

---

Subject: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 18:48:35 GMT

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

---

Who thinks marijuana should be legalized? Decriminalized? Kept illegal? Who here has smoked pot?

Personally, I think pot should be legalized. It does less harm to your body than tobacco or alcohol, and yet those are legal. Areas where pot is legal have seen no increase in the use of harder drugs, showing evidence against pot being a "gateway drug." Also, if you can legally purchase pot, you put thousands of dangerous drug dealers out of business.

However, I believe you shouldn't be able to smoke (or be high) in public, just like laws pertaining to alcohol in public. You would also have to be 18 to purchase pot.

What do you guys think?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 18:55:13 GMT

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

---

It may do less harm to the body, but it does more "harm" to the mind.

I would rather be driving with someone who is smoking tobacco than someone who is smoking pot. "Hey look at me! I feel like I'm flying!" \*Crash\*

Not to mention EVERY person that I know who smokes pot is a complete dunce while they are high.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 18:59:56 GMT

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

---

Right, but what about alcohol. I would \*MUCH\* rather be in the passenger seat of a car being driven by someone high than someone drunk. Besides, driving while high is already a crime in and of itself (reckless endangerment).

Pot doesn't exactly do "harm" to the mind. There has been no reported case or study concluding that smoking pot kills brain cells.

"warranto" Not to mention EVERY person that I know who smokes pot is a complete dunce while they are high.

Same with alcohol.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 19:50:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Of course not. Pot is the reason why many kids ruin their lives at an early age. Im glad my high school football coach threatened to kick us off the team if we got caught smoking or drinking. It made us all better people than the stoners sitting in a corner, seemingly half alive. Not to mention legalizing Marijuana will coax many young kids to think its ok. They are better off not.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 19:58:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What if it were still illegal for minors?

The idea that legalizing pot makes it easier for kids to get is not well thought out. If I want to, I can get pot whenever I want. I just make a phone call and go and pick it up. If I want to buy alcohol (I'm only 18), it's much harder to get. Why? Becuase the people selling alcohol actually regulate who they sell to. A drug dealer doesn't give a shit how old you are. As long as you have the money, he or she will sell to you.

How does pot "ruin" one's life? I know plenty of adults who make tons of (legitimate) money who smoke pot. What sets pot heads who have "ruined their lives" apart from alcoholics who have "ruined their lives?"

I should also add that a pot addiction is by far the easiest to overcome. I smoke pot all the time, and on a \$50 bet, I stopped for a month. By the end of the month, I wasn't itching for pot or anything. In fact, I barely thought about it.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 20:12:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, since I think all mind-altering drugs, including alcohol, are retarded AT BEST... maybe I'm not one to comment. The laid-back, don't care about shit attitude that people on pot express is actually QUITE dangerous. Besides, I used to know someone who killed a pizza driver while he was high on pot, and when the cops asked him why he did it, he replied "I don't know..." -- sure, he had other problems, but the non-caring attitude that he gained while on pot made him not care about the consequences of his actions. Now he has 20-25 years to think about it.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 21:34:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you want your fixes so badly, Amsterdam would be glad to have you. As for here in the heavily populated west, we need less people potentially putting others in real danger (I am considering pot and alcohol in the same category based on their ultimate resolve). I feel the same way about letting my neighbours own ridiculously large amounts of firearms. What happens when you start mixing your fixes together?

Sometimes it feels like you're the only sane person in the universe because you have an affinity toward your own sobered state of mind as opposed to an alternative.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 21:38:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i own alot of guns, they come out of their case only once a year though(hunting season)

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 22:58:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The ONLY reason tobacco and alcohol are legal is because of the history of them. People didn't think of the health risks involved with them back when they were first developed, and it's much harder to make something illegal when it has thousands of years of usage behind it.

I know "Reckless endangerment" is a crime that being high would fall under, but being drunk even has it's own qualification under the law. Pot is only illegal while driving through circumstance, not by an act of law.

Pot doing "harm to the brain did not mean to imply a physical harm (hence the word being in quotes), what I was referring to was the distortion of reality that is inflicted on the person.

Quote:Same with alcohol.

Hence the reason getting drunk is frowned upon by most people.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 23:13:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"warranto"The ONLY reason tobacco and alcohol are legal is because of the history of them. Wasn't pot available to people when the Americas were first being settled?

interesting link:

<http://blogs.salon.com/0002762/stories/2003/12/22/whylsMarijuanaillegal.html>

Quote: People didn't think of the health risks involved with them back when they were first developed, and it's much harder to make something illegal when it has thousands of years of usage behind it.

Very good point. It's irrational, but that's just the way it is.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 26 Jul 2005 23:32:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Being "high" on marijuana is hardly what I would call a "distortion of reality." It makes you feel relaxed and happy, as well as a little hazy. It's really nothing special. I've never understood why people get so worked up about something that--to people who smoke often enough to know what it's like--is hardly an issue. Being drunk is far more serious than being high.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 01:01:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEAL:

Hemp was, but that was mainly for rope, not for smoking. ( side comment:the good idea ended up being used for bad -kind of like everything else). As for the concept of "being available", that may have been the case, but it was never used to the degree as alcohol and tobacco were.

mrpirate:

a "distortion of reality" refers to anything that changes the way you think to such a degree that it could become harmful. Medicine that makes you drowsy does that, hence why you are not supposed to "operate machinery" when you take it. Pot does it to the point that you are not as alert as you should be/don't perceive things as you normally would; as Crimson's post points out.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 01:07:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So if people do it in the safety of their own homes, as permitted by the (supposed) law, what's the harm?

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 01:19:35 GMT

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

---

heh, the old proverb "Give an inch, they take a foot". It won't stay in the home, nothing ever does.

Besides, if you use that mentality, then you should be able to do everything and anything in the privacy of your own home. As well, anyone that happens to live there as well won't get a say. (Warning: lame commercial exploit) What happens if you get high, and decide to see if you're immortal, and grab the closest gun? Or, decide to see if someone else is immortal?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 01:20:17 GMT

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

---

Simple. Look at the possible motives for doing it.

When people take fatigue inducing drugs, generally the intent isn't to have a good time. It can be further implied that in most, not all cases of fatigue inducing drugs, it is to assist with sleep (this is referring to drugs \*meant\* exclusively for insomnia, not necessary drugs like Gravol where drowsiness is a repercussion of the ingrediants).

When people take marijuana, it is generally to have a good time. While in some cases it can be used as a painkiller, that is most definately not the reason the stoners I knew in high school did it. Compare it to alcohol. People use it to have a good time. That's fine. But sometimes, and more often then it should be, that involves someone doing something they definately should not be doing for the sake of the people around them. This is where the problems with marijuana come in. The question on the legalization, as far as I'm concerned, is why bother add another pinch of rat poison to the mix? If I had it my way, ethanol alcohol for pleasure would be quite illegal. I don't really care to have another death in the family as a result of someone under the influence--and as such, I'd rather not add more influences to the system for the sake of the people around me.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 03:01:40 GMT

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

---

Isn't it funny how the people advocating for the legalization of marijuana are often stoners themselves?

"It won't hurt you, man! I smoke pot all the time, man! It doesn't do a bad thing to me! You just need to chill out, maaaaan!"

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 03:19:25 GMT

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

---

Did you expect something different?

And no one I know talks like Brian from Half Baked, etc. That "stoner-talk" you're using isn't really common amongst actual stoners.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 03:33:49 GMT

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

---

Just like slurred speech isn't common amongst drunkards.  
From the drunkards' perspectives, at least.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 04:27:27 GMT

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

---

You don't "decide" shit when you're high. Weed isn't LSD. You don't trip or anything. Its effects are far less than alcohol, in my opinion... I don't have any quantitative basis for thinking this.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 04:34:45 GMT

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

---

I'm all for chilling out, but pots not the way. They'll never legalize it. Stop trying. Every attempt to legalize pot and every discussion thereof is just another moment wasted that could have been spent relaxing normally. Things suck for everyone and you don't see everyone smoking pot.

You are also missing a key point. You want to legalize pot? You want to buy it at a store. Where does the store get it from? You aren't removing the drug dealers, you are just making what they do legal. Who owns the big marijuana plantations in south america? Do you think those druglords are suddenly gonna say here Walmart, you get this one. Target you get this one. No, the drugs still are purchased through them. And we're talking big money moving now. Money used to purchase weapons and mercenaries to terrorise the population of central and south america. That region would probably be more dangerous than the gaza strip.

Legalize it and kill millions in Latin America. Go Potheads.

The government isn't responsible for making you feel good. They protect you and yell at you for being a dumbass. If you want a hug get one from a shallow heartless girlfriend.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 09:21:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Doitle" The government isn't responsible for making you feel good. They protect you and yell at you for being a dumbass. If you want a hug get one from a shallow heartless girlfriend.

Is it just me, or does this kid always come up with the best quotes EVER?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 12:53:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I completely disagree on this subject.

Marijuana is in fact much more harmful to the body than cigs because of the fact that you smoke it unfiltered. A cig's filter really does help to get rid of some of the harmful stuff.

Not only that, but unlike a cig, Marijuana is much more addictive. It also makes people forget reality, and it helps to make children pay less attention in class, or adults less attention in work. Not only would it cause people on jobs to have cravings for it, they're much more likely to act like jackasses until they get some.

Marijuana users are fucking annoying. You want to relax? Go find a passtime that's not addictive. You fucking people make me angry.

That's my take on the subject.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 13:15:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's not fucking physically addictive you retard.

And while America may never legalize marijuana (land of the free), Canada may decriminalize it, which I think would be a good move.

EDIT: Forgot the word "physically." How embarrassing... and slightly ironic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [bandie63](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 14:03:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pot is not addictive physically, but is is addictive mentally. That means that it's not like cigs where

you get all pissy when you don't have one, but you only THINK you need one. That means that it's a lot easier to overcome.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 14:14:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Tue, 26 July 2005 23:33 Just like slurred speech isn't common amongst drunkards.

From the drunkards' perspectives, at least.

Nope. Not just like that. Alcohol actually is a direct cause of slurred speech. "Stoner talk" is a stereotypical way of talking that is not only exaggerated and uncommon, it's not directly caused by pot.

Quote: You are also missing a key point. You want to legalize pot? You want to buy it at a store. Where does the store get it from? You aren't removing the drug dealers, you are just making what they do legal. Who owns the big marijuana plantations in south america? Do you think those druglords are suddenly gonna say here Walmart, you get this one. Target you get this one. No, the drugs still are purchased through them. And we're talking big money moving now. Money used to purchase weapons and mercenaries to terrorise the population of central and south america. That region would probably be more dangerous than the gaza strip.

Wrong, wrong, and wrong. If pot were to become legal in the United States, it would actually be produced here (or at the very least, by American companies). In fact, Marlboro has already copyrighted "Marlboro Greens." Why would a company want to rely on overpriced, dangerous drug lords that are inconveniently far south when they can legally grow their own supplies at fractions of the cost? Drug lords would be put out of business when huge, industrial companies have the capacity to mechanize the process because they would stand no chance of competing.

Quote: The government isn't responsible for making you feel good. They protect you and yell at you for being a dumbass. If you want a hug get one from a shallow heartless girlfriend.

The government isn't responsible for making us feel good, correct. However, I feel the government should give people the oppourtunity to do what they want so long as it doesn't harm or get in the way of others who don't want to take part. The government isn't responsible for making us feel good, yet they are fine with people "feeling good" with tobacco and alcohol.

Quote: Marijuana is in fact much more harmful to the body than cigs because of the fact that you smoke it unfiltered. A cig's filter really does help to get rid of some of the harmful stuff.

Wrong. Marijuana being sold on the streets doesn't have added chemicals and poisons. It's just a plant. As a scare tactic, anti-drug campaigns will tell you that dealers put chemicals like rat poison in their pot, but that's a rare occurance (most dealers want to keep their clients happy, and won't lace their pot with things that their clients don't want). Legalizing pot will allow the pot that goes into the market to be regulated by the FDA, giving people even more assurance that the pot being sold is pure.



Tobacco being "filtered" doesn't make up for the fact that tobacco is still far more harmful to your health than pot.

Marijuana much more addictive than tobacco? How uninformed ARE you?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 16:11:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Serious Ejection of All Logic wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 10:14Hydra wrote on Tue, 26 July 2005 23:33Just like slurred speech isn't common amongst drunkards.  
From the drunkards' perspectives, at least.

Nope. Not just like that. Alcohol actually is a direct cause of slurred speech. "Stoner talk" is a stereotypical way of talking that is not only exaggerated and uncommon, it's not directly caused by pot.  
You didn't get it, did you?

A group of drunks slurring their speech think they're speaking normally to each other. You can't tell left from fucking right when you're high, so you don't think you say stupid shit when you're high, either.

Serious Ejection of All LogicDrug lords would be put out of business when huge, industrial companies have the capacity to mechanize the process because they would stand no chance of competing.

Wait, I thought giant corporations were evil parasites on society run by vile corporate execs just waiting to smash a few poor people into oblivion for a buck, the most vile kinds of corporations being tobacco companies. When did Marlboro suddenly become the good guy?

Also, if you agree that drug lords are an enormous problem in Latin America, why are you doing your part to support them by purchasing their products?

Your hypocrisy has reached SuperFlyingLiberalTool proportions.

Serious Ejection of All LogicWrong. Marijuana being sold on the streets doesn't have added chemicals and poisons. It's just a plant.  
Yeah, you'd know.

I mean, your drug dealer is a trustworthy guy, right?

Serious Ejection of All LogicAs a scare tactic, anti-drug campaigns will tell you that dealers put chemicals like rat poison in their pot, but that's a rare occurrence (most dealers want to keep their clients happy, and won't lace their pot with things that their clients don't want).  
Oh, of course, because drug dealers are the most careful people in the world! They never use their own product, even when they're mixing it up for someone else!

Drug dealers are just plain ole folks carrying on their family's tradition of breaking the law!

Serious Ejection of All LogicTobacco being "filtered" doesn't make up for the fact that tobacco is still far more harmful to your health than pot.

Let's see your medical degree, Doctor.

Serious Ejection of All LogicMarijuana much more addictive than tobacco? How uninformed ARE you?

You say it's not addictive, yet you use it all the time....

Go ahead. You keep telling yourself that if it makes you feel better about your shitty situation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 16:31:59 GMT

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

---

I've never known anyone who DIDN'T talk different when they were high. They even have a characteristic look to their faces.

Another point would be the god-awful smell... one of the few things that smell WORSE than cigarettes.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 16:36:28 GMT

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

---

Marijuana, by itself is just as addictive as tabacco. That being there is no severe addiction.

What makes tabacco products addictive is the nicotine.

Now before people start correcting me that nicotine is already in tabacco, I know that. I'm simply distinguishing between the addictive part and the non-addictive part so I can establish my next point.

You can bet that the "big tabacco" companies that start making it will add nicotine. Instant addiction. That, combined with the mental effects, will make it worse than tabacco over a short period of time.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 17:13:37 GMT

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

---

Quote:A group of drunks slurring their speech think they're speaking normally to each other. You can't tell left from fucking right when you're high, so you don't think you say stupid shit when

---

you're high, either.

Are you retarded? When I'm drunk, I know damn well that my speech is slurred. You're wrong. Just wrong.

Quote:Wait, I thought giant corporations were evil parasites on society run by vile corporate execs just waiting to smash a few poor people into oblivion for a buck, the most vile kinds of corporations being tobacco companies. When did Marlboro suddenly become the good guy?

Big company, or drug lord. Take your pick. At least a big company would be monitored by the government.

Quote:Also, if you agree that drug lords are an enormous problem in Latin America, why are you doing your part to support them by purchasing their products?

That's why I think it should be legal. Put one and one together for Christ's sake.

Quote:Yeah, you'd know.

I mean, your drug dealer is a trustworthy guy, right?

I've smoked WITH my dealer all the time and I've known him for many years (way before he was even a dealer). He's really friendly and looks out for me all the time. So yes, he is a trustworthy guy. Thanks for asking.

Quote:Oh, of course, because drug dealers are the most careful people in the world! They never use their own product, even when they're mixing it up for someone else!

Drug dealers are just plain ole folks carrying on their family's tradition of breaking the law!

Drug dealing has a good deal of trust involved in it. Dealers want to make money. That's why they do what they do. If they lace their shit, people will be able to tell, and they won't buy from them anymore. No trust = no business = no money. And yes, most drug dealers are very careful. The ones that aren't are usually in jail.

Quote:You say it's not addictive, yet you use it all the time....

Go ahead. You keep telling yourself that if it makes you feel better about your shitty situation.

Hmm... that WOULD be a good point had I actually said that marijuana wasn't addictive.

Quote:I've never known anyone who DIDN'T talk different when they were high. They even have a characteristic look to their faces.

Another point would be the god-awful smell... one of the few things that smell WORSE than cigarettes.

So don't hang out with people who smoke if you don't like what it turns them into. If that person is high in public and you have no choice, then that person would be breaking the law.

Quote:You can bet that the "big tobacco" companies that start making it will add nicotine. Instant addiction. That, combined with the mental effects, will make it worse than tobacco over a short period of time.

I've thought about this a lot, actually. Companies add things to tobacco because smoking tobacco by itself sucks. It's not smooth, it tastes gross, and it does almost nothing to you (for the record, I don't smoke tobacco or like to). Smoking marijuana by itself is just fine--no additives required. People who smoke pot WANT pure pot. If companies started putting other stuff in the pot, people would most likely switch to a pure source (street dealers, or alternative companies).

Let's not forget the millions and millions of dollars that would be saved on FBI and DEA funding. I'm assuming if it were ever to become legal, it would be taxed heavily like alcohol and tobacco, providing even more revenue for the government.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 17:41:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEAL wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 10:13So don't hang out with people who smoke if you don't like what it turns them into. If that person is high in public and you have no choice, then that person would be breaking the law.

Mind saying that again, this time to the two kids that my former friend left motherless when he decided to shoot her in the face when she delivered him a pizza... because he was too high to care about the consequences of his actions?

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 17:52:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because the fact that he was high is the ONLY possible reason for him doing that, right?. He couldn't have been a mental case ANYWAY, right?

Look, I don't know WHAT exactly you think marijuana does to you, but it does NOT make you think you are invincible, can fly, do things without consequences, etc. Being high on pot pacifies you.

The only legitimate deaths that are a result of someone being high are people who are stupid enough to drive while high and hit someone/something because of a slowed reaction time. Unlike alcohol, marijuana doesn't effect judgement, so it's not like someone who would normally think driving high is bad will think otherwise after smoking up.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 18:28:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OBVIOUSLY he had other problems, too, but he is not the only person that I've seen not caring

about the consequences of their actions while high... it's the attitude like "it doesn't matter, man... just be cool and shit"... you can't tell me that your worries and concerns go away (or significantly fade away) when you're high.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 18:52:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you aren't one to worry about consequences, you aren't one to let the law have any bearing on your actions, so you don't think twice about smoking pot.

It makes sense that a lot of people who don't care about consequences would break the law, but that doesn't mean that all people who break the law don't care about consequences.

Either way, I think it's safe to say that the number of people died in alcohol related incidents is WAY higher than the number of pot related deaths.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 19:05:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That is THE worst generalization ever... I speed sometimes, but that doesn't mean I have a disregard for the law. I had a few drinks before I was 21, but that doesn't mean I have a disregard for the law.

I lived in Wyoming... there was NOTHING to do there so many of my friends smoked pot. I made these observations on more than one person... 100% of the people I knew were like that.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 19:16:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I wrote:...but that doesn't mean that all people who break the law don't care about consequences.

Let's get rid of that double negative, shall we?

Quote:People who break the law (can still) care about the consequences.

So you're agreeing with me? Good job.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

---

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 19:41:31 GMT

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

---

Then how does that fit in with your argument that it's not pot that makes people NOT care?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 19:47:37 GMT

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

---

Quote:People who break the law (can still) care about the consequences.

I.E.: People who smoke pot still care about the consequences of their actions.

To say that someone killed someone and didn't care about it BECAUSE he was high on marijuana isn't well founded.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 19:54:24 GMT

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

---

hmm... I tend to notice a trend here. "Marijuana should be legal because it is better for you than tobacco and alcohol!", seems to be the prevalent argument, and one that seems to be given the most strength. I have yet to see any valid argument that does not relate on comparing marijuana to alcohol and tobacco.

Heck, if you want to play the "better than" card, assault should be made legal, because it's better than battery and murder!

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 20:20:12 GMT

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

---

-Gets rid of dealers, and thus a supposed source terrorist funding

-Saves money on FBI and DEA funding

-Allows police to focus on crimes that are actually dangerous to the public

-Has medicinal qualities

-Could possibly bring in more revenue through taxation

-People are more likely to do pot than harder drugs if it is readily available (as seen in data of drug use in areas that have legalized or decriminalized marijuana)

---

Your comparison doesn't even work, either. It's more like having battery and murder legal while assault being illegal.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 20:39:11 GMT

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

---

Medicinal qualities? Quoi? The only "medicinal quality" is the painkiller, which, in reality, isn't really. If it was, then the marijuana would not be considered safe at all due to it would have to interact with your synapses in the nerves and cause them to misfire-- very similar to what ASA and other painkillers do. Not only that, the misuse of marijuana, like tyonal or aspirine, would cause your liver to plotz when it's trying to clean up the nerve agent. In reality, MJ just tells your brain to stop thinking about the pain. That in itself is a very dangerous quality of the drug. It causes your brain to misinterpret signals with in your own body.

That's not even to say what you're doing to your lungs. You're smoking something. There is a physical interaction between the alveoli in the lungs and the substance that is being inhaled.

Let me draw up a very valid and similar comparison. When you burn, say, a twig, there are certain chemicals released as a result of the combustion. Twigs, like the leaves of pot, are made up of pretty much the same stuff minus of course the mind altering drug laced within. All plants are made up of the same basic stuff, C6H12O6, CO2 (aq), O2 (aq), and various other chemicals.

When you smoke pot, you're directly and completely inhaling the result of combusting glucose. And considering the very small amount of actual combustion happening, you get very dangerous results. When you combust glucose, you get CO2 and H2O. But you also get incomplete combustion, and quite a lot of it. Which means your body is directly and intentionally inhaling litres of CO (g), which is highly toxic.

Similarly, many of the chemicals that are in both tobacco (not cigarettes) are also in pot leaves. When these combust, they also go directly into your lungs. This includes VERY dangerous things to combust and breathe in, like starch.

You know, there are real health risks that make doctors reluctant to give out medicinal marijuana. I guarantee you those are at the top of the list.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 20:42:02 GMT

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

---

"hydra"Also, if you agree that drug lords are an enormous problem in Latin America, why are you doing your part to support them by purchasing their products?"SEAL"

That's why I think it should be legal. Put one and one together for Christ's sake.

So you would let pot come before your hate of Big Drug dealers? Sounds like an addiction. Tell

me, when and if you have kids(if because pot will ruin your life if you don't quit soon) would you want them to do it?

"hydra" Yeah, you'd know.

I mean, your drug dealer is a trustworthy guy, right?"SEAL"

I've smoked WITH my dealer all the time and I've known him for many years (way before he was even a dealer). He's really friendly and looks out for me all the time. So yes, he is a trustworthy guy. Thanks for asking.

cool, can I borrow some money?

"SEAL"

"warranto" You can bet that the "big tobacco" companies that start making it will add nicotine. Instant addiction. That, combined with the mental effects, will make it worse than tobacco over a short period of time.

I've thought about this a lot, actually. Companies add things to tobacco because smoking tobacco by itself sucks. It's not smooth, it tastes gross, and it does almost nothing to you (for the record, I don't smoke tobacco or like to). Smoking marijuana by itself is just fine--no additives required. People who smoke pot WANT pure pot. If companies started putting other stuff in the pot, people would most likely switch to a pure source (street dealers, or alternative companies).

Let's not forget the millions and millions of dollars that would be saved on FBI and DEA funding. I'm assuming if it were ever to become legal, it would be taxed heavily like alcohol and tobacco, providing even more revenue for the government.

Who cares about money when we have a country full of mindless Zombies to lazy to work or provide for the families they have. Some of my friends have already ruined their lives because of their obsession with this drug. Now one of them doesn't go to college and spent the last 6 months in rehabilitation after getting a woman pregnant. If I could legally break the legs of his drug dealer, I would.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:07:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm still waiting to see a non-pothead advocating it being legalized... those of us who choose not to pollute our lungs and minds with that crud would prefer everyone stay off it.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:16:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And you will not see one. I talked to a 40 year old man today who did Mary Jane when he was younger and quit. He wishes he never did it at all. Said it held him back from so much in life. I believe him, here he is 40 years old, and doing the same factory job I am, only making 50cents



more than I do (\$9.00/hour).

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:17:09 GMT

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

---

SEAL wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 16:20-Gets rid of dealers, and thus a supposed source terrorist funding

-Saves money on FBI and DEA funding

-Allows police to focus on crimes that are actually dangerous to the public

-Has medicinal qualities

-Could possibly bring in more revenue through taxation

-People are more likely to do pot than harder drugs if it is readily available (as seen in data of drug use in areas that have legalized or decriminalized marijuana)

Your comparison doesn't even work, either. It's more like having battery and murder legal while assault being illegal.

- Won't get rid of dealers, they'll just move on to something else. The drug scene isn't "I want to give weed to the world", it's "I want to make money".

- Won't save money, it will just be diverted to other areas of operation. But then the same could be said if people stopped using Marijuana.

- People not touching Marijuana would also allow police to concentrate on other areas.

- You don't need to legalize "public useage" of marijuana on order for it to be given medically.

- Legalizing all drugs could bring in even more tax dollars! Lets use this as a reason for allow cocaine to be legal again!

- Irrelevant. "Lets do something legal and get high, instead of doing something illegal!" I bet you'd get similar results if you made Speed legal, and Marijuana remained illegal.

In short, all things could be solved by people NOT using it, so why are those arguements used to suport using it?

My comparison doesn't work? You're saying that actually hitting someone/killing them is better than threatening to hit them? The comparison works fine. What you are doing is trying to make the comparison of assault= marijuana and battery/murder = tobacco/alcohol. What you are failing to do is use what I am actually comparing. That being legalizing something simply because it "does less harm".

Edit: just as a further comment to continue what gbull wrote. Inagine how much MORE money you could have saved by not smoking Marijuana.

I don't know the exact figures, so lets make some up. Say one roll costs \$2.00. You start when you're 21, and smoke 1 a day for the rest of your life. Lets say you live to be 70.

$70-21= 49$  years at 1/day.

$49*365= 17,885$  rolls smoked at \$2.00 a roll.

$17,885*\$2.00= \$35,770.00$  spent on Marijuana.

I'd rather get a car.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:23:39 GMT

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

---

The reasoning is that marijuana is better than things which are legal. If battery and murder were legal, then I'd see the parallel.

People will always smoke pot. Just like they will always do heroin, coke and PCP. If you want you can believe otherwise, but I'd like you to send me a postcard from Fantasy Land.

For the record, both my parents smoked their share of marijuana when they were my age, and throughout their youth. Now my dad owns an electronics company and my mom has her master's degree. So it's not the end of the world.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:33:40 GMT

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

---

The parallel isn't that hard to see.

Arguement: Marijuana is should be legal because it isn't as harmful as "x"

parallel: Assault should be legal because it isn't as harmful as "x".

If you do need something that even a child could grasp, then here you go.

High powered weaponry is legal to own, but some knives are not. All knives should be made legal because you don't have the annominaty of sniping someone from a distance. It's less dangerous than the high powered weaponry, therefore it should be made legal!

The guns are currently legal, and are more deadly than the currently illegal knives. Is this a better

parallel for you?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:38:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes, that works. But seriously, drop the murder thing, because that's not the same thing at all.

X should be legal because it is better than Y, and Y is legal.  
X should be legal because it is better than Y, but Y is illegal.

I see a difference.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 22:40:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto -- you are the best debater ever... I'd even say you're the master debater and a cunning linguist. (there's really a compliment in there somewhere)

We're in the process of trying to get rid of cigarette smoking, by banning it from more and more public places. Legalizing marijuana just seems like a HUGE step in the opposite direction. I do NOT FUCKING want your secondhand pot smoke, and I bet there are MILLIONS who feel the same way.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 23:33:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mrpirate wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 17:53  
People will always smoke pot. Just like they will always do heroin, coke and PCP. If you want you can believe otherwise, but I'd like you to send me a postcard from Fantasy Land.

People will always murder, rape, steal, and Con. So we should make all those things legal as well I guess.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 27 Jul 2005 23:35:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That wasn't a reason for it to be legal. That was just me being contrary.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 00:11:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 18:07I'm still waiting to see a non-pothead advocating it being legalized... those of us who choose not to pollute our lungs and minds with that crud would prefer everyone stay off it.

What the fuck are you trying to accomplish with that point? OF COURSE advocates of marijuana legalization like marijuana. What an amazing discovery!! Hey, did you know that people who don't advocate using animal fur LIKE animals?!?! CRAZY!

Quote: Won't save money, it will just be diverted to other areas of operation. But then the same could be said if people stopped using Marijuana.

So if you had to pay \$20 a month for medicine (for example), and then you didn't need the medicine anymore and used that twenty for food, that isn't beneficial to you? The same COULD be said if people stopped using pot, but that's not realistic. That would NEVER happen, so don't bring it up as a point.

Quote:Won't get rid of dealers, they'll just move on to something else. The drug scene isn't "I want to give weed to the world", it's "I want to make money".

It will reduce the number of dealers on the street. Coke is harder to come by and fewer people are willing to risk selling it.

Quote:Edit: just as a further comment to continue what gbull wrote. Inagine how much MORE money you could have saved by not smoking Marijuana.

I don't know the exact figures, so lets make some up. Say one roll costs \$2.00. You start when you're 21, and smoke 1 a day for the rest of your life. Lets say you live to be 70...[insert numbers] Earth to warranto: if it were legal your total would be a very small percentage of that.

Quote:Legalizing all drugs could bring in even more tax dollars! Lets use this as a reason for allow cocaine to be legal again!

Pot and coke aren't comprable drugs. There needs to be a balance between benefit to the goverment and harm to the people.

Let me reiterate the comparison. Weed is less harmful than alcohol, yet alcohol is legal and weed isn't.

So the comparison SHOULD be:

Assault is less harmful than murder, yet murder is legal and assault isn't.

But that's not the case because it's illogical. As is the situation with weed.

And another thing about saving money: taxpayers spend the MOST money keeping people who are convicted of weed-related crimes in jail more than any other type of convict. We could be saving BILLIONS of dollars if we didn't waste cell spaces with those people.

Quote: I do NOT FUCKING want your secondhand pot smoke, and I bet there are MILLIONS who feel the same way.

How exactly did you miss the point AGAIN that if it were to be legal it couldn't be done in a public place?

Quote:People will always murder, rape, steal, and Con. So we should make all those things legal as well I guess.

THOSE THINGS HARM OTHER PEOPLE. Comprende, Paco?

-edit-

I forget who said this, but killing pain isn't the only medicinal use. I know someone who has AIDs and uses it to increas his appetite (AIDS reduces appteite significantly, to the point of making eating a chore). It also supresses vomitting for cancer patients.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 00:49:50 GMT

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

---

SEAL wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 10:14Hydra wrote on Tue, 26 July 2005 23:33Just like slurred speech isn't common amongst drunkards.

From the drunkards' perspectives, at least.

Nope. Not just like that. Alcohol actually is a direct cause of slurred speech. "Stoner talk" is a stereotypical way of talking that is not only exagerated and uncommon, it's not directly caused by pot.

Quote:You are also missing a key point. You want to legalize pot? You want to buy it at a store. Where does the store get it from? You aren't removing the drug dealers, you are just making what they do legal. Who owns the big marijuana plantations in south america? Do you think those druglords are suddenly gonna say here Walmart, you get this one. Target you get this one. No, the drugs still are purchased through them. And we're talking big money moving now. Money used to purchase weapons and mercenaries to terrorise the population of central and south america. That region would probably be more dangerous than the gaza strip.

Wrong, wrong, and wrong. If pot were to become legal in the United States, it would actually be produced here (or at the very least, by American companies). In fact, Marlboro has already copyrighted "Marlboro Greens." Why would a company want to rely on overpriced, dangerous drug lords that are inconveniently far south when they can legally grow their own supplies at fractions of the cost? Drug lords would be put out of business when huge, industrial companies have the capacity to mechanize the process because they would stand no chance of competing.

Quote:The government isn't responsible for making you feel good. They protect you and yell at you for being a dumbass. If you want a hug get one from a shallow heartless girlfriend.

The government isn't responsible for making us feel good, correct. However, I feel the goverment should give people the oppourtunity to do what they want so long as it doesn't harm or get in the way of others who don't want to take part. The government isn't responsible for making us feel good, yet they are fine with people "feeling good" with tobacco and alcohol.

Quote:Marijuana is in fact much more harmful to the body than cigs because of the fact that you smoke it unfiltered. A cig's filter really does help to get rid of some of the harmful stuff.

Wrong. Marijuana being sold on the streets doesn't have added chemicals and poisons. It's just a plant. As a scare tactic, anti-drug campaigns will tell you that dealers put chemicals like rat poison in their pot, but that's a rare occurrence (most dealers want to keep their clients happy, and won't lace their pot with things that their clients don't want). Legalizing pot will allow the pot that goes into the market to be regulated by the FDA, giving people even more assurance that the pot being sold is pure.

Tobacco being "filtered" doesn't make up for the fact that tobacco is still far more harmful to your health than pot.

Marijuana much more addictive than tobacco? How uninformed ARE you?

Not as uninformed as you?

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 01:13:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEAL wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 17:11Crimson wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 18:07I'm still waiting to see a non-pothead advocating it being legalized... those of us who choose not to pollute our lungs and minds with that crud would prefer everyone stay off it. What the fuck are you trying to accomplish with that point? OF COURSE advocates of marijuana legalization like marijuana. What an amazing discovery!! Hey, did you know that people who don't advocate using animal fur LIKE animals?!?! CRAZY!

I bet murderers want murder legalized, too. Let's legalize that.

Quote:Earth to warranto: if it were legal your total would be a very small percentage of that.

Sweet! Let's legalize marijuana to reduce its cost! Great argument!

Quote:Let me reiterate the comparison. Weed is less harmful than alcohol, yet alcohol is legal and weed isn't.

Is there a study backing this claim up? Because it sure looks like your opinion and laws aren't built on some stoner's opinion. I still disagree that weed is as harmless as you claim.

Quote:And another thing about saving money: taxpayers spend the MOST money keeping people who are convicted of weed-related crimes in jail more than any other type of convict. We could be saving BILLIONS of dollars if we didn't waste cell spaces with those people.

Cool! Let's allow everything and let everyone out of jail! Next we'll hear some embezzler thinking embezzlement should be legalized so he won't have to go to jail for it.

Quote:How exactly did you miss the point AGAIN that if it were to be legal it couldn't be done in a public place?

You can't seriously think that legalizing weed wouldn't increase my day-to-day exposure to its fumes... can you?

Quote:I forget who said this, but killing pain isn't the only medicinal use. I know someone who has AIDs and uses it to increas his appetite (AIDS reduces appteite significantly, to the point of making eating a chore). It also supresses vomitting for cancer patients.

Ummmm... if medicinal reasons were legitimate to legalize something, then Morphine would be available at the Walgreens on the corner and prescriptions would be a thing of the past.... controlled narcotics... jesus. This is by far the worst set of arguments to try and legitimize a repulsive habit I've ever seen, next to the health benefits of eating one's own boogers.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 01:24:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why do you choose to smoke pot in the first place, SEAL? What pain do you mask with the joint, and how does it make your situation any better?

Or do have to hide behind your fantasy world of marijuanaland every time something bad happens? Are you too much of a pussy to confront life's problems on your own like a man?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 01:25:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The post is too long to quote in one go, so I'll cut that part out.

Quote:So if you had to pay \$20 a month for medicine (for example), and then you didn't need the medicine anymore and used that twenty for food, that isn't beneficial to you?

Yes that would be beneficial, but not if that \$20 that could be for medicine or food went to get you high (unless you're trying to suggest that Marijuana is a credible food source).

[quote]It will reduce the number of dealers on the street. Coke is harder to come by and fewer people are willing to risk selling it.[quote]

I doubt it will reduce the numbers by any significant ammount. Coke was only an example, substitute it for something less "dangerous" such as Speed, LSD, or even Exstasy.

Quote:Earth to warranto: if it were legal your total would be a very small percentage of that

As I said, I don't know how much it would go for or what it goes for now. It all adds up to basically the same thing though, just the variables would be different.

Quote:Pot and coke aren't comprable drugs.

Once again, the drug I used was an example. Feel free to substitue it for any other illegal drug you desire.

Quote:And another thing about saving money: taxpayers spend the MOST money keeping people who are convicted of weed-related crimes in jail more than any other type of convict. We could be saving BILLIONS of dollars if we didn't waste cell spaces with those people.

Then we should also legalize petty theft, and all the other misnomeners. After all, think of how much money would be saved by not having those people in jail!

Quote:There needs to be a balance between benefit to the goverment and harm to the people.

So, as long as the "balance" is maintained, something could be as harmful as you want, as long as the government can revceive equal compensation for it? If that's the case, lets legalize heroin and the government can simply tax it enough so that the "balance" is maintained.

Quote:Let me reiterate the comparison. Weed is less harmful than alcohol, yet alcohol is legal and weed isn't.

Substituting your own comparison to make it look like mine, simply to try and discredit me doesn't work.

Quote:What the fuck are you trying to accomplish with that point? OF COURSE advocates of marijuana legalization like marijuana. What an amazing discovery!! Hey, did you know that people who don't advocate using animal fur LIKE animals?!?! CRAZY!

You missed her point. The only reason Marijuana users want to see it legal is because htey will benifit from it. They have a highlt biased view of the situation. If someone who did not use Marijuana, and was not benifiting from the outcome, said that it should be legal, much more credit would be given to the legalization side. As it currently is, the only reason you are arguing to legalize it is so that you can continue to use it without fear of prosecution.

Quote:How exactly did you miss the point AGAIN that if it were to be legal it couldn't be done in a public place?

Family members would still have to contend with it. Though I do wonder how a newborn acts while high on the second hand smoke...

Quote:The same COULD be said if people stopped using pot, but that's not realistic. That would NEVER happen, so don't bring it up as a point.

The simplt fact that people are so weak that they can't stop should have no bearing on whether or



not something should be legal. People will never stop killing other people or stealing what isn't theirs, so you're saying those should be made legal as well, simply because people will never stop doing it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mripirate](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 01:39:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 21:24 Why do you choose to smoke pot in the first place, SEAL? What pain do you mask with the joint, and how does it make your situation any better?

Or do have to hide behind your fantasy world of marijuanaland every time something bad happens? Are you too much of a pussy to confront life's problems on your own like a man?

You don't have to be hiding from something to smoke pot. Being high is pleasant. You feel good, music sounds better, you enjoy food more, etc. Why does anyone do anything that feels good?

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 02:14:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SEAL wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 20:11 -edit-  
I forget who said this, but killing pain isn't the only medicinal use. I know someone who has AIDs and uses it to increas his appetite (AIDS reduces appteite significantly, to the point of making eating a chore). It also supresses vomitting for cancer patients.

There are two branches of thought on the matter. AIDS patients, and many cancer patients are also terminal. The argument would be that "well, they're dying anyway, so why not make them feel better even though it is causing irreparable harm to their inards", and that's fine.

However, in a strictly medical situation, the marijuana does more harm than good. Increasing appetite is easily done by introducing insulin into the body. It forces the body into a state of hunger because the insulin causes the "hunger" feeling using various hormones and glucogon. The insulin is devoured by the body and the operator mechanisms in the cells that make and breakdown the hormone are totally unaffected.

Surpressing vomitting is done quite simply by muscle relaxants and crappy tasting stuff like Pepto Bismol.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 02:46:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just to let you know who says it'll be cheaper for weed? Are you serious? add taxes and add the

fact that people would rather want weed than, say, cigarettes. Supply + Demand goes up and so does the price. And yes they will get away with probably even a bigger tax increase, because if it is so, as you put it, better than cigarettes - than it's more the reason to of course up the price. Of course I don't know how it works in Canada or other countries, but that's how it'd work in the USA.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 03:22:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's late, so I just skimmed through your posts, so this isn't an all-points post...

But I did notice that MANY said something along the lines of "Well, Crime X blah blah blah, so why don't we legalize that too!?"

Yet every example given is a DANGEROUS, HARMFUL-TO-OTHERS crime.

And Crimson, I actually do consider myself well informed on marijuana's long term and short term effects. I've talked about it with my doctor, and read lots of documentation on it.

I'd also like to thank and congratulate Hydra for his low-blow, lameass attack on how I live my life. Real mature there, champ. If you must know, I smoke to relax, not to hide from the reality of life. It's a personal decision, and I go out of my way to make sure that what I do doesn't interfere with anyone else who doesn't want to be involved. Hydra, I knew you were a dick, but you really need to grow up.

Quote:Just to let you know who says it'll be cheaper for weed? Are you serious? add taxes and add the fact that people would rather want weed than, say, cigarettes. Supply + Demand goes up and so does the price. And yes they will get away with probably even a bigger tax increase, because if it is so, as you put it, better than cigarettes - than it's more the reason to of course up the price. Of course I don't know how it works in Canada or other countries, but that's how it'd work in the USA.

If you were to buy a "pack" of pot cigarettes...

Each cigarette would hold about \$6 worth of pot, so the street price would be \$120. The cost of a pack of un-taxed pot cigarettes, based on what un-taxed tobacco cigarettes would cost, is probably \$2.00. So unless the goverment adds a 6000% tax, I don't think beating street prices will be a problem...

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 03:31:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Even Warranto and Java are against legalizing it. The Left of this forum have no chance at arguing this effectively without them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 03:35:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I never expected them to be for this. Who said they would be? Are you assuming that "left" = smokes pot? No chance? I've been countering almost every single point made by people from the other side of this argument. Just because the majority of the people on this forum are against it, doesn't necessarily mean they are winning. (I'm NOT saying I'm winning either).

It's not like I expected a group of people that spend more time than the average person in front of a computer to smoke pot... yes, I realize that doesn't apply for everyone, but I think it's a pretty safe assumption.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 03:58:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Doitle wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 23:31 Even Warranto and Java are against legalizing it. The Left of this forum have no chance at arguing this effectively without them.

Get moderate or get out.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 04:11:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

OK let's just put this in one big picture. On one argument here we have the people who want to legalize it. Let's compare it to legalized drinking and when we made it illegal. It's obvious you can't just get rid of the problem by making it illegal because you can see how many people smuggled beer in however many ways they could. making it legal had it's points because you didn't have people doing illegal things and fights over the alcohol.

Same with pot, that you'd reduce people who smuggle it in our country and there'd be less fights on drug gangs and what not because there wouldn't be much of a point if they could get it cheaper at a store (regardless whether or not they buy with the same amount of money, but for more) Now in the short run this might be good. But it really isn't stepping in the right direction. I'm not exactly siding anything but most people would like to hope that we can take a step into stopping drugs one day. But that might never happen especially when people are already mentally and physically addicted to some of them. I guess both sides can be technically right in some ways. But you aren't going to get rid of the problem by promoting it. Then again it is the people's decision in the end. For the reference anyways, it doesn't mean anything to say just because pot's illegal and it's less harmful than say beer when that's legal doesn't exactly make it right to legalize it. But whatever.. Like I said i'm not pro-anything and I won't be. In the end run it doesn't help us get rid of the problem but in the short run it might help some.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 06:34:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Doitle wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 23:01 Even Warranto and Java are against legalizing it. The Left of this forum have no chance at arguing this effectively without them.

Thats because this isn't really a Left/Right Debate. Its a Stoner/Non-Stoner Debate.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 12:52:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[quote title=warranto wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 21:25]The post is too long to quote in one go, so I'll cut that part out.

Quote:So if you had to pay \$20 a month for medicine (for example), and then you didn't need the medicine anymore and used that twenty for food, that isn't beneficial to you?

Yes that would be beneficial, but not if that \$20 that could be for medicine or food went to get you high (unless you're trying to suggest that Marijuana is a credible food source).

[quote]It will reduce the number of dealers on the street. Coke is harder to come by and fewer people are willing to risk selling it.Quote:

I doubt it will reduce the numbers by any significant ammount. Coke was only an example, substitute it for something less "dangerous" such as Speed, LSD, or even Exstasy.

Quote:Earth to warranto: if it were legal your total would be a very small percentage of that

As I said, I don't know how much it would go for or what it goes for now. It all adds up to basically the same thing though, just the variables would be different.

Quote:Pot and coke aren't comprable drugs.

Once again, the drug I used was an example. Feel free to substitue it for any other illegal drug you desire.

Quote:And another thing about saving money: taxpayers spend the MOST money keeping people who are convicted of weed-related crimes in jail more than any other type of convict. We could be saving BILLIONS of dollars if we didn't waste cell spaces with those people.

Then we should also legalize petty theft, and all the other misnomeners. After all, think of how much money would be saved by not having those people in jail!

Quote:There needs to be a balance between benefit to the goverment and harm to the people.

So, as long as the "balance" is maintained, something could be as harmful as you want, as long as the government can receive equal compensation for it? If that's the case, let's legalize heroin and the government can simply tax it enough so that the "balance" is maintained.

Quote:Let me reiterate the comparison. Weed is less harmful than alcohol, yet alcohol is legal and weed isn't.

Substituting your own comparison to make it look like mine, simply to try and discredit me doesn't work.

Quote:What the fuck are you trying to accomplish with that point? OF COURSE advocates of marijuana legalization like marijuana. What an amazing discovery!! Hey, did you know that people who don't advocate using animal fur LIKE animals?!?! CRAZY!

You missed her point. The only reason Marijuana users want to see it legal is because they will benefit from it. They have a highly biased view of the situation. If someone who did not use Marijuana, and was not benefiting from the outcome, said that it should be legal, much more credit would be given to the legalization side. As it currently is, the only reason you are arguing to legalize it is so that you can continue to use it without fear of prosecution.

Quote:How exactly did you miss the point AGAIN that if it were to be legal it couldn't be done in a public place?

Family members would still have to contend with it. Though I do wonder how a newborn acts while high on the second hand smoke...

Quote:The same COULD be said if people stopped using pot, but that's not realistic. That would NEVER happen, so don't bring it up as a point.

The simple fact that people are so weak that they can't stop should have no bearing on whether or not something should be legal. People will never stop killing other people or stealing what isn't theirs, so you're saying those should be made legal as well, simply because people will never stop doing it?

If a small child encountered second hand smoke from Marijuana, it would be much more likely to have neurological disorders.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 13:12:40 GMT

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

---

Apparently, according to my doctor, coffee is more addictive than marijuana.

On average, America spends 7.6 billion dollars funding anti-drug campaigns and keeping pot-criminals in jail each year. I don't know about you, but I think the minor inconveniences of legalizing pot are worth putting that kind of taxpayer money to something beneficial, like education. If you divide that by the number of people in jail for pot related crimes, that's \$10,400

per arrest. \$10,400 for what more often than not, is just putting someone away who's looking to enjoy himself with a couple of friends. \$10,400 per arrest is more than what is spent on murderers and rapists.

Pot is not harmless. No drug is. However:

The journal Current Opinion in Pharmacology Overall, by comparison with other drugs used mainly for 'recreational' purposes, cannabis (is) rated to be a relatively safe drug.

AskMen.com "There is no evidence that marijuana use causes brain damage."

"...the American Medical Association (AMA) officially announced its support for the decriminalization of marijuana."

"No trustworthy study has ever shown that marijuana use damages the reproductive system, or causes chromosome breakage."

Lastly, as I said before, areas that have legalized/decriminalized pot have seen a DECREASE in the use of harder drugs. For those who do not know, that is a good thing.

I also suggest that you guys read this:

[http://www.askmen.com/toys/special\\_feature/3\\_special\\_feature.html](http://www.askmen.com/toys/special_feature/3_special_feature.html)

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 15:05:22 GMT

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

You said the problems of legalization will be minimal, and quoted:

"No trustworthy study has ever shown that marijuana use damages the reproductive system, or causes chromosome breakage."

But what if an untrustworthy study was actually correct? If marijuana didn't do anything, and there really wasn't any evidence to suggest it did, it would be legal. I don't believe the medical associations are foolproof in their information, nor do they know the outcome of what will happen if marijuana is legalised, they support it, and problems wind up occurring because people start taking it all the time and get ill. I know a friend who can't even go to work without being stoned. he smokes it at every opportunity. he isn't ill but if he keeps it up i'm sure it won't be good for him in the long run, a bit like smoking.

The other bit about places where legal marijuana has less hard drug use doesn't make sense...this would mean that because marijuana was illegal, people used hard drugs more....which are EVEN MORE ILLEGAL THAN MARIJUANA AND POSE WORSE PENALTIES. The occupants of these places can't be bright people...

apart from all this, it should be illegal because of its god awful smell....i don't want to have to smell it every time I jump on a bus on friday/saturday night...

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 15:07:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I read it, and it offers some interesting points.

The only benefits are medical, which has never been in dispute.

The guy isn't as smart as perhaps he could be. He "needs" Marijuana in order to create great works.

Marijuana causes short term memory loss (while intoxicated). Wow, getting high and not being able to remember what I did. That sounds promising. Perhaps people will start "legally" getting high just prior to committing a crime. Now have a valid legal defense.

It also claims that smoking marijuana has the potential to cause both bronchitis and cancer of the lungs, throat, and neck. Yet another non-medical "benefit" that you were talking about? Oh yes, it may also affect your lungs immune system, and cause your body to change how your heart functions. These benefits really start piling up!.

It also mentions a point you brought up, so I thought I'd mention it again.

Quote:Authorities spend, no, waste millions of dollars going after people who smoke a recreational drug while rapists, murderers, fraudsters, and hard drug dealers roam the streets.

Why should this be the strongest case supporters have for legalizing it? I mean, you could legalize speeding as well. It doesn't harm anyone if you know what you are doing, and police stop them when they could be out catching the criminals that are more dangerous. Think of all the resources that could be diverted elsewhere if speeding were to be made legal! I mean, it works fine on the autobahn, so why not here? You could also (as I mentioned before) legalize petty crime! Sure people are harmed by it, but "everyone" does it, and people will never stop doing it, so think of how much money the legal system would save by not prosecuting these people!

Edit: before I forget, the link also brings up the fact that the dutch partially legalized it, and less people do the hard drugs. Again I say that this is irrelevant. Of course people will stop with the hard drugs, because a different drug was made legal. If you switched Marijuana with speed, LSD or Ecstasy, the same thing would probably hold true. Less use of coke and Heroin, and more use of the product that was made legal.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 15:13:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:You said the problems of legalization will be minimal, and quoted:  
"No trustworthy study has ever shown that marijuana use damages the reproductive system, or causes chromosome breakage."

But what if an untrustworthy study was actually correct? If marijuana didn't do anything, and there really wasn't any evidence to suggest it did, it would be legal.

Tobacco and alcohol companies don't want it to be legal because it would give them more competition. Those companies, especially tobacco companies, have HUGE influences in Washington. THIS is the primary reason it isn't legal--it has little to do with the actual facts pertaining to marijuana. If you want to go around trusting "untrustworthy" studies, be my guest.

Quote: I don't believe the medical associations are foolproof in their information, nor do they know the outcome of what will happen if marijuana is legalised, they support it, and problems wind up occurring.

True. Nothing is foolproof. However, they know a lot more than you or me or anyone else on this forum when it comes to medical information. They are, after all, the AMA.

Quote: The other bit about places where legal marijuana has less hard drug use doesn't make sense...this would mean that because marijuana was illegal, people used hard drugs more....which are EVEN MORE ILLEGAL THAN MARIJUANA. The occupants of these places can't be bright people...

It makes plenty of sense. People who used harder drugs now have a safer, legal alternative, so they use marijuana instead of drugs that do much more harm. Whether or not these people are "bright" doesn't take away from the fact that hard drug use went down, and that's a very good thing.

Quote: Why should this be the strongest case supporters have for legalizing it? I mean, you could legalize speeding as well. It doesn't harm anyone if you know what you are doing, and police stop them when they could be out catching the criminals that are more dangerous. Think of all the resources that could be diverted elsewhere if speeding were to be made legal! I mean, it works fine on the autobahn, so why not here? You could also (as I mentioned before) legalize petty crime! Sure people are harmed by it, but "everyone" does it, and people will never stop doing it, so think of how much money the legal system would save by not prosecuting these people!

Warranto: READ.

Quote: But I did notice that MANY said something along the lines of "Well, Crime X blah blah blah, so why don't we legalize that too!?"

Yet every example given is a DANGEROUS, HARMFUL-TO-OTHERS crime.

Speeding is harmful to others. Petty crime is harmful to others. I generally regard you as an intelligent person, but you continue to bring up the same, flawed argument.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization



Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 19:55:32 GMT

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

---

I used to simply not care either way. Then I came upon a simple reason why weed should remain illegal:

Illegal weed keeps potheads out of my face.

So long as weed is illegal, potheads will find nice, out of the way places to indulge their habit where I don't have to look at them or smell them. Especially smell them. There was one street corner by my high school where all the potheads used to get together and light up at break or after school... you could smell them across the damn street. There is NOTHING that smells worse than pot. Nothing. I'd rather stick my face in a pile of shit or take a nice whif of vomit than smell pot fumes. Cigarettes are bad enough- I can't stand to hang around NORMAL smokers while they're puffing away.

Banning public use wouldn't be much of a solution either...unlike normal cigs, pot odor doesn't just hang around the user. It spreads. Out the window, out of the yard, into the non-smoking section of the restaurant, whatever. It would still be disruptive to passers by on the street.\*boldface for emphasis

Unless there are also ordinances passed that ban use of pot except inside private residences with the doors and windows all closed, it is still too close to the public.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 20:22:19 GMT

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

---

That's a fair point.

For all the potheads out there (right... a grand total of 0 on this forum):

-Get one of those sheets you throw in the dryer to make your clothes smell nice.

-Crumple it up into a ball.

-Stick it in the end of a toilet paper tube.

-Exhale smoke into tube.

I've tried it. It works magic. MAGIC I TELLS YA! You can't smell it at all.

If potheads can figure out how to stop the smell, companies can figure out an even better way.

Anyway... it's not that pot odor "spreads" more. It's a generally a more potent smell. Low quality pot that is poorly ground up tends to smell more, and smell worse to people who don't smoke. Good, well processed and ground up marijuana (the type that companies can come up with easily) tends to burn more smoothly and creates less potent smoke. This is why cigarettes don't smell as much as say, someone smoking tobacco from a pipe.

That, coupled with a public-use ban, could be enough to take care of those concerns. I don't see why it would be wrong to call the cops on someone who is letting their odors get in the way of people who don't want to smell anything. Trust me, I'm all for letting people live their lives without

being bothered.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 21:32:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Serious Ejection of All Logic wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 23:22 I'd also like to thank and congratulate Hydra for his low-blow, lameass attack on how I live my life. Real mature there, champ. If you must know, I smoke to relax, not to hide from the reality of life. It's a personal decision, and I go out of my way to make sure that what I do doesn't interfere with anyone else who doesn't want to be involved. Hydra, I knew you were a dick, but you really need to grow up. I'd rather be a dick than a brainless pothead burnt out on marijuana. You can't find any other, more constructive way to relax? Marijuana smoking is a disgusting, repulsive habit, no matter which way you look at it. You're putting unnatural shit into your body. You call that "relaxing"?

It seems a large lump of marijuana has replaced the part of your brain that used to be occupied by common sense.  
Now I just feel sorry for you.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:00:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.well.com/user/woa/fspot.htm>

There's a fact sheet for you nerologically challenged potheads out there. If you're vision is too blurred from your latest drug usage, then feel free to see it later.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:30:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Speeding is harmful to others. Petty crime is harmful to others. I generally regard you as an intelligent person, but you continue to bring up the same, flawed argument.

Harmful to others, yes it can be. But so can Marijuana. Please don't come back with "How?", it says so in that link you provided.

The arguement only appears flawed because you refuse to acknowledge the idea that Marijuana is harmful to others; just like the things I have been pointing out(and harmful does not mean that it has to have some SERIOUS medical condition. Simply throwing up from the second hand smoke is considered "harmful").

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:30:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:The arguement only appears flawed because you refuse to acknowledge the idea that Marijuana is harmful to others; just like the things I have been pointing out(and harmful does not mean that it has to have some SERIOUS medical condition. Simply throwing up from the second hand smoke is considered "harmful").

I've already talked a great deal about how people who smoke pot can and could be legally forced to insure others aren't "harmed." I'm not revisiting this unless you come up with something new.

And Hydra, since you personally know me and can thus accurately describe me, I intend on taking your comments very seriously.

As for that link...

Quote:The strength of today's marijuana is as much as ten times greater than the marijuana used in the early 1970s.

Absolute bullshit. Marijuana/hashish has been grown/produced for hundreds of years. People have been smoking it in the east for many more years than in the US. A lot of marijuana still comes from there today. It's the same plant.

Quote: People describe this reaction as an extreme fear of "losing control," which causes panic. I don't know who these people that they asked are, but they sound like they have problems already. Extreme fear and losing control? Give me a break.

Quote:Long-term regular users of marijuana may become psychologically dependent. It has been proven that marijuana is addictive by a study financed by the US government. That study also mentioned that coffee, sex, and chocolate are more addictive. POT: REAL ADDICTIVE!!

Quote:Research shows that the earlier people start using drugs, the more likely they are to go on to experiment with other drugs.I would support pot being illegal to minors. This logic that pot leads to harder drugs is based on the fact that most people who do harder drugs started with pot. However, the majority people who smoke pot do not move on to harder drugs. Not so bad when you look at the facts correctly, huh?

Quote:Some research studies suggest that the use of marijuana during pregnancy may result in premature babies and in low birth weights. Studies of men and women may have a temporary loss of fertility. These findings suggest that marijuana may be especially harmful during adolescence, a period of rapid physical and sexual development.

"No trustworthy study has ever shown that marijuana use damages the reproductive system, or causes chromosome breakage. Studies of actual human populations have failed to demonstrate that marijuana adversely affects the reproductive system. Claims that marijuana use may impair hormone production, menstrual cycles, or fertility in females are both unproven and unfounded."  
- [http://www.askmen.com/sports/health/20b\\_mens\\_health.html](http://www.askmen.com/sports/health/20b_mens_health.html)

Quote:Scientists believe that marijuana can be especially harmful to the lungs because users often inhale the unfiltered smoke deeply and hold it in their lungs as long as possible. Therefore, the smoke is in contact with lung tissues for long periods of time, which irritates the lungs and damages the way they work. Marijuana smoke contains some of the same ingredients in tobacco smoke that can cause emphysema and cancer. There is no evidence showing higher rates of lung cancer in people who use marijuana.

Marijuana Unlikely to Cause Head, Neck, or Lung Cancer

Oh, the good ol' Missouri Department of mental health...

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:35:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, this is a classic. Please, tell me, which statement is true?

Quote:Cancer  
Smoking marijuana has the potential to cause both bronchitis and cancer of the lungs, throat, and neck, but this is generally no different than inhaling any other burnt carbon-containing matter since they all increase the number of lesions (and therefore possible infections) in your airways.

OR

Quote:Marijuana, unlike tobacco and alcohol, does not appear to cause head, neck, or lung cancer, says a researcher from Johns Hopkins Medical School in Baltimore who presented findings from a study here recently at a meeting of internal medicine physicians.

Now, which statement is true? Mind you, picking from one source immediately discredits anything coming from the other.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:40:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEAL wrote on Thu, 28 July 2005 18:30 Well Hydra, since you personally know me and can thus accurately describe me, I intend on taking your comments very seriously.

As for that link...

Quote:The strength of today's marijuana is as much as ten times greater than the marijuana used in the early 1970s.  
Absolute bullshit. Marijuana/hashish has been grown/produced for hundreds of years. People

have been smoking it in the east for many more years than in the US. A lot of marijuana still comes from there today. It's the same plant.

It's how the plant is grown, and things get altered over time. Growers made it more addictive. The plant itself changes over time.

Quote: People describe this reaction as an extreme fear of "losing control," which causes panic. I don't know who these people that they asked are, but they sound like they have problems already. Extreme fear and losing control? Give me a break.

They get this from Marijuana. Can you read, or is your vision still blurred from your latest hit?

Quote: Long-term regular users of marijuana may become psychologically dependent. It has been proven that marijuana is addictive by a study financed by the US government. That study also mentioned that coffee, sex, and chocolate are more addictive. POT: REAL ADDICTIVE!!

There are such things as sex, coffee, and chocolate addicts. Strangely enough, they get irritable and such.

Quote: Research shows that the earlier people start using drugs, the more likely they are to go on to experiment with other drugs. I would support pot being illegal to minors. This logic that pot leads to harder drugs is based on the fact that most people who do harder drugs started with pot. However, the majority people who smoke pot do not move on to harder drugs. Not so bad when you look at the facts correctly, huh?

Children and teens obtain Cigs and Alcohol from their parents own supply, what stops Marijuana from being different? It's also not bad for pot users, who can't see the facts because the smoke is too thick to see through.

Quote: Some research studies suggest that the use of marijuana during pregnancy may result in premature babies and in low birth weights. Studies of men and women may have a temporary loss of fertility. These findings suggest that marijuana may be especially harmful during adolescence, a period of rapid physical and sexual development.

"No trustworthy study has ever shown that marijuana use damages the reproductive system, or causes chromosome breakage. Studies of actual human populations have failed to demonstrate that marijuana adversely affects the reproductive system. Claims that marijuana use may impair hormone production, menstrual cycles, or fertility in females are both unproven and unfounded."  
- [http://www.askmen.com/sports/health/20b\\_mens\\_health.html](http://www.askmen.com/sports/health/20b_mens_health.html)

Quote: Scientists believe that marijuana can be especially harmful to the lungs because users often inhale the unfiltered smoke deeply and hold it in their lungs as long as possible. Therefore, the smoke is in contact with lung tissues for long periods of time, which irritates the lungs and damages the way they work. Marijuana smoke contains some of the same ingredients in tobacco smoke that can cause emphysema and cancer. There is no evidence showing higher rates of lung cancer in people who use marijuana.

Marijuana Unlikely to Cause Head, Neck, or Lung Cancer

Oh, the good ol' Missouri Department of mental haelth...

As for your last two links that's crap, probably made by some old college students who had a good 'ol time in high school.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:42:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Merely showing that for any link you give me, I can throw one back at you. BOTH sources are biased.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:45:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

At any rate, isn't it better to assume something is dangerous and not use it, than to go around using something that could be dangerous? It's always better to assume the worst in a situation like this.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 22:53:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pot won't be legalized, it will never be legalized. Get over it. The people don't want another filthy habit wondering the streets like smoking or drinking.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 23:10:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This thread is about whether it should be, not will be, legalized.

Quote:The people don't want another filthy habit wondering the streets like smoking or drinking.

Really? Last time I checked, millions upon millions of Americans smoke on a regular basis.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 28 Jul 2005 23:16:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SEAL wrote on Thu, 28 July 2005 18:40This thread is about whether it should be, not will be, legalized.

Quote:The people don't want ANOTHER filthy habit wondering the streets like smoking or drinking.

Really? Last time I checked, millions upon millions of Americans smoke on a regular basis.

Stop inferring, and Read. Thats twice you did that to my posts today.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 00:59:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It already is "wandering" the streets. Wake up.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 02:00:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thankfully, most people realize it's dangers, and don't want their child or self a spaced out pot smoker who go onto online forums to make horrible debates about how pot should be legalized.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 02:20:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Smooth. Let's attack me personally because we have no more legitimate points to make to counter me.

Thanks for making assumptions about me, asshole. Spaced out? You know nothing about me or how I act when I'm high. I happen to be much more focused when I smoke. But you never thought that would happen to someone high, did you? You're basing all of that shit about me based on the misinformed stereotyped bullshit that you people spew.

AskMen.ComBut while alcohol and cigarettes are legal, we must ask ourselves: is it normal, fair, economical, rational, or logical to lump ganja, weed, pot, schmag, or bud in the same category as hard drugs that admittedly kill, destroy and ravage everything in sight? To objectively answer this question, one must have smoked at one point in their lives. For a non-smoker to say, "thou shalt

not smoke," is like a virgin saying "thou shalt not have sex." You do not know what you are talking about. There are thus social, medical, legal, ethical, and economical factors to be considered."

The site speaks truth, but you're too close minded, stubborn and stuck in your point of view that you refuse to even consider that the author might be right.

You don't know what you're talking about, so stop pretending like you do. Hell, even your Lord and Savior, good ol' Dubya has smoked a doobie. Oh, yeah... well, him and 50 other million Americans.

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 02:44:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEAL wrote on Thu, 28 July 2005 22:20Smooth. Let's attack me personally because we have no more legitimate points to make to counter me.

Thanks for making assumptions about me, asshole. Spaced out? You know nothing about me or how I act when I'm high. I happen to be much more focused when I smoke. But you never thought that would happen to someone high, did you? You're basing all of that shit about me based on the misinformed stereotyped bullshit that you people spew.

AskMen.ComBut while alcohol and cigarettes are legal, we must ask ourselves: is it normal, fair, economical, rational, or logical to lump ganja, weed, pot, schmag, or bud in the same category as hard drugs that admittedly kill, destroy and ravage everything in sight? To objectively answer this question, one must have smoked at one point in their lives. For a non-smoker to say, "thou shalt not smoke," is like a virgin saying "thou shalt not have sex." You do not know what you are talking about. There are thus social, medical, legal, ethical, and economical factors to be considered."

The site speaks truth, but you're too close minded, stubborn and stuck in your point of view that you refuse to even consider that the author might be right.

You don't know what you're talking about, so stop pretending like you do. Hell, even your Lord and Savior, good ol' Dubya has smoked a doobie. Oh, yeah... well, him and 50 other million Americans.

Psst... Bush sucks? :-\

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 02:51:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What's the point of keeping it legal? It has obvious short, and long term effects. If adults used it,



say, anyone who has a job, they'd function less. Would you like someone who is not able to concentrate holding a firearm as a police officer? Attempting to save your family as a fire fighter? Operating on you at the surgery table?

Probably not. They're likely to make more mistakes the chemicals from Marijuana enters the body.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 03:09:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

glyde51 wrote on Thu, 28 July 2005 15:45At any rate, isn't it better to assume something is dangerous and not use it, than to go around using something that could be dangerous? It's always better to assume the worst in a situation like this.

True dat... heck, within the last century people didn't know cigarettes kill you.

I don't have to do something to know it's stupid and dangerous. Why don't you potheads go jump off a cliff because you apparently can't judge how retarded it is to do until you try it yourself. You truly disgust me.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [mripirate](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 03:21:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Sometimes these forums make me sad.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 03:26:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SEAL wrote on Wed, 27 July 2005 13:52Being high on pot pacifies you.

Then explain why some high idiot threw a huge rock at my cousin and got into a fight with him (I witnessed it).

Fact is, it's a case-per-case situation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 03:43:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, since I seem to be being ignored, I'll quote myself.

Quote:Oh, this is a classic. Please, tell me, which statement is true?

Quote:

Cancer

Smoking marijuana has the potential to cause both bronchitis and cancer of the lungs, throat, and neck, but this is generally no different than inhaling any other burnt carbon-containing matter since they all increase the number of lesions (and therefore possible infections) in your airways.

OR

Quote:

Marijuana, unlike tobacco and alcohol, does not appear to cause head, neck, or lung cancer, says a researcher from Johns Hopkins Medical School in Baltimore who presented findings from a study here recently at a meeting of internal medicine physicians.

Now, which statement is true? Mind you, picking from one source immediately discredits anything coming from the other

AND

Quote:Quote:

Speeding is harmful to others. Petty crime is harmful to others. I generally regard you as an intelligent person, but you continue to bring up the same, flawed argument.

Harmful to others, yes it can be. But so can Marijuana. Please don't come back with "How?", it says so in that link you provided.

The arguement only appears flawed because you refuse to acknowledge the idea that Marijuana is harmful to others; just like the things I have been pointing out(and harmful does not mean that it has to have some SERIOUS medical condition. Simply throwing up from the second hand smoke is considered "harmful").

Subject: Re: Marijuana legalization  
Posted by [bandie63](#) on Fri, 29 Jul 2005 21:55:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In reply to all those people who are saying all advocates are pot heads:

I have never smoked pot, nor do I intend to in the foreseeable future. That does not mean that I would not support it being legalized. If people want to do this, I'm not stopping them, but I do agree. There should be some rules in place for the use of this stuff.

---