Subject: Re: Drugs ARE NOT bad
Posted by warranto on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 00:45:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ugh... try this again... (I think I caught the forum in a backup.

comments based off the titles of
http://www.populistamerica.com/free_from_the_nightmare_of_prohibition

Quote:The difficulty of enforcing victimless-crime laws leads to three bad consequences.

The Rise in Violent Crime
Black Markets
Police State Tactics

LOL. I love this logic. If only it were that simple. Guess what? If people would not break the small crimes, the police wouldn't have to waste their time enforcing them! There would BE no rise in violent crime, no Black Markets and no police state tactics required if people would not break the law.

You have no one to blame but yourself, people! But then, "propaganda" tells me that people like this often try to blame someone else for their own acts... seems like it is true in this instant.

Quote:HOW THE INNOCENT ARE HURT

Oh, how I wish I could use this logic
in any of my philosophy classes. I would be sitting with a 4.0. Unfortunately, this logic does not work with anyone who has even a shred of intelligence.

Faults of the system that govern crime does not mean the crime should be legal. Heck, just look at how many people are arrested/jailed for murder they did not commit. I DARE you to say that murder should become legal because innocent people get caught in the system.

Quote:Some Are More Equal Than Others
The Honorable Hypocrites

Corrupt politicians = crime should be legalized huh? Again, such wonderful logic there. I don't have much to say on this because I can't understand the logic myself... it is so horrible that even I don't know where to begin.

Quote:TWO TYPES OF CRIMES

Ah yes, the "victimless" crime reasoning. I could agree with this, provided someone can guarantee me committing the "victimless" crime will not involve a victim later. As Crimson pointed out one time, someone she knew got high and killed a person. Sure, getting high may have been victimless, but what about after? Sure, gambling can be victimless, but what about when you become a burden on society because you are now poor? Sure, drinking is fine, but what about

getting drunk and doing something to someone who did not consent?

"Victimless" crimes only count when the act and the CONSEQUENCES of the act do not involve another person.

Quote:It may be difficult for a spouse to leave an alcoholic or a gambler, but it is the spouse's own free will that determines whether to stay or go. All parties are there voluntarily, however dismal the situation.

Wrong. If a wife has been beaten to the point of being broken, she will not be there voluntarily. If a child is present, it will not be voluntary (a child legally lacks the capacity to agree to such things). A spouse does not take lightly the idea of leaving someone because of things they do. They may feel obliged to remain as they gave their vows they would. That does not imply consent. What if the spouse simply can't leave?
Be it injury or financially unable to leave?

Sorry, but this logic is also a failure.