities like Chicago. It has been written that the violence generated by Prohibition caused more deaths during the twelve years it lasted than cirrhosis and alcohol-induced accidents.

If everything I've said does not remind you of what's happening today with the prohibition of cocaine and other drugs, then you've been living for 20 years on a desert island with no newspaper and no radio.

Now, what happened in the United States when Prohibition was over? Multinationals as well as small producers put unadulterated wines and spirits up for sale. The only war that they waged against each other was through advertising and slashed prices. The mafia turned its back on this sector, and there were no more cases of corruption or "money laundering". And, oddly enough, alcohol and cigarette consumption drops in many countries where their sale is allowed.

Has the experience that I've just described to you of alcohol prohibition in the States nothing to teach us, or is it relevant to our analysis of the new prohibition that now targets amphetamines, cocaine, heroin, cannabis..., what in fact are commonly called "drugs" ? There is something that I find frightening in the toughness and the violence of the suppression of drug addicts. The vocabulary and the means used are really those pertaining to war. In our own country, which portrays itself as a model of the legally constituted state, police authorities and magistrates call for emergency legislation and exceptions to the law on the pretext that they will corner and punish dealers. As in the glorious days of Nazism and Stalinism, denunciation becomes obligatory. When, governments everywhere show such repressive unanimity, should not the asking of questions be the very least of our duty as citizens? Could it be, for example, that we are repeating the mistakes of alcohol prohibitionists whose remedies caused more deaths than the blight they wanted to fight? Could it be that repression suits the business of the mafia as much as that of the politicians? Everything that concerns drugs has a bearing on our subconscious, and it is precisely because the emotion which drugs generate provokes all manner of manipulations that we must ask ourselves such questions.

The Persecution Of Drug Addicts

The most important manipulation is of course based on vocabulary. When magistrates and police authorities maintain that they wage a "war on drugs", they abuse words. "Persecution" is the correct word. Calling their crusade "persecution" would make the policemen's case less popular, but it would better describe the reality. You will note that in a war, there are two adversaries who struggle to impose themselves on each other. The addict, by comparison, threatens no one ; he has certainly chosen the wrong path, but he compels no one to follow him ; the addict forces no one to take drugs, it is us who want, by sheer force of arms, to impose on him our own way of living. I wonder, therefore, what are the reasons behind this persecution. Why are drugs prohibited? For there cannot be -absolutely not- any rational justification to prohibit the manufacture, the commercialisation, and the consumption of drugs. No moral reason exists. No economic reason exists. No social reason exists. The persecution practised by our governments is beyond reason. Its absurdity is such that we must look for its roots in our fears, in the fear felt by our society when faced with attempts at modifying various states of consciousness. We don't like mystics, shamans, we ridicule clairvoyants, we lock up the mentally deranged even if they are not dangerous; we persecute drug users, as we once burnt witches. In our so-called secular civilisation, the persecution of drug users is of a religious nature. This is what I want to explain.

The Real Dangers Of Drugs

At the outset, let me tell you that, like any father in the West I am confronted with the problem of drugs. For me drugs mean neither the intellectual stimulants taken by Einstein, Freud (or Sherlock Holmes), nor the catalyst of dreams and visions so loved by Baudelaire, Malraux, Cocteau, Michaux and many others. I am appalled that today drugs are what school children pass on to their friends, they are what were in the syringes thrown about in the public parks, they are what are consumed by junkies with their loose gums and their swollen toes so horribly jabbed because toes are less easily visible by the police than the arm.

However, I also have another experience of drugs. For ten years, I was president of a French company which produced cocaine -entirely legally as this alkaloid still has medical uses. The cocaine we produced under the supervision of the Ministry of Health and under police control was of the purest quality and was sold to pharmaceutical laboratories and hospitals. From time to time, customs officers sent us what they had seized, hoping that, after treatment, we would buy from them the retrieved cocaine. These products, confiscated from dealers, disconcerted our best chemists and were for me the revelation of a huge aberration in our repressive policy. Contraband cocaine was so adulterated, mixed with almost any white powder, washing powder, even plaster, there were so many impurities that eight times out of ten, it was irretrievable. But I realised that this was the mixture that young people sniffed or injected themselves with. The dangerous difference between the cocaine we produced in our laboratory and that sold in the streets was one of impurities. The paste that a dealer sells off is potentially lethal, not so much because of the

cocaine it contains as the products mixed with it.

This is easily explained. As you have seen many times on television, cocaine is extracted from the leaves of a plant, the coca. Its extraction involves a chemical process which calls for simple but bulky equipment. The prohibition of cocaine production means that the laboratories where the extraction is carried out must remain hidden in farms, disused factories, shanty towns and that they must frequently be moved; the conditions of hygiene can in no way be satisfactory. The sale of organic solvents required for the extraction process is itself controlled by the police.

Underground chemists therefore use substitutes that they themselves prepare in their garage and in their cellars and you can imagine their quality. This adulterated paste must then cross frontiers and remain undetected by customs. Recently, I heard that an antique dealer was arrested in Geneva. He was importing paintings, far too many paintings according to customs officers. Cocaine was diluted in the varnish of the paintings. Somebody was going to inject himself with the varnish in which there was a little bit of powder.

The Effects Of Operating Underground

The necessity of transporting the goods illegally encourages drug dealers to sell the hardest drugs, those which for a minimum volume are the most potent. The same phenomenon was noticed -and for the same reasons- during Prohibition: beer and cider had almost disappeared to the profit of gin and whisky. The rule is that a prohibited substance is rapidly replaced by a more noxious one. Then, when the drug reaches its destination the dealers cut it to increase their profits. This is, of course, a new pollution of the product, and an additional risk for the addict, as he doesn't know in which proportion the drug was cut, and therefore he cannot calculate the dose of active principle he is going to take. Suppose you take sleeping tablets, all looking alike, some of them containing one gram of active ingredients, the others ten grams or more. One day you won't wake up. This is how addicts die of an overdose.

The drug business, like any other human activity, is subject to economic coherence. Severe repression, which in certain countries goes as far as the death penalty, is the reason why supply is reduced while demand remains high. Prohibition, therefore, ensures high prices to drug dealers. Like any other entrepreneur, they want to reduce risks, in their case, that of being arrested ; however their commercial margin is sufficiently large for them to bribe the authorities, and as a consequence, the risk tied to illegality remains, at least for the big dealers, more theoretical than real.

The high prices of drugs resulting from their prohibition, explain the delinquent or violent acts which threaten the whole population, even that section, which keeps itself well away from drug trafficking. On the one hand, armed gangs fight over this lucrative business, indifferently killing

rivals or passers-by. On the other hand, many consumers can only find the money for their doses by stealing. Even if you've never been a victim of the delinquency of addicts, you are made to bear the costs. Insurance companies pass them on to you in the premiums they charge.

This recourse to theft explains why high prices for the product do not curb consumption, as would be the case on a legal market. Since they are in any case forced into hiding, drug consumers have no qualms about stealing the money they don't earn, and this gives them a purchasing power which in theory is unlimited. True, to steal without being caught demands a certain aptitude but addicts have ready recourse to "snowball" sales. It is in the interest of a heroin addict to buy more of the product than he consumes and to build up a clientele to whom he sells the surplus. Thus it is up to his clients to do the dirty job of stealing car radios or snatching hand bags.

Drug prohibition is a typical example of administrative intervention gone awry. The impression is given that dealers are being fought and some are, indeed, arrested, but, at the same time, exorbitant profits are ensured to many others. Again the impression is given that addicts are being protected against themselves, but prohibition encourages dealers to market only the most dangerous drugs. The impression is given that by eliminating a vice a moral stature is brought to society: yet violence and delinquency increase and society as a whole has to pay the moral and material costs.

The Benefits Of Legalisation

I start from the hypothesis that the real aim of the authorities is to protect addicts and to put an end to crime linked to drug trafficking. I am not convinced that this hypothesis is the right one but let's assume for the moment that it is so. In such a case, would not the legalisation of drugs be the solution? I am not talking of decriminalising consumption: this half-measure adopted in the Netherlands and which could be viewed as a step in the right direction does not rule out the dangers inherent in illegal manufacturing. Legalisation simply means that drugs will be sold through the usual commercial outlets, like wine and cigarettes.

Recommending the sale of hashish and cocaine in grocery shops perhaps be considered by some of you as monstrous. However, the advantages of changing a shady and gory traffic into a transparent market are decisive. In every free market, suppliers are identifiable companies or private individuals responsible under civil law. The day suppliers market hashish, marijuana, cocaine, ecstasy, LSD... under their name or their brand, every consumer will be certain he is buying a product which is not adulterated (and if it was, the consumer could sue the supplier and claim damages : this of course is impossible today, given the under-hand nature of the business).

Competition amongst suppliers also brings the prospect of a decrease in the toxicity of products. Let's not forget that while we call the user of drugs an addict, he is not in fact aiming at poisoning himself, but at a sort of physical well-being. Yet, eliminating the toxicity is as much the objective of the supplier as the wish of the addict. Even if you think that businessmen have not an ounce of humanism, you have to recognise, however, that sane commercial logic considers killing customers not a viable strategy. The moment they will be free to market what will no longer be called drugs, but rather intellectual stimulants or dream inductors, industrialists will want to satisfy consumer demand by creating correctly measured products which have no side effects. Today, with or without the encouragement of the authorities, companies have in fact put on the market light cigarettes, sugar-free colas and chewing gums, decaffeinated coffee, cholesterol-free cooking oils... By the same logic, drug manufacturers will compete to offer the least noxious products. In any event, the availability of products with almost similar effects naturally suppresses the need for more toxic products. Why risk taking absinthe when pastis is available? Similarly, why would one risk taking crack when pure and cheap cocaine would be available on the market?

It is to be hoped that when laboratories will be allowed to carry out research on these products -which as you know is completely prohibited today- they will quickly find a way of reducing the phenomenon of addiction brought about by certain drugs. Contrary to what a superficial analysis can lead one to believe, addiction does not play in favour of the producer. Rather, the fear of addiction and the frightening sequels of withdrawal act as a constraint to any increase in consumption. Now, who is the producer who would not like to see the removal of constraints to the dissemination of his product?

Another welcome consequence of total legalisation would be the fall in price, which would free the addict from the necessity of recourse to delinquency for the purchase of his dose. Less toxic and less expensive products mean that the consumer will often be able to keep his job and that his salary will allow him to satisfy his needs. A commercial margin which does not include the cost of the illegality of the transaction will demotivate the mafia, who will then quickly turn their attention to more lucrative activities.

Learning To Drink, To Smoke, To Snort

The liberalisation of drugs will not mean a world of junkies any more than the end of Prohibition turned the United States into a country of drunkards. It is not police repression, but example and education which can ensure a limitation of drug consumption. There is pathological behaviour linked to what we consume (chain smokers, bulimics and alcoholics...), but social norms, rites and customs act as moderators on each one of us. In the West, one does not smoke anywhere or at any time; one does not drink in the morning or between meals before the evening... For the Indians of Mexico, there are rites that have to be followed before chewing peyote. Parents teach these rules to their children. The socialisation of consumption ensures the handing down from one

generation to another of lessons concerning the good and bad use of drugs. Yet, repression does not only hit the product, but it also affects its mode of use. In the closed secret world of addicts the wildest illusions and myths are entertained about substances which in fact, more than any other, need to be treated with sagacity and competence. Legalising drugs, rendering them commonplace, and, at the same time, diminishing the danger they represent, will ensure as a consequence that we can integrate them within our culture and exercise control on their use.

A Poor Excuse For A Prohibitionist Policy

We are witnessing the failure of repression. I think you can agree that repression doesn't work: you just have to look around you. Fifty percent of criminal prosecutions in a country like France, fifty percent of imprisonment in the United States are linked to drugs. This figure is appalling, and yet, the number of drug addicts does not fall. How far are we prepared to go? Should we put a policeman in each classroom, in each night-club? Against the background of this failure I have tried to describe the advantages that a total legalisation of drugs would bring. Why do we then insist on a course of repression and failure, when there exists an alternative?

This stubbornness cannot be for economic reasons. Even from the point of view of the persecuting States, which are always semi-bankrupt, legalisation becomes a fiscal source: by the stroke of the abolitionist's pen, the whole of the drug business becomes taxable. On the other hand, illegality brings about consequential expenses without equivalent income. Look at the bottle-necks at the law courts, the maintenance of customs controls at the borders, the police networks across the country, the imprisonment of tens of thousands of drug dealers, to which must be added the cost of hospital treatment administered to drug addicts, the spread of AIDS, etc. From an economic point of view, legalisation cannot cost more than repression.

Repression can no longer be justified for social or public health reasons. The argument, here, would be that used by supporters of abortion. Since abortions cannot be effectively prohibited, let us at least ensure that the mother's life is not put at risk. We do not have to approve the choice of a life on drugs or the termination of a pregnancy, but when the choice is made we must ensure that we do not add a physical risk to the moral fault. It is astonishing that the same politicians, who approved the termination of pregnancies on the basis of this argument, now refuse to take it into account when dealing with the problem of drugs. And since we are talking of public health, I wish to highlight certain facts: first, alcohol in France, kills a 100 times more than drugs, and drugs would kill even fewer if they were not prohibited; second, just as drinking a glass of wine at every meal does not necessarily turn someone into an alcoholic, the progression from soft to hard drugs is not an automatic process. In the United States, there are 40 million people who have smoked pot, and only 700,000 heroin addicts, that is only 1.75 % of soft drug users have gone for harder stuff. Contrary to a widespread idea, it is not the product that induces addiction, but rather the psychology of the individual who seeks this addiction. Very few of the thousands of American G.I.s who took heroin in Vietnam have known problems of addiction once

back home.

Finally, it is not for moral reasons that we maintain repression. The distinction that must be made here lies between ethics and the law: it is not because a product or a behaviour are beneficial that the authorities must make them compulsory (at best, they can content themselves with giving advice); and it is not because other products or behaviour are dangerous for those who adopt them that the authorities have to prohibit them (they only have to issue warnings). The role of the authorities in a legally-constituted state is to protect citizens against attacks from others, not against themselves. "Freedom is to be able to do everything that does not harm others", states the Declaration of Human Rights. Wearing a veil or feathers on one's head, eating pork, drinking alcohol, taking alkaloids or undergoing a medical treatment are choices which (eventually) can be prejudicial only to those who have made them, not to others. Each one of us should be able to paraphrase Voltaire: "I don't approve of what you snort, but I will fight to the very end so that you can do it".

Confusing vice and crime, morals and the law is the very essence of fundamentalism. Morally, fundamentalism is indefensible; morals can only exist when there is freedom. The paradox lies in the fact that the very leaders of Western democracies who proclaim themselves the champions of freedom are those who, at the same time, practise the most retrograde of fundamentalism as they lead the fight against drugs. This is an ideological position which is difficult to maintain: how can one explain that every adult has the right to elect the leaders of the City, to express opinions on taxation rates, on the death penalty, on school regulations,... that is how can one explain that the citizen has enough judgement to decide how others should live, but would not have enough judgement to decide how he himself should live?

Of What Contraband Are We Talking?

The question, therefore, is why should we maintain repression if it does not respond to economic, social and moral requirements, if it can in no way overcome the evil it allegedly sets out to fight? I will suggest two answers. One: What if the ultimate aim was repression itself? if the fight against drugs was only an excuse? If the real goal was not the eradication of drugs but to find a means of imposing on freedom-loving populations laws that, in fact, destroy their most fundamental freedoms ? The big clandestine operation brought about by drugs would be the surreptitious introduction of war-time police measures.

Files are no longer kept on "commies" ; however, since spying on citizens still goes on, it is those who are suspected of having contacts with dealers on whom records are kept. Since citizens do not like the idea that their telephone conversations are tapped and since there is no longer a Cold War to justify it, the "war on drugs" is therefore used as an excuse. It is because of this so-called

"war" that governments try to prohibit the encryption of messages on the Internet. When it came to the removal of border controls within the European Union, customs officers avoided the threat of losing their employment by invoking the danger of drug smuggling. It is in the name of this convenient "war" against drug traffickers that arbitrary police custody is authorised while officers can confiscate goods and properties without recourse to law courts.

Certainly, this is not a huge plot hatched against freedom by the governments of the world. Democracies do not operate in this way. In our countries, numerous vested interests must converge for a fundamental policy of this amplitude to be accepted. However, it is a fact that many professionals responsible for repression, while sincerely deploring the fate of addicts, would experience great difficulty in finding a job other than that of persecuting these same addicts. The law needs delinquents (whom, with reason, policemen term as their "clients"). This is why drug repression serves many interests. It is not to be thought that servants of the State have no personal interests just because they seem less motivated than others by money. Of course they are career-minded, they attach a lot of importance to their public image and this is in the normal course of things. Obviously, they look for job-satisfaction but unfortunately they can only find it in the most pernicious of passions: namely, the exercise of power over others.

The farmer will try to sell his milk at a higher price, the bookseller will try to sell more books; to you this seems quite normal. The same logic of personal interest dictates that policemen permanently press for more severe repression since it inflates their social importance and their budget. For prosecutors, repression is the gateway to promotions and celebrity. Politicians boast on television that they defend the country's youth and moral health. Making the most of this opportunity, taxmen obtain the removal of bank confidentiality laws, while customs officers carry out searches without warrants. For these junior and top servants of the State the protection of their sinecures, the assertion of their power, the carrying out of a vast crusade with international press coverage are strong motivations. Meanwhile, addicts die and dealers thrive.

It is clear therefore, that the greatest virtue of repression is its uselessness. Because it will never achieve its aims, it ensures the permanence of the bureaucracies responsible for its exercise.

The New Inquisition

There is, however, another explanation. Such determination, the use of so many means cannot be the sole expression of vested interests. Few human beings are capable of repeated and systematic attacks on innocents with the sole purpose of promoting their careers. The persecutor needs to believe in something; his prosecutors, policemen and informers must have the assurance that they are serving a superior cause which removes all responsibility for the violence they use and justifies in advance every possible abuse.

In the case of drugs, I maintain that this justification is of a religious order. I believe it is not possible to explain the persecution of addicts if there is no reference to the notion of religious persecution.

Let me make myself clear. In every society, there are food restrictions: alcohol and pork for the Muslims, beef for the Hindus, innumerable products for the Jews... It is not because these products are dangerous to health that they are prohibited. The Greeks and Romans, living under the same climatic conditions as Israel, ate everything that the Jews went without. These restrictions have a symbolic significance. They confirm, amongst other things a sense of belonging to a society. Dietary taboos force the Muslim to assert in front of his hosts that he belongs to the people of the Koran who are not allowed to eat pork. Our people are a people of technology, of triumphant rationality and, we are not allowed to consume products which can impair our capacity to think rationally. Any drug which modifies our state of consciousness represents a sacrilege towards the cult of Rationality.

But here there is a paradox. Rationality and technical progress are the only values with which modern societies can oppose the culture of drugs. Technology has enabled us to multiply Nature's resources, to transform matter (for better or for worse); it has enabled us to modify the infectious, physiological and cellular developments that take place within the human body ; it has also allowed us to modify the various states of consciousness.

Since this innovation is possible, it will indeed take place and the guardians of morality will not be able to do anything against society's urge to experiment. They will not be able to stop people from going further in the exploration of human potential: the exploration of physical potential through sports and medicine; of creative potential through business, art and science ; and the exploration of our potential in terms of our consciousness through asceticism, trance and the use of drugs.

To put it simply, the persecution of addicts is carried out by those who are against progress. Obscurantism has changed sides. Official dogma and the ideology of power are no longer those of the Roman Curia, they belong to scientists. White overcoats now replace cassocks. Scientists thought they could explain mathematically the choices, the aspirations, the feelings of human beings, and that they could plan life by planning the economy. The drug addict reminds us suddenly that there are other values that cannot be accounted for mathematically, other values than those of rationality, even if they are not the ones that you and I would want for ourselves.

The other paradox is that with these so-called champions of the rational, any rational debate on drugs is impossible. To paraphrase Timothy Leary, we can say that drugs are substances that induce irrational, delirious behaviour amongst those who never take them. Here, we stand firmly in the world of beliefs. We have here the proof that this persecution is of a religious order. Trying to explain to a prosecutor in Geneva or in New-York that one can derive pleasure in smoking a joint is as useless (and as dangerous) as to speak highly of a vintage Bordeaux wine to an Ayatollah. Having said that, why not? I do not have any problems with this absence of dialogue. We do not need to discuss our religious convictions; we only need the right to practise them. We don't need to convince others as to the benefits derived from cocaine or from wine; suffice it that others allow us to consume them. What we need to start in our society is not a debate on drugs but on Rights. The only question that needs to be asked in relation to drugs is whether a human being -an adult, a citizen and an elector- has the right to ingest in all lucidity a substance which he believes brings him pleasure without his threatening anybody else.

Withdrawal Symptoms

What this question of drugs reveals is the extent to which our society experiences withdrawal symptoms - withdrawal from freedom. Yet, I am sure that the full legalisation of drugs is as inevitable in the future as it is difficult to imagine today. I maintain that in 20 years from now, our children will be astounded to learn that we persecuted addicts in the same manner that we, today, find it difficult to imagine that our parents imprisoned homosexuals and beer brewers and that our forefathers burnt heretics and witches.

To end, allow me to make a wish. I hope one day that our society will stop persecuting those who want to live differently, without forcing others to follow them. I hope it will stop persecuting those who explore new modes of life where we fear to tread. In other words, I wish that wars of religion are not inevitable.

Comments?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Sun, 21 Jan 2007 02:32:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I got through most of it, a little biased and a bit of stretching reality at times but pretty much hit the nail on the head - It would be good if users would make their voices heard on these issues but due to the fact they are all committing crimes it makes that difficult in a serious political sense, the subject of legalisation never seems to get an serious public support here in England at least and it's all too easy to make the majority of the population who choose not to do drugs buy in to the whole bullshit principle that I am a criminal because I choose to smoke a bit of weed.

It seems to me that legalisation requires the users to be proactive and demand it themselves, unfortunately we aren't always the most proactive people

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 14:43:46 GMT

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

Comments?

Junk.

An attempt by someone to use phrases that have no relation to what he is stating, other than to ensure that he is heard simply by their use.

Add in glossing over the bad, and associating it - incorrectly - with other wrong things, and emphasizing a good that is also incorrectly associated with things that have nothing to do with it. All in the hopes that someone will take what it says at face value with doing absolutely no research on it themselves, simply because it was composed in a way to make it sound good.

How... Michael Moore of him.

He comments that legalization would be beneficial as education would allow the usage to be monitored.

Kind of like how drug education works now, right?

Oh, wait... it doesn't. Otherwise it wouldn't be used. Especially with the health risks associated with it.

From Wikipedia[edit] Effects and health issues

[edit] Acute

Cocaine is a potent central nervous system stimulant. Its effects can last from 20 minutes to several hours, depending upon the dosage of cocaine taken, purity, and method of administration.

The initial signs of stimulation are hyperactivity, restlessness, increased blood pressure, increased heart rate and euphoria. The euphoria is sometimes followed by feelings of discomfort and depression and a craving to experience the drug again. Sexual interest and pleasure can be amplified. Side effects can include twitching, paranoia, and impotence, which usually increases with frequent usage.

With excessive dosage the drug can produce hallucinations, paranoid delusions, tachycardia, itching, and formication.

Overdose causes tachyarrhythmias and a marked elevation of blood pressure. These can be life-threatening, especially if the user has existing cardiac problems.

The LD50 of cocaine when administered to mice is 95.1 mg/kg.[13] Toxicity results in seizures, followed by respiratory and circulatory depression of medullar origin. This may lead to death from respiratory failure, stroke, cerebral hemorrhage, or heart-failure. Cocaine is also highly pyrogenic, because the stimulation and increased muscular activity cause greater heat production. Heat loss is inhibited by the intense vasoconstriction. Cocaine-induced hyperthermia may cause muscle cell destruction and myoglobinuria resulting in renal failure. There is no specific antidote for cocaine overdose.

Cocaine's primary acute effect on brain chemistry is to raise the amount of dopamine and serotonin in the nucleus accumbens (the pleasure center in the brain); this effect ceases, due to metabolism of cocaine to inactive compounds and particularly due to the depletion of the transmitter resources (tachyphylaxis). This can be experienced acutely as feelings of depression, as a "crash" after the initial high. Further mechanisms occur in chronic cocaine use.

[edit] Chronic

Chronic cocaine intake causes brain cells to adapt functionally to strong imbalances of transmitter levels in order to compensate extremes. Thus, receptors disappear from the cell surface or reappear on it, resulting more or less in an "off" or "working mode" respectively, or they change their susceptibility for binding partners (ligands) – mechanisms called down-/upregulation. Chronic cocaine use leads to a DAT upregulation[verification needed], further contributing to depressed mood states. Finally, a loss of vesicular monoamine transporters, neurofilament proteins, and other morphological changes appear to indicate a long term damage of dopamine neurons.

All these effects contribute to the rise in an abuser's tolerance thus requiring a larger dosage to achieve the same effect. The lack of normal amounts of serotonin and dopamine in the brain is the cause of the dysphoria and depression felt after the initial high. The diagnostic criteria for cocaine withdrawal is characterized by a dysphoric mood, fatigue, unpleasant dreams, insomnia or hypersomnia, E.D., increased appetite, psychomotor retardation or agitation, and anxiety.

Cocaine abuse also has multiple physical health consequences. It is associated with a lifetime risk of heart attack that is seven times that of non-users. During the hour after cocaine is used, heart attack risk rises 24-fold [14]

Side effects from chronic smoking of cocaine include chest pain, lung trauma, shortness of breath, sore throat, hoarse voice, dyspnea, and an aching, flu-like syndrome. A common misconception is that the smoking of cocaine chemically breaks down tooth enamel and causes tooth decay. However, cocaine does often cause involuntary tooth grinding, known as bruxism, which can deteriorate tooth enamel and lead to gingivitis.[15]

Chronic intranasal usage can degrade the cartilage separating the nostrils (the septum nasi),

leading eventually to its complete disappearance. Due to the absorption of the cocaine from cocaine hydrochloride, the remaining hydrochloride forms a dilute hydrochloric acid.[1]

Cocaine may also greatly increase this risk of developing rare autoimmune or connective tissue diseases such as lupus, Goodpasture's disease, vasculitis, glomerulonephritis, Stevens-Johnson syndrome and other diseases.[16][17][18][19] It can also cause a wide array of kidney diseases and renal failure.[20][21] While these conditions are normally found in chronic use they can also be caused by short term exposure in susceptible individuals.

There have been published studies[citation needed] reporting that cocaine causes changes in the frontal lobe of the brain. The full extent of possible brain deterioration from cocaine use is not known.

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!!!")

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 14:48:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43Drugs, on the other hand, STARTED OUT illegal.

Nope.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 14:54:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 08:48warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43Drugs, on the other hand, STARTED OUT illegal.

Nope.

x2

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 09:43Yes, 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.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 15:25:57 GMT

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

Sorry, I should have clarified. Of course nothing, literally, starts off as illegal.

My statement of starting off illegal should have implied that there was no great usage and acceptance before substances like cocaine were deemed illegal. Sure, Coke (the soft drink) may have laced their soda before it was illegal, but no general acceptance or great usage occurred that would make people complain about it becoming illegal.

Unlike say, alcohol and tobacco.

Though I do notice that's the only point of my post people seem to be disputing.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 15:36:37 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 15:25 Sorry, I should have clarified. Of course nothing, literally, starts off as illegal.

My statement of starting off illegal should have implied that there was no great usage and acceptance before substances like cocaine were deemed illegal. Sure, Coke (the soft drink) may have laced their soda before it was illegal, but no general acceptance or great usage occurred that would make people complain about it becoming illegal.

Unlike say, alcohol and tobacco.

Though I do notice that's the only point of my post people seem to be disputing.

Thats ok no one disputed anything in my posts a page back so i must be on the right path

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 15:43:03 GMT

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

Well, not much can be said about what goes on in your own time (hence why small amounts for personal use aren't deemed a major offence in Canada). Unfortunately, "your own time" is very little. Unless you live alone, and never have guests over.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 15:52:19 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43Well, not much can be said about what goes on in your own time (hence why small amounts for personal use aren't deemed a major offence in Canada). Unfortunately, "your own time" is very little. Unless you live alone, and never have guests over.

my guests would know i smoke pot. Just like if i had a cigg or drank. Up to them if they want to come over or not. And i would think my guests (friends) would be those like me.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 16:10:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Darkknight wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 08:52warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43Well, not much can be said about what goes on in your own time (hence why small amounts for personal use aren't deemed a major offence in Canada). Unfortunately, "your own time" is very little. Unless you live alone, and never have guests over.

my guests would know i smoke pot. Just like if i had a cigg or drank. Up to them if they want to come over or not. And i would think my guests (friends) would be those like me.

or if they were not like me i would air it out and febreze it all so they would not be bothered by it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 19:28:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Romaner wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 10:10Darkknight wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 08:52warranto wrote on Mon, 22 January 2007 09:43Well, not much can be said about what goes on in your own time (hence why small amounts for personal use aren't deemed a major offence in Canada). Unfortunately, "your own time" is very little. Unless you live alone, and never have guests over.

my guests would know i smoke pot. Just like if i had a cigg or drank. Up to them if they want to come over or not. And i would think my guests (friends) would be those like me.

or if they were not like me i would air it out and febreze it all so they would not be bothered by it.

We we're using Oust! and it seemed quite effective, we shall try febreze and see how it compares.

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, lets 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.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 15:32:53 GMT

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

Quote: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.

Or, just prevent the possibility by not using it at all. Why should the simple idea of it being regulated mean that it SHOULD be allowed?

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

He was referring to the fact that people forcefully oppose the use of drugs by use of the phrase "war on drugs" among other things.

Quote: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.

I clarified that in a subsequent post.

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

It is when the people asking for it are acting like children. "It's my right! Therefor it should be allowed!"

Try to come up with an actual argument rather than crying that all the time. I have yet to see any sort of reason for drugs to be allowed other than crying "rights violation" or by comparing it to something else. Nothing to explain the drug use itself.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 15:50:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sometimes it's nice to be in an altered mental state.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 19:08:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 16:50 Sometimes it's nice to be in an altered mental state.

Does your life suck that much?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 19:18:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto Try to come up with an actual argument rather than crying that all the time. I have yet to see any sort of reason for drugs to be allowed other than crying "rights violation" or by comparing it to something else. Nothing to explain the drug use itself.
How about the pleasure of a high. That's a pretty valid reason. It may be a very immoral reason to you, but as I've said numerous times throughout this thread, morality is subjective.

If I don't hurt you while I'm doing something, I see no reason why I should be punished for it.

Plus, if drugs are legalized, the quality can be better regulated to ensure a cleaner drug.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 19:32:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fuckin degenerate stoners...give them their legal weed and cut their welfare.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 19:56:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

all im for is lets not group weed with all the other drugs, all the other drugs are way more destructive to your body and your mental state than weed is. what i want to see is weed being treated same as alcohol cause really if you look at the research done about both they are pretty

much in the same class.

and i bet there are alot more alcoholics out there then people addicted to weed. you cannot overdose on weed and if you look at it this way you can get alcohol pisoning so really when you compare the two i would say better weed than alcohol. sure nobody wants to see people smoke it on the street, but yet we got bums that drink on the street. when i was in school and had to take the bus almost every day i would see some one (a bum most likely) drink on the bus, sometimes even mouthwash just to get drunk. but yet weed is so bad for you? please there are alot of things out there that are 10 or maybe even 100 times worse and more addictive than weed so why classify pot as this huge problem? or this huge concern. all im saying is would it impact society that much to legalize weed and slap the same restrictions for it as they do with alcohol. no public intoxication and no smoking and driving, now would that really ruin the society nowadays?

i think you all know the answer but choose not to face it. letting those who choose to get high before going to a movie, or maybe in a bar, and in the privacy of their own homes is not going to change anything. and just so you know i have never seen anyone get violent from smoking weed, something i cant say about people drinking.

on the most part a stoner is still more useful then an alcoholic for any job, and all weed does is make you relax and makes most people mellow. so how is that bad?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 20:00:02 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 12:18warrantoTry to come up with an actual argument rather than crying that all the time. I have yet to see any sort of reason for drugs to be allowed other than crying "rights violation" or by comparing it to something else. Nothing to explain the drug use itself.

How about the pleasure of a high. That's a pretty valid reason. It may be a very immoral reason to you, but as I've said numerous times throughout this thread, morality is subjective.

If I don't hurt you while I'm doing something, I see no reason why I should be punished for it.

Plus, if drugs are legalized, the quality can be better regulated to ensure a cleaner drug.

Who really cares about a cleaner drug? Oh right... only those who use it. I say if you're willing to use those sort of drugs, I could care less what happens to you. If taking them is so important, deal with the risks involved.

As for the "pleasure" of a high, I could care less. Just because it generates a pleasure, doesn't mean it should be done. Heck, "regulated" child porn would give some people pleasure, and it wouldn't hurt anyone as long as the industry was regulated, but I don't see that becoming legal any time soon.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 20:03:14 GMT

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

Romaner wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 12:56all im for is lets not group weed with all the other drugs, all the other drugs are way more destructive to your body and your mental state than weed is. what i want to see is weed being treated same as alcohol cause really if you look at the research done about both they are pretty much in the same class.

and i bet there are alot more alcoholics out there then people addicted to weed. you cannot overdose on weed and if you look at it this way you can get alcohol pisoning so really when you compare the two i would say better weed than alcohol. sure nobody wants to see people smoke it on the street, but yet we got bums that drink on the street. when i was in school and had to take the bus almost every day i would see some one (a bum most likely) drink on the bus, sometimes even mouthwash just to get drunk. but yet weed is so bad for you? please there are alot of things out there that are 10 or maybe even 100 times worse and more addictive than weed so why classify pot as this huge problem? or this huge concern. all im saying is would it impact society that much to legalize weed and slap the same restrictions for it as they do with alcohol. no public intoxication and no smoking and driving, now would that really ruin the society nowadays?

i think you all know the answer but choose not to face it. letting those who choose to get high before going to a movie, or maybe in a bar, and in the privacy of their own homes is not going to change anything. and just so you know i have never seen anyone get violent from smoking weed, something i cant say about people drinking.

on the most part a stoner is still more useful then an alcoholic for any job, and all weed does is make you relax and makes most people mellow. so how is that bad?

And act incredibly stupid, not to mention slow down their progress and cognitive abilities.

EVERY person I've encountered who was high acted just that way. "mellow and relaxed" to the point of not even caring about the job they were doing, or what was going on around them. One group of people who were quite obviously high were shouting at the movie screen in a theatre.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 20:10:01 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 15:00j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 12:18warrantoTry to come up with an actual argument rather than crying that all the time. I have yet to see any sort of reason for drugs to be allowed other than crying "rights violation" or by comparing it to something else. Nothing to explain the drug use itself.

How about the pleasure of a high. That's a pretty valid reason. It may be a very immoral reason to you, but as I've said numerous times throughout this thread, morality is subjective.

If I don't hurt you while I'm doing something, I see no reason why I should be punished for it.

Plus, if drugs are legalized, the quality can be better regulated to ensure a cleaner drug.

Who really cares about a cleaner drug? Oh right... only those who use it. I say if you're willing to use those sort of drugs, I could care less what happens to you. If taking them is so important, deal with the risks involved.

As for the "pleasure" of a high, I could care less. Just because it generates a pleasure, doesn't mean it should be done. Heck, "regulated" child porn would give some people pleasure, and it wouldn't hurt anyone as long as the industry was regulated, but I don't see that becoming legal any time soon.

Simple argument against child porn: Non-consenting adults. That is why it's illegal, and that's why it'll remain illegal.

Just because something might be better off left alone doesn't mean it should be outlawed unless it imposes on the rights of others. Again, stop trying to objectify morality.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 20:45:00 GMT

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

Oh, I'm not trying to objectify anything.

As for the "non-consenting" aspect, would only work if the parents did not consent to the act... but what if the parents did? Would it be OK then, if it were regulated, to allow it because it gives some people pleasure?

Quote:Just because something might be better off left alone doesn't mean it should be outlawed unless it imposes on the rights of others.

Or the general populace is too immature to handle that responsibility.

Which is why Driving while drunk is illegal (simply driving drunk doesn't impose on anyone's rights... it only does if there is an accident involving someone else or their property), and heck... even why being drunk in public is wrong. People (as a group) are far too immature NOT to get so drunk that they would do those things... so the government makes it illegal so they can impose penalties on those who are not mature enough to handle it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 21:03:00 GMT

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

warrantoOh, I'm not trying to objectify anything.

As for the "non-consenting" aspect, would only work if the parents did not consent to the act... but what if the parents did? Would it be OK then, if it were regulated, to allow it because it gives some people pleasure?

Quote:Just because something might be better off left alone doesn't mean it should be outlawed unless it imposes on the rights of others.

Or the general populace is too immature to handle that responsibility.

Which is why Driving while drunk is illegal (simply driving drunk doesn't impose on anyone's rights... it only does if there is an accident involving someone else or their property), and heck... even why being drunk in public is wrong. People (as a group) are far too immature NOT to get so drunk that they would do those things... so the government makes it illegal so they can impose penalties on those who are not mature enough to handle it.

No, it's not okay if the parents consent. Parents consent to beating their kids. Parents consent to forcing their children into labor. Parents consent to incest. Parental consent doesn't mean everything

Marijuana may make people lazy, but alcohol makes people lazy, aggressive, sad, ecstatic, etc... and can be just as detrimental, but society hasn't fallen apart because of it since Prohibition ended. In fact, it was worse when alcohol was banned.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 21:08:12 GMT

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

Romaner wrote on Wed, 17 January 2007 16:36crimson i get your point, but it sounds to me that this ex of yours had alot of stuff going on with him and weed was just the tip of the iceberg. yes smoking weed does make you loose your judgement for a period of time, but it all depends on how you handle yourself when you are high on it. and how much you consume.

I already said that. He was planning to kill himself that night. But my point is, when he was on weed, he didn't care about the consequences of his actions, and therefore pulled the trigger on some random woman who had the audacity to deliver him a pizza. Whether he would have done it while not on weed is up for debate, but I think most people can agree that weed gives you a relaxed, don't give a shit type of mentality.

Quote:plus again age is a factor, how old was your ex when all this was going on, how mature was he to begin with. i mean if you are immature and inconsiderate of others then smoking weed would only make you worse.

I think he was 21 or 22 at the time. His maturity level was definitely questionable. He abused alcohol and weed all the time.

Quote:plus just like alcohol some people are just not cut out for it and should not use it. unfortunately those are the people that usually end up using it more and more till they get completely out of control. also i play ren when im high (thats why my join mesage says intoxicated at work lol), and i react pretty fast i would say. having said that i would never get high before or during work cause i really cant fuck up or its going to be a very big mess.

And this is a perfect argument for keeping weed illegal. But, then again, I don't think alcohol

should be legal, either. People in general don't seem to be mature enough to consume it until they're like 25.

Quote:and since you said it was a 6.50\$ an hour job for an assistant manager i would say you guys were pretty young back then.

also no offense but i hope you pick them better now if you know what i mean.

Um, yeah, that was in 1998-1999 so I was like 18-19. And, I do pick them better. Not to go into too many details, but this particular person was never a "boyfriend", just someone I went out with a few times.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 21:08:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gbull wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 14:08mrpirate wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 16:50Sometimes it's nice to be in an altered mental state.

Does your life suck that much?

Yeah because I'm going to turn 21 this year and I'm not even engaged to be married yet.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 21:09:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 14:08gbull wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 14:08mrpirate wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 16:50Sometimes it's nice to be in an altered mental state.

Does your life suck that much?

Yeah because I'm going to turn 21 this year and I'm not even engaged to be married yet.

Don't get married until you're at least 25 (and she is too) or you'll probably end up regretting it.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 21:11:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

haha that was just a jab at gbull; marriage is not in my immediate plans.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Romaner](#) on Mon, 05 Feb 2007 23:07:45 GMT

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

crimson, i once again want to state what i posted in my previous reply. that if regulated properly weed isnt going to change anything in the community from what you see it as of right now. i mean you would not let a drunk person work for you so then why let a person that is stoned (high on weed) work for you? but when they go home do you really care if they smoke a joint? or have a beer? but that doesnt mean weed should be illegal it only means it should be controlled. you guys meaning mostly you warranto, dont really take my point for what it is. i am not for letting people run the streets high as a kite, and going to work while drooling from their mouths. all im saying is in the privacy of your home or just after work hours whats so bad about it? and if all the same restrictions are imposed on weed as they are on alcohol then what is the problem? also just out of interest warranto have you ever smoked a joint in your life? if no then all the description that you have provided for weed is from studies and hearing others say it, you really base your opinion on that... not personal experience. and dont get me wrong for some things like cocain, crack, herion etc. i would never try it myself but weed...

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 00:05:15 GMT

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

No, I have never smoked a joint, nor will I ever do that.

The descriptions I've provided were from what I have seen (as in, with my own two eyes) others act like.

As for personal experience, you don't need it when you can make educated guesses.

If you let people have unrestricted access (I don't mean kids getting a hold of it, I mean as with current tobacco and alcohol distribution), it will be abused... regardless of the intent of the law. Before you bring in the failure of the prohibition of alcohol, let me remind you: the only reason that failed was because of how ingrained the consumption of alcohol is on the world's culture. Had it been illegal to begin with (way back when it was first developed), the prohibition of alcohol would have succeeded, if needed at all. This is the same reason people are so reluctant regarding current tobacco laws about its prohibition in public places. It's history is what makes people resistant, not the simple idea itself. The facts of its history, that is.

Without it's current history, I have no doubt that alcohol would be more restricted (it does have direct health-related benefits - ie. small consumption of wine leading to a stronger heart.. or whatever it was), and smoking would never have gotten a foothold.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 00:22:41 GMT

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

Crimson, your claim that marijuana would make people commit acts of violence because they're "too high to consider the consequences" is completely bogus. You can't immediately associate his violence or negligence with being high just because he was high while committing violent acts. Try finding anything reliable on the web that ties violence to marijuana use. If someone committed a crime, he or she should only be prosecuted for that crime (this includes alcohol).

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 00:52:18 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 19:05No, I have never smoked a joint, nor will I ever do that.

The descriptions I've provided were from what I have seen (as in, with my own two eyes) others act like.

As for personal experience, you don't need it when you can make educated guesses.

If you let people have unrestricted access (I don't mean kids getting a hold of it, I mean as with current tobacco and alcohol distribution), it will be abused... regardless of the intent of the law. Before you bring in the failure of the prohibition of alcohol, let me remind you: the only reason that failed was because of how ingrained the consumption of alcohol is on the world's culture. Had it been illegal to begin with (way back when it was first developed), the prohibition of alcohol would have succeeded, if needed at all. This is the same reason people are so reluctant regarding current tobacco laws about its prohibition in public places. It's history is what makes people resistant, not the simple idea itself. The facts of its history, that is.

Without it's current history, I have no doubt that alcohol would be more restricted (it does have direct health-related benefits - ie. small consumption of wine leading to a stronger heart.. or whatever it was), and smoking would never have gotten a foothold.

So you're basically trying to say that using marijuana is relatively new, correct?

Quote:marijuana was probably first used as an intoxicant in India around 1000 B.C., and soon became an integral part of Hindu culture (Snyder, 1970: 125).

In China, where the marijuana plant had been used to make cloth and certain medicines for centuries, it was not recorded as an intoxicant. Explanations are unclear as to why marijuana was used as an intoxicant in India but not in China.

Marijuana was also used as an intoxicant in other parts of the world prior to 500 A.D. but was not as well documented as the use of opium.

The drug "nepenthe" in Homer's Odyssey is believed by a number of scholars to have been a brew in which the most active ingredient was hemp (Brotteaux, 1967: 10).

Galen wrote in the second century that it was customary to promote hilarity and happiness at banquets by giving the guests hemp (Reininger, 1967: 14-15).

Cannabis is used in three different preparations in India (Snyder, 1970: 27). The first is called Bhang, comparable in potency to marijuana in the United States.

It is made from the leaves and stems of uncultivated plants and blended into a pleasant tasting liquid concoction.

The second is Ganja, more potent than Bhang, made from the tops of cultivated plants.

The third and most potent preparation, charas, is similar to hashish or "hash" and is obtained by scraping the resin from the leaves of the cultivated plants. Hard blocks are pressed from this material which are converted for smoking.

High-caste Hindus are not permitted to use alcohol. But they are allowed Bhang at religious ceremonies, and also employ it as an intoxicant at marriage ceremonies and family festivals.

Bhang is used by laborers in India in much the same way as beer is used in the United States (Barber, 1970: 80).

The lower classes of India use either a few pulls at a Ganja pipe or sip a glass of Bhang at the end of the day to relieve fatigue (Grinspoon, 1971: 173), to obtain a sense of well-being, to stimulate appetite, and to enable them to bear more cheerfully the "strain and monotony of . . . daily routines" (Geller and Boas, 1969: 5).

These types of users and objectives are frequently the reverse of those in the United States where marijuana users consider themselves an exclusive and advanced "in-group" (Andrews and Vinkenoog, 1967: iii). A major intoxicant use in India is for religious purposes.

That would say otherwise. Oh, and Wikipedia, too...

Quote:Biologists generally agree that the cannabis plant first grew somewhere in the Himalayas.[citation needed] Evidence of the smoking of cannabis can be found as far back as the Neolithic age, where charred hemp seeds were found in a ritual brazier at a burial site in present day Romania.[2] The most famous users of cannabis were the ancient Hindus. It was called ganjika in Sanskrit (ganja in modern Indian languages, named for the Ganges river [3]).[4] The ancient drug soma, mentioned in the Vedas as a sacred intoxicating hallucinogen, was sometimes associated with cannabis.[5]

The citizens of the Persian Empire would partake in the ceremonial burning of massive cannabis bonfires, directly exposing themselves and neighboring tribes to the billowing fumes, often for over 24 hours.[6][7]

Cannabis was also well known to the Assyrians, who discovered it from the Aryans. Using it in some religious ceremonies, they called it qunubu, or the drug for sadness. Also introduced by the Aryans, the Scythians as well as the Thracians/Dacians used it, whose shamans (the kapnobatai - "those who walk on smoke/clouds") burned cannabis flowers in order to induce trances. The cult of Dionysus, which is believed to have originated in Thrace, is also believed to have inhaled cannabis smoke.

In 2006, dried cannabis leaves were found with a 2,800 year old mummy of a shaman in Xinjiang, China.[8]

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 02:21:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 15:11haha that was just a jab at gbull; marriage is not in my immediate plans.

Silly mrp

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [ballstein](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 02:52:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 19:52

In 2006, dried cannabis leaves were found with a 2,800 year old mummy of a shaman in Xinjiang, China.[8]

Ancient weed, wonder how'd that would smoke. lol

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 03:11:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:So you're basically trying to say that using marijuana is relatively new, correct?

Nice try. No where did I even suggest that.

I can only assume you are talking about this statement:

Quote:the only reason that failed was because of how ingrained the consumption of alcohol is on the world's culture.

Even you should be able to see that it was not a major commodity, and only used in isolated areas. Unlike say... tobacco (which was brought back from North America and became prevalent) and alcohol (which, despite it's 9000 year history, became THE drink of pleasure.)

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 03:15:16 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 22:11Quote:So you're basically trying to say that using marijuana is relatively new, correct?

Nice try. No where did I even suggest that.

I can only assume you are talking about this statement:

Quote:the only reason that failed was because of how ingrained the consumption of alcohol is on the world's culture.

Even you should be able to see that it was not a major commodity, and only used in isolated areas. Unlike say... tobacco (which was brought back from North America and became prevalent) and alcohol (which, despite it's 9000 year history, became THE drink of pleasure.) That's really beside the point. Just because it wasn't used worldwide doesn't mean that it was used as sparingly as you would like to think. Plus, alcohol wasn't that potent in its humble beginnings, so I don't see how your argument is any more valid than mine.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 07:22:46 GMT

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

mjfabian wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 17:22Crimson, your claim that marijuana would make people commit acts of violence because they're "too high to consider the consequences" is completely bogus. You can't immediately associate his violence or negligence with being high just because he was high while committing violent acts. Try finding anything reliable on the web that ties violence to marijuana use. If someone committed a crime, he or she should only be prosecuted for that crime (this includes alcohol).

I didn't claim that... you must be smoking crack. Once again, he was suicidal and drunk which led to violence. The weed just helped the alcohol to make sure he didn't think twice about what could happen if he pulled the trigger, and he went for it and ended a woman's life and left two kids without their mother.

Personally, I'm not stupid enough to put weed, cigarettes, or alcohol into my body (I do have, on average, the equivalent of 6-8 drinks in a year and I do not drive for at least an hour, even after 1 drink.)

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 15:43:01 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Tue, 06 February 2007 02:22

The weed just helped the alcohol to make sure he didn't think twice about what could happen if he pulled the trigger, and he went for it and ended a woman's life and left two kids without their mother.

No. It. Didn't. You're wrong. You're making that assumption from your own false ideas about marijuana and what marijuana does to the human body. Seeing how you've never smoked, I hardly think you're in the position to make that logical leap.
If the marijuana did anything, it just made it harder for him to aim.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 16:02:35 GMT

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

Ah yes... the old "If you haven't tried it, you can't argue against it" idea.

I don't think there has there ever been a more hypocritical and weak argument developed.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 17:25:36 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Tue, 06 February 2007 11:02Ah yes... the old "If you haven't tried it, you can't argue against it" idea.

I don't think there has there ever been a more hypocritical and weak argument developed. Because, as we all know, medicines, toxins, and pleasures all affect the human body the same in any person. There is no differentiation between individuals, at all.

Oh, and pigs can fly, too.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Feb 2007 17:51:21 GMT

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

Which, of course, has nothing to do with my "anti-argument".

See what I mean by hypocritical? People here are arguing that it's ok to use because they have never had any side effects. (After all, you can't argue based on what how you have seen it work in others, right?)

Yet, apparently you can't argue against it for that very same reason?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 07 Feb 2007 13:49:44 GMT

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

The argument that "you've never done it" was only used against Crimson's specific claim. Generally, there shouldn't need to be an argument that "it's ok to use." Whether or not it's okay to use is MY business because I made the CHOICE to smoke marijuana, and I should have the freedom to do so without prosecution.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Thu, 08 Feb 2007 14:55:17 GMT

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

See what pot smoking makes you do

Quote:

BRATTLEBORO, Vt., Feb. 8, 2007

(AP) Blame global warming. An Albany, N.Y., man is accused of riding nude in a gondola at Stratton Mountain Resort on Dec. 15. William N. Barrett III, 46, pleaded not guilty to felony lewd and lascivious conduct and misdemeanor marijuana possession Tuesday in Vermont District Court.

A witness reported to lift attendants that Barrett was nude and touching himself inappropriately while riding the lift.

Barrett, who was fully clothed when he reached the bottom of the hill, denied being nude. He told police he had taken off his jacket and shirt because of the nice weather.

He also was charged with marijuana possession. Police found a glass pipe and film canister containing marijuana in his pocket when they arrested him, authorities said.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Thu, 08 Feb 2007 23:53:10 GMT

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

You really do need to try it before you can really say anything like that. I was scared as hell the first time before I smoked, I was so worried something bad would happen. Did anything happen? no. I've been smoking everyday since then.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Fri, 09 Feb 2007 00:09:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

im sure dk tried it on more than a few occasions...

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [SeargentSarg](#) on Fri, 09 Feb 2007 00:23:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AmunRa wrote on Thu, 08 February 2007 17:53 You really do need to try it before you can really say anything like that.
I was scared as hell the first time before I smoked, I was so worried something bad would happen. Did anything happen? no. I've been smoking everyday since then.

Smoking everyday since then IS a bad thing.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Fri, 09 Feb 2007 00:57:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah man you got to keep it in check. i didnt really start up with it till about a year after i tried it for the first time.
and then took a few month breaks. and generally smoke about a joint a day or a joint every 2 days

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 09 Feb 2007 03:29:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AmunRa wrote on Thu, 08 February 2007 17:53 You really do need to try it before you can really say anything like that.
I was scared as hell the first time before I smoked, I was so worried something bad would happen. Did anything happen? no. I've been smoking everyday since then.

my post was a sarcasm if you read the rest of the thread you will see how i feel on the subject.

and yes romaner ive umm tried it a few times

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 22:04:04 GMT

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

AmunRa wrote on Thu, 08 February 2007 17:53 You really do need to try it before you can really say anything like that.

I was scared as hell the first time before I smoked, I was so worried something bad would happen. Did anything happen? no. I've been smoking everyday since then.

But how many fags a day had you smoked before trying weed?

Were you a nicotine junkie prior to having a joint?

How many a day were you smoking, truthfully?

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 23:07:19 GMT

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

i tried ciggs and hated it. only had maybe 1 or 2 never smoked them again. Did pot for years till i was to scared of the drug testing at work thats what made we quit.

Subject: Re: Marijuana

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 03:41:30 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Tue, 06 February 2007 01:22 mjfabian wrote on Mon, 05 February 2007 17:22 Crimson, your claim that marijuana would make people commit acts of violence because they're "too high to consider the consequences" is completely bogus. You can't immediately associate his violence or negligence with being high just because he was high while committing violent acts. Try finding anything reliable on the web that ties violence to marijuana use. If someone committed a crime, he or she should only be prosecuted for that crime (this includes alcohol).

I didn't claim that... you must be smoking crack. Once again, he was suicidal and drunk which led to violence. The weed just helped the alcohol to make sure he didn't think twice about what could happen if he pulled the trigger, and he went for it and ended a woman's life and left two kids without their mother.

Personally, I'm not stupid enough to put weed, cigarettes, or alcohol into my body (I do have, on average, the equivalent of 6-8 drinks in a year and I do not drive for at least an hour, even after 1 drink.)

No one seems to have picked on the area I highlighted. You see delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC the chemical in weed responsible for you getting high) actually does the exact opposite. Even with

alcohol. In fact probably even more so with alcohol [not including unique cases].

You don't smoke weed if you're going to off yourself. You see after you've toked up. You'll then realize how horrific death is and the last thing you'll want to do is go through with it. And since alcohol generally tends to amplify whatever emotion you're feeling at the time [minus being overly bold when you should be more discreet] it should have further made him realize this. He was obviously too far gone an alcoholic or wasn't quite ticking over mentally. Or alternatively he'd built up too much of a tolerance to the stuff and wasn't actually stoned when he done it.

If anything you could say the weed would have delayed his suicide for maybe months.

But yeah Crimson. Some people would rather get stoned and do house hold chores, homework or their job. And they aren't drooling going "MAAAN IM SO FRIED, MY HAND LOOKS SO COOL. I CANT EVEN BE BOTHERED DOING ANY WORK MAN. HELL YEAH 420 SKMOE DEEEEW EVERY DAY MAAAAAAN!!!" they are actually thinking "right, better get this assignment out the way because I'm more driven out of fear of losing my job now than I am sober when I'd be more bored doing this assignment." Yep, stoners ARE DROOLING FUCKING RETARDS THAT JUST DONT CARE ABOUT ANYTHING.

Of course who cares to even bother researching cannabis before jumping on the "FUCK FUCK IT MAKES YOU LAZY AND YOU MAKES DONT CARE FUCK FUCK OH GOD IT MAKES YOU LAZY AND TURNS YOU INTO A ZOMBIE.. HURRRRRRRRR. WE ARE UPSTANDING CONSERVATIVES AND WE'LL BE FUCKED IF WE RESEARCH DRUGS. HURF HURF DURRRRRRRRR" bandwagon.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 20:11:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

puddle_splasher wrote on Sat, 10 February 2007 17:04AmunRa wrote on Thu, 08 February 2007 17:53You really do need to try it before you can really say anything like that. I was scared as hell the first time before I smoked, I was so worried something bad would happen. Did anything happen? no. I've been smoking everyday since then.

But how many fags a day had you smoked before trying weed?

Were you a nicotine junkie prior to having a joint?

How many a day were you smoking, truthfully?

I was up to about a pack a day ish before I started smoking.

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 21:12:46 GMT

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

You were smoking a pack a day, and then you --Started-- smoking?

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:25:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

forgot to put weed in there

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 01:11:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AmunRa wrote on Sun, 11 February 2007 18:25forgot to put weed in there

you should never forget the weed

Subject: Re: Marijuana
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 03:26:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thus is the only negative result I've gotten ever from smoking. My memory blows ass
