

---

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

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

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

---

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

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

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

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 Once prohibition was repealed, organized crime suffer big time.

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

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

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

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

---