

---

Subject: Re: The "War on Drugs"

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 16:38:36 GMT

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

---

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

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

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

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

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 However, with prohibition no longer in effect, the list of people affected by the resulting acts of someone else getting drunk keeps getting longer.

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

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

---