
Subject: weed

Posted by [Jamie or NuneGa](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 22:24:15 GMT

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

should it be made legal in britain... like holland.

Talk about it.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 22:25:30 GMT

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

Heh i know plenty of people who have used it. Not me though i don't smoke.

-Ghost-

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 22:27:26 GMT

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

It should be legalized everywhere. It's your body, do whatever you want with it regardless of how immoral someone else may view your actions.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 22:28:45 GMT

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

All nonmedical drugs should be illegal, including smoking. Nobody cares if you damage your own body, but seeing this damage your brain, you become a harm to EVERYONE (smoking can also harm nonsmokers for standing around other smokers, sometimes you'd have to travel miles to find a place with a no smoking sign).

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [renohol](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 23:02:30 GMT

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

As Thomas Jefferson once said, "They should make education illegal, then everyone would get one."

If the possession "Hemp", (the English version of Marijuana), were to suddenly become legal, what would happen to the \$50,000,000,000 generated annually through its sale?

What would happen to the "Gorrila Growers", the importers, the middlemen, the security guards, the transporters, the salesmen, the small time crooks all the way up to the Feds who make a living off the fact that possessing Hemp is "Illegal".

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 00:00:01 GMT

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

All the discussion you could ever want on this subject.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 00:16:26 GMT

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

No.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 00:24:48 GMT

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

iDoser is your friend.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 05:00:12 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 10 July 2007 18:27It should be legalized everywhere. It's your body, do whatever you want with it regardless of how immoral someone else may view your actions. I guess i will become immune to not breathing ever again, i'm around it enough at work, and even inside the building i can smell the weed with all doors and windows shut, the smell is that strong, I hate it, it makes me sneeze, cough, and gag, I want it all burnt and never to exist again, i am allergic to it and smoke from ciggerets, but normal smoke from firewood and burning paper doesnt bother me...ever think second hand smoking would be a issue with weed too? I cant just stop breathing..I have to breathe.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [renohol](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 05:56:37 GMT

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

Second"lung" smoke is a problem even though I would HIGHly recommend you avoid cigarette

smoke, the secondlung smoke from the most pure, unadulterated, gift from the Gods Bud tips should only enhance your life and enrichen your soul.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 06:15:56 GMT

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

You do notice.....weed purchased on streets or made in homes isnt always "pure" it's tainted with chemicals that affect your body and make you more high and "out of it" plus I wont breathe it in anyways, it smells like crap to me, anad weed isnt a gift from God, just because God made weed it doesnt mean it's good, God made Trex's but all they did was eat...then they died....they werent that great to dino-civilization.....though most people say DARE teaches kids when young not to do drugs, I say opposite, yes they say drugs are bad, but kids dont listen and just do it, I on the otherhand know what drugs do to the human body "good feeling" but in the long run not that awesome.....SO thats why i dont do drugs...plus the fact they stink, and i am allergic.....it smells worse than burning leaves.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [renohol](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 06:27:02 GMT

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

your right AoBfrost, drugs can be harmful if abused, but remember, food is a drug, I know because I'm overweight, and I'm not trying to give young people advice on using Hemp because I was addicted, pyscology at least and craved it every day in my teens.

I say Renegade and alcohol r the 2 most addictive drugs on the planet, so users beware!

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 06:43:54 GMT

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

renohol wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 01:27I say Renegade and alcohol r the 2 most addictive drugs on the planet, so users beware!

For me it's Renegade and Snickers. Renegade eats my time and Snickers pollutes my blood.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 09:47:32 GMT

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

BuzzOfTheStar wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 01:43renohol wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 01:27I say Renegade and alcohol r the 2 most addictive drugs on the planet, so users beware!

For me it's Renegade and Snickers. Renegade eats my time and Snickers pollutes my blood.

Renegade, Alcohol *cough* Pepsi Lite, Maynards sports mix gums. You don't need weed.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 09:52:16 GMT

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

People will smoke weed in Britain whether it is legal or not - it's incredibly easy to get hold of.

Making it legal however would:

1. Most likely reduce the cost to users, who are currently getting ripped off
2. Take billions of pounds away from criminals, people who also deal in other illegal activities
3. Generate billions of pounds of tax revenue that would more than cover any costs of regulating the drug, providing support to people who want to stop using it and any costs caused by health problems.
4. Improve the quality and remove any harmful additives that might be present in illegal weed
5. Allow for regulation - perhaps forcing users to register and only have access to a certain amount, perhaps even being "prescribed" it to ensure that smokers are acting responsibly with it and can't just walk in to a shop and buy as much as they want.
6. Aid sufferers of diseases like MS who have to endure immense pain that can be effectively reduced by smoking weed - currently people who try to help these people are getting arrested for dealing (despite distributing it for free in various forms such as chocolate or gel)
7. Alternative safer ways to take weed would become available, alternatives to smoking such as weed foodstuffs, gels etc for people who want to relax but don't want to kill their lungs.

It should be (as smoking/drinking) against the law to smoke anywhere in public apart from specially licensed cafe's, meaning that people would continue to smoke in the privacy of their own home.

The only downside I can see to this is that potentially a few people who would not normally take drugs might be tempted due to it being legal - I don't see that can really be that many people though considering how widespread it's current usage is.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Herr](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 11:40:03 GMT

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

I live in the netherlands and am quiet aware of the stereotype how we all smoke weed and go to

prostitutes.

But actually, legalizing these things really makes it less attractive. Believe me, I have seen 2 old friends go down on this shit. Being 15/16, starting to smoke it like hell, don't care about other friends, don't care about school, or basically care about anything. Good thing is they have come around now they are 19/20, but they messed up their future bad.

As for about 70% of the people I knew back then, they all tried it once. So did I. A fun night with your friends giving it a shot, fortunately it did not please me at all.

The usage of it (for the majority) is very occasional. Since it's legal, it lost interest. There is also a group of people who searches for harder drugs like XTC.

(As for the prostitutes, my city has 2 red light districts of it's own. Actually I drive through one of them each day since I live near there. But I can tell you, about 70-80% of the visitors there are foreign. Most of them Polish, German or other east-european countries.)

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 12:15:06 GMT

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

Why stop at weed? Let's legalize Paint huffing too!

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 13:04:19 GMT

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

No thank you.

It's bad enough having to smell it on people who recently smoked it (and nearly passing out in the process). It's bad enough I have to hold my breath while passing people who smoke cigarettes (I'm allergic to the smoke), I don't want to have to add pot to that as well.

I prefer to actually be able to breath, not pass out because of my allergic reaction to it.

(And people say smoking pot doesn't hurt anyone.... they should stop thinking about themselves and realize there are other people who have to deal with it as well)

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 14:31:01 GMT

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

Like MexPirate said, specially licensed businesses should allow for marijuana smoking in their restaurants, just like there are alcohol licenses.

As for everybody griping about the health concerns... YOU'RE NOT FORCED TO BE AROUND

IT. The high-horsery STILL amazes me.

Jecht, it should be legal. If you don't like drugs, here's a novel idea: DON'T DO DRUGS. Just because your morals stop you from participating doesn't mean everybody else has to stop because of you and a few others' high-horsery. If I want to damage my body, it's my right to do so.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 14:37:43 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 09:31

...

As for everybody griping about the health concerns... YOU'RE NOT FORCED TO BE AROUND IT. The high-horsery STILL amazes me.

...

We are if they smoke it on the streets, which is Warranto's concern. (The answer is obviously to ban it in public places)

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 14:51:46 GMT

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

In the open air the smoke doesn't hang around and the health risks are minimal.

-Ghost-

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [jimmyny](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 15:00:40 GMT

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

no.

BBC link

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 15:02:22 GMT

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

And it will maybe travel into places near by and other people can smell it?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 15:03:23 GMT

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

CarrierII wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 10:37cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 09:31

...
As for everybody griping about the health concerns... YOU'RE NOT FORCED TO BE AROUND IT. The high-horsery STILL amazes me.

...
We are if they smoke it on the streets, which is Warranto's concern. (The answer is obviously to ban it in public places)

Unless you're in a public building, you have the ability to walk away. Plus, just as you can't get drunk in public, you shouldn't be able to get high in public.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 15:51:08 GMT

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

Ghostshaw wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 08:51In the open air the smoke doesn't hang around and the health risks are minimal.

-Ghost-

Unfortunately it does. I have a very sensitive nose when it comes to smell. I can tell that someone has been smoking up to an hour or two (depending on windspeed) after they have been there. A faint scent may not cause a reaction, but it still causes discomfort and coughing.

It sucks when my grandmother is over, because she smokes tobacco and I can't be in the house when she does it because I can smell it from anywhere.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [futura83](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 17:11:37 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 16:51Ghostshaw wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 08:51In the open air the smoke doesn't hang around and the health risks are minimal.

-Ghost-

Unfortunately it does. I have a very sensitive nose when it comes to smell. I can tell that someone has been smoking up to an hour or two (depending on windspeed) after they have been there. A faint scent may not cause a reaction, but it still causes discomfort and coughing.

It sucks when my grandmother is over, because she smokes tobacco and I can't be in the house

when she does it because I can smell it from anywhere.

It also isn't about the smell hanging there.

Walking past someone who smokes, and doesn't hesitate to blow it in your face, or walking past someone too ignorant to even direct the smoke away from you, isn't exactly what people want.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 18:14:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I feel sorry for you if you need weed or other drugs to feel better.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 18:17:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I feel sorry for you if you've never experienced drugs, for what it's worth.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 18:22:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 19:02:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22 You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

If only xptek were here to laugh at your assumptions. He's researched the drugs he's done. He knows the potential of the drugs. There's a lot of propaganda from dumb anti-drug groups.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 19:02:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

renohol wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 02:27your right AoBfrost, drugs can be harmful if abused, but remember, food is a drug, I know because I'm overweight, and I'm not trying to give young people advice on using Hemp because I was addicted, pysicsology at least and craved it every day in my teens.

I say Renegade and alcohol r the 2 most addictive drugs on the planet, so users beware!

I guess all those vegetables I eat are gonna kill me someday cause I abuse them and eat them daily every meal, Maybe i'll stop eating too, stop breathing too, and stop everything i need to live, even drugs used daily are harmful even if not abused, I know people where i work they smoke only once or twice a week and over the past 3 years they seem really different, they used to be fun to be around, now they seem gloomy and unaware of whats going on, it's just if you abuse to and use too much in a short time, you go out faster, if you use less but in the long run, you still go out but alot slower.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 19:11:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Why do I get the feeling that it's actually YOU who doesn't have a fucking clue what he's talking about?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 19:33:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think that people should be able to decide for themselves what they put into their bodies. I mean, people know that most drugs are bad for you and can make decisions on their own.

After all, if our society truly is "free" shouldn't we be able to make free choices about things like drugs without someone deciding for us?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 19:49:57 GMT

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

Not really.

Hence the reason there is a "notwithstanding" clause that our Government has access to, and why Canada views rights as something that is "freedom within reason".

No one in their right mind would allow someone to do something that could potentially harm themselves or someone else, just because they have the "right" to. (No, I'm not attacking Marijuana here... this applies to anything)

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 20:02:33 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:11BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Why do I get the feeling that it's actually YOU who doesn't have a fucking clue what he's talking about?

Do some research dude,

and ffs! Stop taking my statements and saying them back to me, make up your own for once!

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 20:40:07 GMT

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

Just to point out two different sources (if you notice, they don't conflict with each other despite both seeming to support the opposite side of the argument)

<http://www.nida.nih.gov/Infofacts/marijuana.html>

<http://www.webmd.com/mental-health/news/20030701/heavy-marijuana-use-doesnt-damage-brain>

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 20:54:33 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:49

No one in their right mind would allow someone to do something that could potentially harm themselves or someone else, just because they have the "right" to. (No, I'm not attacking Marijuana here... this applies to anything)

I guess that means we shouldn't be able to drive because you could crash and kill someone or yourself, and you certainly shouldn't be able to cook either, because you could make yourself or someone else sick!

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 20:58:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Which is why serving food and driving require a license to prove that you know what you are doing... or at least have sufficient coverage to rectify a situation should you actually harm someone.

Driving and cooking are not rights, they are privileges.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:01:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Theres a point of how much freedom you have though, You have to know when to not do something even if it feels good to you, like weed for example, there are side effects, people always make studies which cant even be trusted but claim weed is ok, I mean look, if we legalize weed, next your gonna tell me you want meth legalized and meth is 10 times worse, it eats your teeth away and eventually kills you, and DONT even bother telling me meth is good for you, that there was some study, I know a woman where i work and she is always doing meth at her home, she has no teeth, she's always high, so obviously there are side effects.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:01:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 15:58 Which is why serving food and driving require a license to prove that you know what you are doing... or at least have sufficient coverage to rectify a situation should you actually harm someone.

Driving and cooking are not rights, they are privileges.

It's a privilege to cook for yourself or a friend? You've got some weird laws in Alberta.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:06:21 GMT

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

It is.

It's not a right that is guaranteed by the government, regardless of where you are in the world.

If it is not a right, then it is a privilege. Were you to poison said friend, and server jail time, that privilege would be taken away for the duration of your stay in prison, and restored to you when you got out. There is no form of act or legal provision that says they MUST let you out for a night, or allow you access to cooking material because you have a "right" to cook for a friend.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:19:39 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 16:02mrpirate wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:11BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Why do I get the feeling that it's actually YOU who doesn't have a fucking clue what he's talking about?

Do some research dude,

and ffs! Stop taking my statements and saying them back to me, make up your own for once!

Do some research on what? I'd be willing to bet that I've done a lot more research into drug use than you have. I'm curious as to what makes you think you're qualified to make statements like "You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs" when you're not even keeping up with the discourse well enough to notice that weed being unhealthy isn't really the topic being discussed here.

Is there any reason why I shouldn't be allowed to smoke a joint in my room and play video games? What's so wrong with that?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:23:15 GMT

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

I think this thread is becoming pointless like all other heavily debated threads, the non users say weed is bad, the users say weed is good for you, then post links of studies saying weed is good and non users are retards, all i can say is in my opinion, when your into something you dont see the negative effects like others around you see you.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:24:27 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 16:19BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 16:02mrpirate wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:11BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Why do I get the feeling that it's actually YOU who doesn't have a fucking clue what he's talking about?

Do some research dude,

and ffs! Stop taking my statements and saying them back to me, make up your own for once!

Do some research on what? I'd be willing to be that I've done a lot more research into drug use than you have. I'm curious as to what makes you think you're qualified to make statements like "You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs" when you're not even keeping up with the discourse well enough to notice that weed being unhealthy isn't really the topic being discussed here.

Is there any reason why I shouldn't be allowed to smoke a joint in my room and play video games? What's so wrong with that?

Well, sitting here and watching people say that all weed does is make you better, makes me realise how dumb that is!

Do you know what second hand smoking is? Some people have to travel miles just to get to a place where there is no smoking, so don't say "You can just avoid that person!", but when everyone is smoking, it's hard to avoid.

I don't care what you do to your body, but selfishly, it's what people do to MY body.

BTW, I don't need drugs to feel good.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:40:11 GMT

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

So tell me guys, if weed is SOOOO good and healthy for you, what health benefits does it provide? I want actual facts and not opinion like I have been hearing this entire thread.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 21:55:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you guys want your weed, I want my machinegun. Seems fair enough a trade to me.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 22:11:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 17:40So tell me guys, if weed is SOOOO good and healthy for you, what health benefits does it provide? I want actual facts and not opinion like I have been hearing this entire thread.

Are you stupid? Nowhere in this thread is anyone claiming that marijuana is healthy for you.

Java: Just so long as you're not pointing it at me.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [jimminy](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 22:25:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jimminy wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 10:00no.

BBC link

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 22:57:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Javaxcx wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 17:55If you guys want your weed, I want my machinegun. Seems fair enough a trade to me.

Omg your a genius! jav is the only person who made a actual point today!

Fine, I'll support weed legalization if you legalize killing, murder, rape, child abuse, pyro maniac arson, dog fighting, illegal street racing, and bombing local shopping malls.

Seems fair.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:21:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, because smoking weed is as bad as raping someone.

It's become increasingly clear that you've got nothing to contribute to this discussion, frost. Maybe you could stop posting?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:22:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Fine, I'll support weed legalization if you legalize killing, murder, rape, child abuse, pyro maniac arson, dog fighting, illegal street racing, and bombing local shopping malls.

Don't be an idiot.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [futura83](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:23:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I wouldn't be against people smoking weed.

So long as they have to have a permit, can only have so much per day, and can only do it in private...

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:25:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why would it matter how much they smoke per day if they're doing it in private?

I think requiring a permit to use drugs might not be such a bad idea, though.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:25:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If they do it in their own home, why would you care? Once they start smoking the substance in public, that's where the problem comes into play.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:29:11 GMT

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

Dave S. Anderson wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 18:25 If they do it in their own home, why would you care? Once they start smoking the substance in public, that's where the problem comes into play.

Well, maybe the people (relatives) who live with the smoker would care?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:34:25 GMT

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

Then the relatives can take it up with the smoker.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:44:47 GMT

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

But then wouldnt neighbors also smell/see you smoking pot? then they would call the cops and make a big deal, I can smell pot being smoked from the parking lot of where i work, but not normal cigarette smoke, I think smoking pot in private wouldnt be that private if neighbors could smell it from their own home/yard.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:47:28 GMT

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

why do you continue to post?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 23:50:48 GMT

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

What i mean is because some people say others should have permits to use drugs, and in private, but then if you still disturb the public with the smell or sight of you smoking pot in your home or yard, then what good would a permit allowing you (in private of your home) smoke pot?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 00:06:17 GMT

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

they can fucking live with it

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 01:28:38 GMT

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

Can someone change the name of this thread to "Marijuana: Round 2"?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 01:42:04 GMT

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

way more than 2 by this point...

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 02:19:44 GMT

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

Round 7.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 02:22:03 GMT

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

Seven is a really cool number.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 08:37:27 GMT

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

Hey Blue, why don't you actually bring some knowledge or ideas to the debate before spouting mindless bullshit.

To anyone whos argument is "I don't want to breath pot smoke" try reading my earlier post - I don't think anyone is saying it should be allowed in public places where you sensitive people might come in contact with it, private property or specially licensed premesis designed for the purpose. If it's in private property then it's up to the owner to dictate if it's allowed, a cafe would be FOR smoking weed if you don't like it don't go near the place (regulations stating adequate ventilation/air conditioning etc could also be enforced to protect any public walking past from the

deadly fumes)

Don't even try and say "but people will smell of smoke" tough shit, when I get on a train and some fat bastard stinks of sweat I deal with it, it's not nice but it isn't doing me any harm, neither is the SMELL of smoke on somebody.

NOBODY IN THIS THREAD WHO SUPPORTS THE LEGALIZATION OF WEED HAS SAID IT IS GOOD FOR YOU, WE ARE AWARE THAT IT IS DAMAGING OUR HEALTH - WE JUST CONSIDER IT AN ACCEPTABLE RISK FOR THE PERCEIVED BENEFITS.

Quote:1. Most likely reduce the cost to users, who are currently getting ripped off
2. Take billions of pounds away from criminals, people who also deal in other illegal activities
3. Generate billions of pounds of tax revenue that would more than cover any costs of regulating the drug, providing support to people who want to stop using it and any costs caused by health problems.
4. Improve the quality and remove any harmful additives that might be present in illegal weed
5. Allow for regulation - perhaps forcing users to register and only have access to a certain amount, perhaps even being "prescribed" it to ensure that smokers are acting responsibly with it and can't just walk in to a shop and buy as much as they want.
6. Aid sufferers of diseases like MS who have to endure immense pain that can be effectively reduced by smoking weed - currently people who try to help these people are getting arrested for dealing (despite distributing it for free in various forms such as chocolate or gel)
7. Alternative safer ways to take weed would become available, alternatives to smoking such as weed foodstuffs, gels etc for people who want to relax but don't want to kill their lungs.

It should be (as smoking/drinking) against the law to smoke anywhere in public apart from specially licensed cafe's, meaning that people would continue to smoke in the privacy of their own home.

The only downside I can see to this is that potentially a few people who would not normally take drugs might be tempted due to it being legal - I don't see that can really be that many people though considering how widespread it's current usage is.

Somebody feel free to either come up with another valid argument against legalising weed that doesn't have a simple solution or come up with some constructive criticism of the points I have raised for it being legal.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 11:36:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Seriously. iDoser.

It's a program that plays binaural beats that affect your brain wave and give you the affect of being drunk - Tripping on Acid, Feeling stoned, Heck, There's even a hangover cure.

If weed is illegal, Do it the legal way. iDoser.

I have a copy and it worked for me.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 11:52:51 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 09:31 Like MexPirate said, specially licensed businesses should allow for marijuana smoking in their restaurants, just like there are alcohol licenses.

As for everybody griping about the health concerns... YOU'RE NOT FORCED TO BE AROUND IT. The high-horsery STILL amazes me.

Jecht, it should be legal. If you don't like drugs, here's a novel idea: DON'T DO DRUGS. Just because your morals stop you from participating doesn't mean everybody else has to stop because of you and a few others' high-horsery. If I want to damage my body, it's my right to do so.

By all means, I'm all for the self-damaging of morons. What I'm not for is an extra agent out on the street that clouds the senses and judgement of individuals to the point where it could harm me or my family. I'm also against exposing to children that this practice is acceptable. America's values are all ready down the shitter, i'd rather not be accociated with something that could and would make them worse. Call it high-horsery if you want, but it's wrong to do.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 12:13:00 GMT

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

It'd be just as illegal to be stoned in public as it is to be drunk in public. Do you seriously think that because weed is illegal, people aren't out in public stoned?

At this point in politics, I don't think legalizing pot would be a good idea. At least, not in America. Pot has been shown to make people lazier, which will get them fired from jobs or make them cease to care about getting one, putting more people on welfare. As soon as welfare's abolished, I'd be more than happy to allow for the legalization of marijuana.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 14:56:20 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22 You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Good for you? Probably not. But bad for you? Continuing studies are showing that THC (not weed per se) doesn't do anything adverse to you physically. In fact as it stands, the only people who seem to be adversely affected by THC are those without the psychological fortitude to stop. It is experimentally shown not to be chemically addictive, but in many cases it is extremely psychologically addictive. The irony is that because the line of psycho-addiction is so blurry, most stoners have no idea they are in fact dependent on it. I would imagine that a decent percentage of users on this board have some kind of psychological addiction to THC and are completely oblivious to it. Pound for pound, THC requires virtually hundreds of times the dosage as opposed to say alcohol before a lethal dose is a reality.

That said, marijuana and THC are two completely different things. Stoners and non-smokers alike make the misconception frequently enough that because studies show that THC isn't necessarily bad for you, that marijuana must also be harmless. That simply isn't the case. They think that smoking the plant is harmless when in fact it is extremely harmful. Filtration supposedly helps but I personally doubt it. The irony is that if stoners simply ate the plant, it would be as harmless as consuming just the THC by itself. I would further imagine that chemical addiction is a real possibility when you smoke the stuff; not because of the THC, but because of the hundreds of other chemicals which are oxidizing and staying in your lungs while you hold your breath.

As for legislation, I stand by what I said before. I'm proven to be competent and able to handle both small arms, large arms, and automatic firearms by the government. But I'm not allowed to own a machinegun for some reason. I personally think if I don't intend to hurt anyone with it then I should be able to own one because I want one. I don't NEED it by any means, but on that note stoners don't necessarily NEED weed. They're not necessarily hurting anyone when they use it, and if they are competent then they won't necessarily hurt themselves. But here's the problem. If I am allowed to own a machine gun, then all you guys need to do is complete a standard firearms safety course and complete your basic training with the army and you'll be as qualified as me. But that doesn't stop someone from abusing the now-widely accessible legal system. In fact, it just gives potential criminals a means to an ends. On the same note, while most of you here will not be a danger smoking pot, there just needs to be one of you to go for a drive while high to put your mother, father, or siblings in mortal danger. And it would've been utterly legal and mindnumbingly easy for you to get the pot in the first place. Alcohol has the exact same problem. I hardly see why, in the spirit of 'feeling good', I should support putting another abusive substance into the pool of legality. There are millions of ways to feel good on this planet that don't involve intoxication; get out of your parent's basement and go for a walk.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 16:23:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alex wrote on Thu, 12 July 2007 12:36
If weed is illegal, Do it the legal way. iDoser.

I have a copy and it worked for me.

That is freaky.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 17:20:12 GMT

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

Javafx wrote on Thu, 12 July 2007 15:56BlueThen wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 14:22You guys practically know nothing about weed or other drugs. Just google them and you'll see some of the effects.

If you think weed is good for you, then you're honestly a dumb-ass.

Good for you? Probably not. Bad for you? Continuing studies are showing that THC (not weed per se) doesn't do anything adverse to you physically. In fact as it stands, the only people who seem to be adversely affected by THC are those without the psychological fortitude to stop. It is experimentally shown not to be chemically addictive, but in many cases it is extremely psychologically addictive. The irony is that because the line of psycho-addiction is so blurry, most stoners have no idea they are in fact dependent on it. I would imagine that a decent percentage of users on this board have some kind of psychological addiction to THC and are completely oblivious to it. Pound for pound, THC requires virtually hundreds of times the dosage as opposed to say alcohol before a lethal dose is a reality.

That said, marijuana and THC are two completely different things. Stoners and non-smokers alike make the misconception frequently enough that because studies show that THC isn't necessarily bad for you, that marijuana must also be harmless. That simply isn't the case. They think that smoking the plant is harmless when in fact it is extremely harmful. Filtration supposedly helps but I personally doubt it. The irony is that if stoners simply ate the plant, it would be as harmless as consuming just the THC by itself. I would further imagine that chemical addiction is a real possibility when you smoke the stuff; not because of the THC, but because of the hundreds of other chemicals which are oxidizing and staying in your lungs while you hold your breath.

As for legislation, I stand by what I said before. I'm proven to be competent and able to handle both small arms, large arms, and automatic firearms by the government. But I'm not allowed to own a machinegun for some reason. I personally think if I don't intend to hurt anyone with it then I should be able to own one because I want one. I don't NEED it by any means, but on that note stoners don't necessarily NEED weed. They're not necessarily hurting anyone when they use it, and if they are competent then they won't necessarily hurt themselves. But here's the problem. If I am allowed to own a machine gun, then all you guys need to do is complete a standard firearms safety course and complete your basic training with the army and you'll be as qualified as me. But that doesn't stop someone from abusing the now-widely accessible legal system. In fact, it just gives potential criminals a means to an ends. On the same note, while most of you here will not be a danger smoking pot, there just needs to be one of you to go for a drive while high to put your mother, father, or siblings in mortal danger. And it would've been utterly legal and mindnumbingly easy for you to get the pot in the first place. Alcohol has the exact same problem. I hardly see why, in the spirit of 'feeling good', I should support putting another abusive substance into the pool

of legality. There are millions of ways to feel good on this planet that don't involve intoxication; get out of your parent's basement and go for a walk.

Please can you make more posts in this forum.

I understand your point about stupid people gaining access to it and it's a compelling argument - my view however is that the benefits of legalising it outway the disadvantages and punishment for using whilst driving should be just as strict as are applied to alcohol (I am aware that wasn't your point, merely adding a comment)

Problem is I enjoy the action of smoking as much as the high itself

I am pretty confident that I can say I am not dependant or addicted on it though, when I can afford it I smoke some probably 5 days a week - but equally I can go without it and regularly do for weeks at a time, I stopped smoking it for about 9 months straight simply because I was living with my girlfriend who didn't smoke and I virtually always smoke with friends.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 18:28:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 11 July 2007 15:58 Which is why serving food and driving require a license to prove that you know what you are doing... or at least have sufficient coverage to rectify a situation should you actually harm someone.
maybe cannabis should too...

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 21:37:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with everything Java said in this thread.

I'm also completely for stupid people poisoning and maiming themselves, especially to the point where they can no longer contribute to the gene pool (and no, I'm not saying that weed makes you impotent, I'm just in favor of stupid people making themselves impotent in any way they can manage it).

I have a problem with people who are high driving well under or over the speed limit and/or recklessly and putting my life and others lives in danger.

I have a problem with stoners who are too lazy to get a job so they steal from other people to get things to sell in order to buy more drugs.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Romaner](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2007 22:44:27 GMT

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

its my weed and i will smoke it where i want to smoke it and i will drive to my dealer to get more weed once im done. and furthermore if my neighbour doesnt like it i will go through his shit and find something i can get some money for so i can get more weed! and then i will go get a knife and rob someone to get some money or jewellery to get more weed.

if this is what you people think of pot smokers you are way off.

now if you substitute the word weed with crack cocaine... then you got it dead on!

i myself am a responsible adult (or so i would like to think tyvm) and even though i enjoy a puff or two in some occasions (like weekends or parties) it doesnt mean i should be slapped with a ticket for it. or worse taken to jail over it. in every culture and society there will be those that are prone to addiction and thus substance abuse. but basing the desicion on those few will not stop them from getting their fix. they are addicted they dont care if its legal or not... and i have never seen people go to extremes for weed. i mean its not that addictive that you have the shakes or anything. i smoked weed on a daily basis while in highschool. and when i went into college i cut it to once a week. when came graduation i quit for 3 months just to be as sober as i can for my finals and to pass any drug tests i thought i would need in order to get a job.

and it wasnt that hard. all you have to do is occupy yourself and close that time gap where before you would be getting high with doing something else. for me it was taekwondoe and soccer.

its all in your head. if you are stupid and cant control yourself you will be a menase to society in one form or another and making pot illegal will not affect you...

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Fri, 13 Jul 2007 21:40:41 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Thu, 12 July 2007 16:37I agree with everything Java said in this thread.

I'm also completely for stupid people poisoning and maiming themselves, especially to the point where they can no longer contribute to the gene pool (and no, I'm not saying that weed makes you impotent, I'm just in favor of stupid people making themselves impotent in any way they can manage it).

I have a problem with people who are high driving well under or over the speed limit and/or recklessly and putting my life and others lives in danger.

I have a problem with stoners who are too lazy to get a job so they steal from other people to get things to sell in order to buy more drugs.

You don't get stoners stealing to fund their weed habit (unless previously behaving like that). Yeah maybe on HEROIN where they get so fucked up they are incapacitated for hours at a time and only get up to set up their next fix once they feel the HARSH CRAVINGS kick in. But weed isn't

overly expensive and it doesn't impair you so much you can't work a part time job, it can even help out in a grinding job like retail (stacking shelves and the like).

I mean do you steal to fund your food budget or coffee budget? Assuming you drink a lot of coffee (ie: addicted to caffeine) you aren't driven to steal to get more coffee. Weed can be applied to a similar context. So lets get rid of that retarded misconception a lot of you seem to have.

edit: Also every heavy stoner I know is employed and work hard at what they do. Keep in mind a lot of stoners are only stoners while they are teenagers then cut down on what they smoke when they move on to a higher paying job. There are a lot of IT 'stoners' out there I know of who manage servers and networks.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [OWA](#) on Sun, 15 Jul 2007 12:22:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's banned now, keep it that way. Apart from cannabis (or is it cocaine) that is supposed to be good for your joints. It could be prescribed that way.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 16 Jul 2007 03:05:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alcohol was banned, too. They repealed the ban, and since alcohol is worse than cannabis, the ban on cannabis should be repealed, too.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 16 Jul 2007 12:50:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's not why it was repealed, though.

The only reason it was repealed was because by that time alcohol had become too ingrained into society. Cannabis has not reached that stage yet, thankfully, and a ban will not be treated as an attack on our culture/history/whatever.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 16 Jul 2007 13:30:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There should be a ban on drunkenness, thats not social.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Mon, 16 Jul 2007 13:50:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

health problems is thus far not a concern for me.
I've been smokin weed a good while now and I'm fine with it.
I also tend to dabble in skittles(coricidin) a lot and cocaine.
I'm happy
also,
good song, very descriptive

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [renohol](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 03:49:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wake up! Weed will ALWAYS be "illegal", as far as profiteering "Federal Governors", and their patsies treat other humans as "property".

That said, "weed", is a safer form of alcohol for teens. Not only is it "smaller" to hide in the pockets, it is also less intoxicating when consumed in several or large consumptions.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [z310](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 07:35:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You can't compare weed and alcohol like that.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 08:58:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AmunRa wrote on Mon, 16 July 2007 08:50health problems is thus far not a concern for me.
I've been smokin weed a good while now and I'm fine with it.
I also tend to dabble in skittles(coricidin) a lot and cocaine.
I'm happy
also,
good song, very descriptive

You're killing yourself.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 09:57:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

didn't say I cared

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 14:28:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Tue, 17 July 2007 09:58AmunRa wrote on Mon, 16 July 2007 08:50health problems is thus far not a concern for me.

I've been smokin weed a good while now and I'm fine with it.

I also tend to dabble in skittles(coricidin) a lot and cocaine.

I'm happy

also,

good song, very descriptive

You're killing yourself.

They will never understand that will they? I say if they want to do that then let them do it. There is a consequence for everything.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mripirate](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 14:36:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no need to be so condescending, shithead

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 15:07:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ya...whatever.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 17:52:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

smoking weed and doing cocaine are completely seperate things. smoking weed doesnt kill you, might make you a little dumber but hey there is a price for everything. but when you do harder drugs you are litterraly fucking yourself over. on this i agree with you gbull. but putting the two in

one sentence isnt right since one is like having beer for example. and the other is drinking rubbing alcohol. what im trying to say is weed and coke/crack/ectasy and all that other chemical shit is not even close to eachother. and me saying weed isnt that bad by no means is me supporting the other shit.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 18:43:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

at least with ecstasy no one has to see/smell you smoking

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 23:05:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shit the only thing i DONT do is anything ya gotta shoot up, i fucking hate needles.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [renohol](#) on Wed, 18 Jul 2007 04:50:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cant u all see its all about the roots of communication.

While we were still walking on 4 legs we perfected the art of communicating "BAD" or "DANGER" to each other to prevent one another from being eaten.

Weed is just a plant yet through various brain washing techniques wealthy business men have giving Cannibus bad names like "Dope", or "Weed", or "Marijuana", while laughing all the way to the bank as the price increased and the competition went to jail for years and years.

A great example is Baseball and steriods...

For decades nobody cared that huge muscled bound giants hit a ball with a stick very very far. Then the president used the "DANGER" communication technique and all the media followed suit. Now public opinion has turned as we see the once hero as the now "BAD/DANGER" scapegoat. Who owns who?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 18 Jul 2007 14:40:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

renohol wrote on Wed, 18 July 2007 00:50Cant u all see its all about the roots of communication.

While we were still walking on 4 legs we perfected the art of communicating "BAD" or "DANGER" to each other to prevent one another from being eaten.

Weed is just a plant yet through various brain washing techniques wealthy business men have giving Cannibus bad names like "Dope", or "Weed", or "Marijuana", while laughing all the way to the bank as the price increased and the competition went to jail for years and years.

A great example is Baseball and steriods...

For decades nobody cared that huge muscled bound giants hit a ball with a stick very very far. Then the president used the "DANGER" communication technique and all the media followed suit. Now public opinion has turned as we see the once hero as the now "BAD/DANGER" scapegoat. Who owns who?

I believe (most) people are more advanced than 4-legged creatures, and should be able to make decisions for themselves.

Businessmen gave cannabis those "bad" names? Are you smoking right now? I'm pretty sure most, if not all, of those nicknames are terms of endearment, and weren't created by wealthy businessmen, but by those doing the smoking.

As for the whole steroid issue, the dangers weren't known about steroids, and when they have been known, then there was a public outcry, not a warning by the President.

The reason why marijuana is illegal is because the government couldn't regulate it. They couldn't tax it, so it wasn't worth keeping legal.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 13:56:37 GMT

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

<http://www.cnn.com/2007/HEALTH/07/27/marijuana.psychosis.ap/index.html>

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 14:31:47 GMT

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

I expect this response:

"But they had problems to begin with, that's not caused by using pot!!!"

Right?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 14:34:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:The researchers said they couldn't prove that marijuana use itself increases the risk of psychosis, a category of several disorders with schizophrenia being the most commonly known.

I've been smoking weed almost every day for two years and I'm not psychotic... and don't say I am or I will stab you.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 14:41:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lots of people smoke cigarettes every day and don't develop anything. My grandmother smokes worse than a wood stove, but has not developed any smoking-related problems.

Does this mean it is actually good for you, or does it still make it bad?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 14:49:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think anyone is saying that marijuana is actually healthy.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 14:49:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Fri, 27 July 2007 09:34Quote:The researchers said they couldn't prove that marijuana use itself increases the risk of psychosis, a category of several disorders with schizophrenia being the most commonly known.

I've been smoking weed almost every day for two years and I'm not psychotic... and don't say I am or I will stab you.

actually on the floor right now laughing so much that I think my ass will fall off.

I fully believe that weed does worsen conditions such as schizophrenia (having lived with a paranoid schizophrenic and seeing the difference when he was stoned was pretty scary). It may even bring conditions that were unnoticeable to a stage where it would be recognisable and diagnosed as a mental illness. I just don't buy the headlines that weed actually causes a normal mentally healthy person to develop a mental illness, I also believe that people as a general rule who suffer mental illnesses are statistically more likely to smoke weed for a number of

social/economic reasons, a fact that is hard to prove but valid in my eyes and something that would have a major impact on studies/statistics surrounding the issue.

As I see it (biased of course) this should be a reason for legalising canibis as it would allow for some kind of regulation and monitoring of the mental health of pot smokers - making a basic mental examination a requirement to obtaining weed legally.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 30 Jul 2007 14:19:09 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Fri, 27 July 2007

08:56<http://www.cnn.com/2007/HEALTH/07/27/marijuana.psychosis.ap/index.html>

These studies haven't actually proven anything other than people with mental illness use weed. For all you know these people could have been self-medicating after they contracted the illness. And a proper control group wasn't used. So these studies are less then reliable.

Not to mention at least two of the people managing the studies were working for big pharmaceutical companies with interests in medicines for psychosis.

And most importantly which no one seems to have picked up on. Correlation DOES NOT EQUAL causation. Therefore these studies haven't proven anything assuming everything was peachy from the start.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Mon, 30 Jul 2007 18:31:37 GMT

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

Romaner wrote on Tue, 17 July 2007 13:52smoking weed and doing cocaine are completely seperate things. smoking weed doesnt kill you, might make you a little dumber but hey there is a price for everything. but when you do harder drugs you are litterraly fucking yourself over. on this i agree with you gbull. but putting the two in one sentence isnt right since one is like having beer for example. and the other is drinking rubbing alcohol. what im trying to say is weed and coke/crack/ectasy and all that other chemical shit is not even close to eachother. and me saying weed isnt that bad by no means is me supporting the other shit.

cocaine erodes the lining of your brain.

its quite marvelous really.

phew, and lets not forget how much dxm ive done in the past month.
damn.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 30 Jul 2007 19:21:00 GMT

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

AmunRa wrote on Mon, 30 July 2007 13:31 Romaner wrote on Tue, 17 July 2007 13:52 smoking weed and doing cocaine are completely seperate things. smoking weed doesnt kill you, might make you a little dumber but hey there is a price for everything. but when you do harder drugs you are litterraly fucking yourself over. on this i agree with you gbull. but putting the two in one sentence isnt right since one is like having beer for example. and the other is drinking rubbing alcohol. what im trying to say is weed and coke/crack/ectasy and all that other chemical shit is not even close to eachother. and me saying weed isnt that bad by no means is me supporting the other shit.

cocaine erodes the lining of your brain.

its quite marvelous really.

phew, and lets not forget how much dxm ive done in the past month.
damn.

Just in case you weren't joking about the cocaine eroding lining of the brain. It does not .

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 05:32:34 GMT

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

since when?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 14:35:55 GMT

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

Hogosphere in Web2.0 wrote on Mon, 30 July 2007 07:19 Crimson wrote on Fri, 27 July 2007 08:56 <http://www.cnn.com/2007/HEALTH/07/27/marijuana.psychosis.ap/index.html>

These studies haven't actually proven anything other than people with mental illness use weed. For all you know these people could have been self-medicating after they contracted the illness. And a proper control group wasn't used. So these studies are less then reliable.

Not to mention at least two of the people managing the studies were working for big pharmaceutical companies with interests in medicines for psychosis.

And most importantly which no one seems to have picked up on. Correlation DOES NOT EQUAL causation. Therefore these studies haven't proven anything assuming everything was peachy from the start.

Maybe you are too stoned to have picked up on it, but this is in the article itself:

Quote:Scientists cannot rule out that pre-existing conditions could have led to both marijuana use and later psychoses, he added.

Though it's not a huge argument in favor of weed smokers to say "Yeah, well, maybe we smoke weed because we are mentally ill, instead of the weed making us that way!"

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 15:19:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Every single person who smokes pot is mentally ill.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:08:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Everybody should stop smoking pot and move on to salvia divinorum and nepeta. I hear hawaiian baby woodrose seeds are good, too. Always some Chill Herbal Smoking Blends, too.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:30:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've smoked salvia a few times. Seriously dude... fuck. Way too intense to smoke more than like once a year. Scared the shit out of me the last time I did it and I've vowed never to smoke it again. And I've done my share of other psychedelic drugs but nothing comes close to the intensity of salvia.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:34:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 31 July 2007 14:30I've smoked salvia a few times. Seriously dude... fuck. Way too intense to smoke more than like once a year. Scared the shit out of me the last time I did it and I've vowed never to smoke it again. And I've done my share of other psychedelic drugs but nothing comes close to the intensity of salvia.
Awesome. I just bought some 20x.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:39:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Haha... didn't know you were interested in this kind of stuff.

Have you smoked salvia before?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:45:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, with xptek talking a lot about it last year, my interest was peaked in LSD, pot, and salvia. Unfortunately, the gf at the time hated the idea of me smoking. My current, however, does it herself, so again my interest has been peaked. I was randomly searching info on salvia and somehow found a store about 3 miles from my house, so needless to say I ran and got some.

I haven't smoked any yet, but I have a couple of people willing to share the experience with me.

Edit: What concentration did you smoke that made you vow not to smoke it again?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:47:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Salvia can be fun, but be warned that the first time you smoke it you're probably going to be scared shitless. After that it isn't so bad because you know what to expect. Just don't smoke when you're already drunk or intoxicated some other way (this is how I managed to have such a bad experience). Try doing LSD if you can find it--fascinating stuff.

EDIT: The first couple times I tried it I was smoking 20x. The time I had such a terrible fright was actually 5x... but I was very drunk and stoned and I took a pretty big hit.

If you're a non-smoker it might be hard for you to smoke since you're supposed to hold in the hit for 30ish seconds. Holding it in is a trip because as soon as you exhale you can feel reality starting to fall apart...

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 18:51:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I wanted to try some LSD for the state of mind that I read Albert Hoffman had when he tried some. That and your body doesn't build an addiction to it.

Edit: I smoke an occasional cigar, but I don't inhale. If I use a water pipe to inhale, it might be a little easier.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 23:01:48 GMT

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

How did this topic turn into a conversation on smoking potent stuff and how to smoke it?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 23:25:36 GMT

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

I never tried smoking, never will. I don't care how addicting it is. I just don't think any type of smoking should be legalized. It kills the smoker and the crowd around him/her. Unlike a bullet through the head, this kills slowly... and painfully. It really doesn't matter of what type of smoking is more or less severe.

They all kill.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 13:48:34 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 19:25 I never tried smoking, never will. I don't care how addicting it is. I just don't think any type of smoking should be legalized. It kills the smoker and the crowd around him/her. Unlike a bullet through the head, this kills slowly... and painfully. It really doesn't matter of what type of smoking is more or less severe.

They all kill.

Then don't do them. Those in this thread who do smoke already know the negative (and even positive) health effects of weed and other drugs. They're knowingly doing this to themselves, and you have no right to tell them otherwise. When they smoke around you in public areas, I can see your complaints, otherwise... get off of your high horses.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 04:20:28 GMT

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

BlueThen wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 18:25 I never tried smoking, never will. I don't care how addicting it is. I just don't think any type of smoking should be legalized. It kills the smoker and the crowd around him/her. Unlike a bullet through the head, this kills slowly... and painfully. It really doesn't matter of what type of smoking is more or less severe.

They all kill.

Why? If people want to put things into their bodies, they should have the choice to. We don't need the government acting like some sort of parent, to tell us what we can and can't put in our bodies.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Renegade](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 04:42:28 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 31 July 2007 14:47 Salvia can be fun, but be warned that the first time you smoke it you're probably going to be scared shitless. After that it isn't so bad because you know what to expect. Just don't smoke when you're already drunk or intoxicated some other way (this is how I managed to have such a bad experience). Try doing LSD if you can find it--fascinating stuff.

EDIT: The first couple times I tried it I was smoking 20x. The time I had such a terrible fright was actually 5x... but I was very drunk and stoned and I took a pretty big hit.

If you're a non-smoker it might be hard for you to smoke since you're supposed to hold in the hit for 30ish seconds. Holding it in is a trip because as soon as you exhale you can feel reality starting to fall apart...

I really can't get high off salvia.

I have 5x, and I smoke a half-quarter to myself.

Hold it in,

Exhale,

And all I feel is a slight tingle in my feet.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 12:11:48 GMT

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

You're smoking 5x...

I didn't get any result out of 20x, but I also didn't hold it in long enough, probably didn't smoke enough, and I also bought shit from some local store. I also found out that I can get 3 grams of salvia for the price I paid for 1 locally.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mripirate](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 13:42:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How are you smoking it?

You have to smoke it through a bong or a pipe since a joint won't burn hot enough. Also make sure you're holding it in as long as you can.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 13:52:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I used a bong. I held it for about 20 seconds, but I don't think I ripped enough of the salvia.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 20 Sep 2007 04:40:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I realize this topic hasn't been replied to in forever, but the forums are looking pretty dead lately anyway. I'm generally stoned from the moment I wake up 'til the moment I go to sleep, and somehow I manage to maintain a full-time job and a decent GPA. Go figure.

To all you fucks bitching about smoking: Vaporizers!

To all you fucks bitching about weed and mental health:
http://www.norml.org/index.cfm?Group_ID=6798

Some of you guys might want to look at the effects of alcohol on your mental health as well. It's been shown to lead to depression, interfere with sleep patterns, and cause long-term anxiety. As long as it's legal, I suppose.

Quote:I've smoked salvia a few times. Seriously dude... fuck. Way too intense to smoke more than like once a year. Scared the shit out of me the last time I did it and I've vowed never to smoke it again. And I've done my share of other psychedelic drugs but nothing comes close to the intensity of salvia.

Salvia is fucking ridiculous. Last time I did it, it ripped my world apart and I really haven't wanted to bother with it since.

brb schizophrenic episode

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Sep 2007 09:42:47 GMT

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

I feel sorry for you. You need drugs for your life not to suck.

Alcohol has absolutely no effect on my mental health btw.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 03:00:53 GMT

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

Jecht wrote on Thu, 20 September 2007 05:42 I feel sorry for you. You need drugs for your life not to suck.

Alcohol has absolutely no effect on my mental health btw.

I'm terribly sorry you "need" alcohol (surprise! also a drug.) for your life not to suck as well. Feel free to be continue being a condescending prick though.

Marijuana has no effect on my mental health either, but that's because it's been established that smoking is only harmful to those who are already predisposed for mental health issues.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Aprime](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 03:45:19 GMT

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

My only drug is caffeine (I dropped it last year, but thanks to College... :/).

It doesn't affect me the way it did last year and before, though. I feel barely different, except for the fact that I don't yawn as much as I do when I'm caffeine-less.

Fuck everything else. :!

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 04:17:07 GMT

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

I used to like the drink... a little too much. I drank plenty during high-school, and my first year in university. It wasn't until a very bad night, that I realized I was addicted to the bottle, and it messed me up.

Now, I don't do anything, save a mug of tea (loe caffeine) in the morning. Sometimes, I'll get a thirst for another stiff Rum n' Coke, but that's where cool, filtered water comes in.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 14:59:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I LIKE PIE.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 18:46:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Frozen Kit Kat FTW!

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 20:19:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

how about huffing ether?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 20:49:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Fri, 21 September 2007 10:59 I LIKE PIE.
Probably cream pie.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 22:48:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Humans are the only animals that do not instinctively run away from smoke.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 22 Sep 2007 04:19:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

xptek wrote on Thu, 20 September 2007 22:00 Jecht wrote on Thu, 20 September 2007 05:42 I feel sorry for you. You need drugs for your life not to suck.

Alcohol has absolutely no effect on my mental health btw.

I'm terribly sorry you "need" alcohol (surprise! also a drug.) for your life not to suck as well. Feel

free to be continue being a condescending prick though.

Marijuana has no effect on my mental health either, but that's because it's been established that smoking is only harmful to those who are already predisposed for mental health issues.

You know what assuming does right? It makes an ass...out of you. I said alcohol has no effect on me because I don't drink, at all. You know what I need for my life not to suck? I'll give you a rundown:

An Education,
My fiancée,
My family,
Good health,
A house,
A career,
And a kick ass computer.

So far I have 5/7, the University is helping me get the other two I need.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 22 Sep 2007 12:02:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Okay, I'd agree with your argument if you weren't being a hypocrite.

You assumed that he needs weed for his life not to suck. How is that ANY different from his "assumption"?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 22 Sep 2007 14:02:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"xptek" I'm generally stoned from the moment I wake up 'til the moment I go to sleep

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 23 Sep 2007 04:40:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Sat, 22 September 2007 10:02 "xptek" I'm generally stoned from the moment I wake up 'til the moment I go to sleep

Yes, but did he say, "my life sucks, so I'm generally stoned from the moment I wake up 'til the moment I go to sleep"? No. That's my point.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 23 Sep 2007 05:18:56 GMT

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

People who smoke that much generally use it as a crutch.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Sun, 23 Sep 2007 10:16:26 GMT

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

DarkDemin wrote on Sun, 23 September 2007 00:18: People who smoke that much generally use it as a crutch.

You don't seem to know too much about the drug and its effects, so your assumption is fairly baseless.

People who smoke it that much generally use it because they love having an altered perception. That may not necessarily be the healthiest way of living life but it doesn't mean it's a crutch. If anything problems can become much more meaningful or apparent to you (ie: freaking out).

A crutch would be using alcohol to forget about your problems. One example would be drinking yourself into a delirious state (a stupor). The same goes for heroin, but that isn't necessarily a crutch for very long as it becomes a desperate need due to the inability to function without it.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 24 Sep 2007 07:42:34 GMT

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

Name some successful business people (I mean people who actually contribute something to society...in other words, not rappers) who smoke weed regularly. For the most part, potheads are pumping my gas, not driving nice cars and making a decent living.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 24 Sep 2007 11:10:39 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Mon, 24 September 2007 08:42: Name some successful business people (I mean people who actually contribute something to society...in other words, not rappers) who smoke weed regularly. For the most part, potheads are pumping my gas, not driving nice cars and making a decent living.

You'd be surprised just how many people use drugs in general in high positions (no pun intended). The more money you have the more money you have to spend on drugs. Most people can strike a balance. It's just the obvious "pot heads" that are in low positions because they couldn't strike that

balance unlike others.

You'd be surprised how many people use cocaine in very high positions of authority, the main reason for that is they have the money to throw away on it. As they say a rich mans drug.

also: A point I forgot to bring up in my previous post. Those who try to justify their drug use are generally the ones with problems. If you use drugs and strictly use it to get 'fucked up' you're far more likely to achieve that balance as opposed to using it because you're "stressed." Everything in moderation.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [GsXr1400](#) on Mon, 24 Sep 2007 12:13:21 GMT

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

weeed... is very addictive me being 16 got on it for about a yr . now im on it for weekends only !!!

weeed changes mental health.. if you dont you were already mental in the head. after a yr of smoking it i get paranoid a lil but its slowy goin

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 09:02:03 GMT

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

I knew a guy once who actually said, "I smoke weed at least 6 times a day, and I'm not addicted to it". Last I heard he was making his 3rd trip to jail for possession. What a great way to live eh?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Kytten9](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 11:21:59 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Tue, 25 September 2007 10:02I knew a guy once who actually said, "I smoke weed at least 6 times a day, and I'm not addicted to it". Last I heard he was making his 3rd trip to jail for possession. What a great way to live eh?

Some people who smoke weed are the arseholes of soceity - sad but true- having said that I don't agree or disagree with smoking weed.

I think the whole "it's their body it's their choice" thing is the best way to look at it. At the age of 13 I started smoking pot....I know you can call me whatever you want but this does have a point. I quit smoking pot at 19 because I was going through a very very bad patch of depression and I could not get through a day without crying my eyes out 5 times for no good reason whatsoever. I do not believe that pot had anything to do with this mood, (but I'm not an expert). My depression was trigged by a few skeletons from my closet that was topped by the death of a dear friend, I was

a heavy smoker, a heavy drinker and an occasion pot fiend, but I always kept my job, I always did weed at a time where it was recreational not work or family and I know that both my parents have smoked pot before and my auntie and uncle also smoke it (STILL) They all have upstanding jobs in the British society and are all on at least £26,000 a year (\$52,000) so I think there are always arguements for and against. I know pot heads who are in jail and I know pot heads who contribute to our society.

The agrument for making pot legal (in the UK at least) Is that it would reduce petty crime, it would reduce prostitution, it would reduce smuggling, the pot that would be legalised would no doubt be controlled and subsequently taxed by the British Government (which would mute all the fucking people who bitch about taxes because smokers in the main part contribute to British taxes a shit load) and besides: smoking in doors in public areas, areas of work (but not prisons) and even smoking in company cars is now illegal so it wouldn't affect much of the non-weed (or cigarette) smoking community here.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 12:28:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SoQReaL wrote on Mon, 24 September 2007 07:13weed... is very addictive me being 16 got on it for about a yr . now im on it for weekends only !!!

weed changes mental health.. if you dont you were already mental in the head. after a yr of smoking it i get paranoid a lil but its slowy goin

You are a gaping vagina if you were 'addicted' to weed or are getting paranoid. That's a sign you shouldn't be doing substances full stop. Grow some balls.

And Blazer that doesn't mean he was addicted. Nor does it make him a slime bag for being being in jail or anything, his crime was for possessing weed which the legality of is being discussed in this thread. That's why a lot of people want it legalized.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 14:01:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hogosphere in Web2.0 wrote on Tue, 25 September 2007 08:28And Blazer that doesn't mean he was addicted. Nor does it make him a slime bag for being being in jail or anything, his crime was for possessing weed which the legality of is being discussed in this thread. That's why a lot of people want it legalized.

That's pretty much how I was going to respond. Being jailed for possession just means he... possessed the substance. I could be jailed for having an open bottle of alcohol in my car, but be completely sober.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 22:43:36 GMT

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

Granted just being in possession of something isn't really a big deal...but I knew this guy. He would get high and do crazy shit, like set his dog on fire, and blame it on "because I was so high man". Once he got into my car, pushed my cigarette lighter in, then when it popped out, he took it and shoved it onto the end of my turn signal lever, melting it all over the place. Why did he do that? "Sorry dude I was high". And while he was driving on the road high (as he often did), he would do crazy shit like swerve towards people and stuff to scare them. I'm quite sure that all the times he was busted for possession on the road, he was also high so I sure don't feel sorry for him.

Note: I realize that not all people are nutballs like this, and they do it "recreationally", but to be honest I don't agree with smoking at all. Smoking killed my mother so I am biased, and always will be. For good reason I think though, as most smokers themselves agree it's a dirty unhealthy habit that they would quit in an instant if they "could".

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 23:10:07 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Tue, 25 September 2007 18:43 Granted just being in possession of something isn't really a big deal...but I knew this guy. He would get high and do crazy shit, like set his dog on fire, and blame it on "because I was so high man". Once he got into my car, pushed my cigarette lighter in, then when it popped out, he took it and shoved it onto the end of my turn signal lever, melting it all over the place. Why did he do that? "Sorry dude I was high". And while he was driving on the road high (as he often did), he would do crazy shit like swerve towards people and stuff to scare them. I'm quite sure that all the times he was busted for possession on the road, he was also high so I sure don't feel sorry for him.

Note: I realize that not all people are nutballs like this, and they do it "recreationally", but to be honest I don't agree with smoking at all. Smoking killed my mother so I am biased, and always will be. For good reason I think though, as most smokers themselves agree it's a dirty unhealthy habit that they would quit in an instant if they "could".

it killed a few of my relatives (cigarettes that is) and I know it's a dirty unhealthy habit. and yet, I really don't care.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 23:15:16 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Tue, 25 September 2007 23:43 Granted just being in possession of something isn't really a big deal...but I knew this guy. He would get high and do crazy shit, like set his dog on fire, and blame it on "because I was so high man". Once he got into my car, pushed my cigarette lighter in, then when it popped out, he took it and shoved it onto the end of my turn signal lever, melting it all over the place. Why did he do that? "Sorry dude I was high". And while he was

driving on the road high (as he often did), he would do crazy shit like swerve towards people and stuff to scare them. I'm quite sure that all the times he was busted for possession on the road, he was also high so I sure dont feel sorry for him.

Note: I realize that not all people are nutballs like this, and they do it "recreationally", but to be honest I don't agree with smoking at all. Smoking killed my mother so I am biased, and always will be. For good reason I think though, as most smokers themselves agree its a dirty unhealthy habit that they would quit in an instant if they "could".

That guy may have been a bit fucked in the head to begin with. But I can understand your viewpoint and can empathize a little.

I have a lot of friends who study hard, have good certifications (cisco certs etc) and have a very good understanding of their work but do partake in the smokage. It's just you wont hear about them so much, I suppose you could say they weren't assholes to begin with and can keep it discrete as well as balanced.

Then you get the people who were always jerks or assed about and became wasters, trouble makers and poor contributors to society in general. But a lot of their behavior will be the same without pot in the equation (or with other drugs for example).

Also: You don't have to smoke it, it can be turned into a vapor free of tar/'bad things' or alternatively you can ingest it orally .

Blazer I'm sure you can understand though that with balance and a bit of intelligence it is almost completely harmless and unimpacting on someones life.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 23:49:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Would anyone become president who smokes weed? Would you meet a girls parents with a blunt in your mouth? Would you smoke a joint in a restuarant? Would you hit a bong in an elevator?

If it's so harmless...why not?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 23:56:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Tue, 25 September 2007 18:49Would anyone become president who smokes weed? Would you meet a girls parents with a blunt in your mouth? Would you smoke a joint in a restuarant? Would you hit a bong in an elevator?

If it's so harmless...why not?

That's more the stigma attached to it than it's health implications. Obviously it's very rude to do those things mentioned above, and to be honest I'm for banning smoking in public places etc simply because I hate smoke when I eat etc. It's more something you do discreetly as I said before, in private or with friends.

And I George Bush has smoked pot (and also done cocaine). If he kept his use private he could probably still operate as the president. Of course he wouldn't much of a chance to do it recreationally but assuming he maybe had a joint or two within the space of say two days at a time there shouldn't be anything hindering his work as the president as well as being unnoticeable by the media.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 00:12:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LOL...so you'd be okay with someone high with their finger on the button?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 02:13:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Tue, 25 September 2007 19:49Would anyone become president who drinks beer? Would you meet a girls parents with an open beer in hand? Would you beer bong in a restuarant? Would you crack a beer in an elevator?

If it's so harmless...why not?

You wouldn't take a shit in your pants while at a restaurant. You shouldn't put on pants while driving. You shouldn't pee in a pool. You shouldn't sleep while in a meeting.

That's poor logic, really. Just because something's "harmless" doesn't mean that there aren't more appropriate times to partake in said activities.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 08:02:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I knew a guy who did pot and was pretty much high all day and he ended up killing a pizza delivery driver and is now spending many, many years in jail for 2nd degree murder. It's not a coincidence that the vast majority of people who abuse substances end up being the bottom-feeders of society and the single moms who raise more of them.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 09:36:36 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 04:02I knew a guy who did pot and was pretty much high all day and he ended up killing a pizza delivery driver and is now spending many, many years in jail for 2nd degree murder. It's not a coincidence that the vast majority of people who abuse substances end up being the bottom-feeders of society and the single moms who raise more of them.

so your blaming it on pot? now THAT made me LOL

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 15:31:34 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 04:02I knew a guy who did pot and was pretty much high all day and he ended up killing a pizza delivery driver and is now spending many, many years in jail for 2nd degree murder.

So are you a gun control advocate now? Because that argument of "if he wasn't high, he probably wouldn't have killed the guy" is pretty much a mirror of the argument that gun control advocates use against guns. It's a convenient, but weak argument.

As for the bottom feeder argument... that's why I'll only support the legalization of drugs AFTER welfare is dissolved.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 15:58:20 GMT

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

You can say whatever you'd like, but until you know someone, watch their personality changes while high, and then they go and kill someone, then we can talk again.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Mon, 08 Oct 2007 16:15:55 GMT

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

DRUGS ARE BAD

Crimson wrote on Wed, 26 September 2007 11:58You can say whatever you'd like, but until you know someone, watch their personality changes while high, and then they go and kill someone, then we can talk again.

File Attachments

1) [xd-16635.jpg](#), downloaded 1003 times



Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 16:12:55 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 10 July 2007 18:27 It should be legalized everywhere. It's your body, do whatever you want with it regardless of how immoral someone else may view your actions.

Agreed

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Falco](#) on Fri, 19 Oct 2007 23:59:36 GMT

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

Weed should be legalized. It's not really a harm, besides buring your brain cells. Face it, everyone would be happier smoking weed, no one will be mad, and no one will have a raging violence, unless your phsycho.

The only reason why the government doesn't legalize it, it is becuae people can grow it, and people WILL grow it if it was ever legalized. And becuae of that, it is a big fat IF. Government just wants your money, and there is no possible way they can get money off legalizing weed. Well they could if they sold it in stores and put a tax on it as they do with cigarettes, but becuae people can just grow it for free, that won't be a huge income.

US Governments are bias!!!

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 20 Oct 2007 00:33:21 GMT

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

DeAd3yE11 wrote on Fri, 19 October 2007 18:59 Weed should be legalized. It's not really a harm, besides buring your brain cells. Face it, everyone would be happier smoking weed, no one will be mad, and no one will have a raging violence, unless your phsycho.

The only reason why the government doesn't legalize it, it is becuase people can grow it, and people WILL grow it if it was ever legalized. And becuase of that, it is a big fat IF. Government just wants your money, and there is no possible way they can get money off legalizing weed. Well they could if they sold it in stores and put a tax on it as they do with cigarettes, but becuase people can just grow it for free, that won't be a huge income.

US Governments are bias!!!

You sooooo like no brain cells? How about giving non-smokers lung cancer? K there is soooooo less harm in smoking weed.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mripirate](#) on Sat, 20 Oct 2007 01:33:00 GMT

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

sadukar needs to get high

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sat, 20 Oct 2007 01:35:19 GMT


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

Discovery!

Even Kane smokes weed!

File Attachments

1) [Kane Chronic.jpg](#), downloaded 967 times



Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sat, 20 Oct 2007 02:56:45 GMT

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

Yes, but notice the violence present in that picture.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 20 Oct 2007 07:36:31 GMT

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

because weed makes people violent

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Falco](#) on Sun, 21 Oct 2007 05:59:58 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Sat, 20 October 2007 03:36because weed makes people violent
lol, i know you're being sarcastic, so read fuck

last time i've checked, drunk people get in fights a lot.. weed mellows you out, but alcohol is legal
when people get alcohol poisoning? drunk driving is the reason for almost all the accidents on the
streets.. honestly, weed makes you concentrate more, just makes you lazy as fuck, and you forget
things a lot, lol

imo weed is a lot safer than alcohol, if you disagree.....

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sun, 21 Oct 2007 12:23:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And give other people lung cancer?

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sun, 21 Oct 2007 17:44:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeAd3yE11 wrote on Sun, 21 October 2007 00:59mrpirate wrote on Sat, 20 October 2007
03:36because weed makes people violent
drunk driving is the reason for almost all the accidents on the streets.. honestly, weed makes you
concentrate more, just makes you lazy as fuck, and you forget things a lot, lol

imo weed is a lot safer than alcohol, if you disagree.....

Driving while under the influence of anything is a really bad idea.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 21 Oct 2007 18:18:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 21 October 2007 08:23And give other people lung cancer?

Study Finds No Cancer-Marijuana Connection
Marijuana Unlikely to Cause Head, Neck, or Lung Cancer
Marijuana May Fight Lung Tumors
Marijuana Does Not Raise Lung Cancer Risk
Marijuana Cuts Lung Cancer Tumor Growth In Half, Study Shows

THC, one of the active chemicals in marijuana has actually been shown to inhibit tumor growth
and is currently being studied as a treatment for normally inoperable/fatal cancers.

There are also a myriad of ways to use cannabis without actually combusting the plant material.

Research before making such stupid, baseless, assumptions is a good idea. If someone that's basically been stoned for a year straight can do it, I'm sure you can manage as well.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 21 Oct 2007 19:11:00 GMT

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

sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 19 October 2007 20:33

You sooooo like no brain cells? [...] K there is soooooo less harm in smoking weed.

Whoops, this completely slipped past me.

Study shows marijuana increases brain cell growth

Cannabinoids promote embryonic and adult hippocampus neurogenesis and produce anxiolytic- and antidepressant-like effects

Marijuana Boosts Brain Cell Growth

Marijuana has been found to stimulate new cell growth in the hippocampus (responsible for some aspects of memory formation and emotional expression). Hell, even NIDA (National Institute of Drug Abuse) admits that marijuana doesn't kill brain cells. On the other hand, nicotine and alcohol have both been proven to reduce brain function and actually kill brain cells.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 05:53:57 GMT

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

http://www.metacafe.com/watch/881091/do_you_smoke_u_got_to_watch_this/

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 08:47:05 GMT

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

That's so gross.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 19:35:24 GMT

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

Oh btw, smoking weed has 4-5 times the tar of a cigarette.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 20:43:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Fri, 26 October 2007
00:53http://www.metacafe.com/watch/881091/do_you_smoke_u_got_to_watch_this/

Yuck!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 31 Oct 2007 04:52:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

weed will liberate you from mental slavery

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 31 Oct 2007 16:18:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Tue, 30 October 2007 23:52weed will liberate you from mental slavery

It's 'tards like yourself that make it look bad.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Hex](#) on Wed, 31 Oct 2007 20:34:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Up until a few years ago I toked for 16 years, anyone that says it does not have long term affects knows nothing, anyone that says it is harmless is just plain ignorant, yes cannabis has it upsides but the downsides of long term toking are way more than any upside

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2007 00:28:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hex wrote on Wed, 31 October 2007 15:34Up until a few years ago I toked for 16 years, anyone that says it does not have long term affects knows nothing, anyone that says it is harmless is just plain ignorant, yes cannabis has it upsides but the downsides of long term toking are way more than any upside

As someone who supports your view, can you give us further elaboration? I'm interested to hear it.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2007 22:20:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

xptek wrote on Wed, 31 October 2007 10:18Rocko wrote on Tue, 30 October 2007 23:52weed will liberate you from mental slavery

It's 'tards like yourself that make it look bad.
I don't actually smoke weed. I can be retarded on my own without it. k thx

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Falco](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2007 23:15:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 26 October 2007 15:35Oh btw, smoking weed has 4-5 times the tar of a cigarette.
lies

only if you smoke resin (which will happen on occasion for me lol)
and resin is like tar with thc in it lol

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Falco](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2007 23:16:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jeht wrote on Wed, 31 October 2007 19:28Hex wrote on Wed, 31 October 2007 15:34Up until a few years ago I toked for 16 years, anyone that says it does not have long term affects knows nothing, anyone that says it is harmless is just plain ignorant, yes cannabis has it upsides but the downsides of long term toking are way more than any upside

As someone who supports your view, can you give us further elaboration? I'm interested to hear it.
weed makes you stupid
only smoke it if you dont care about school or life lol

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 04 Nov 2007 16:51:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hex wrote on Wed, 31 October 2007 15:34Up until a few years ago I toked for 16 years, anyone that says it does not have long term affects knows nothing, anyone that says it is harmless is just plain ignorant, yes cannabis has it upsides but the downsides of long term toking are way more

than any upside

If possible, would you mind elaborating? I smoked at least 1.5 grams a day for a year, temporarily quit about a month ago, and haven't really noticed a change at all. My memory is still the same (I didn't have a problem with memory loss while smoking, though) and I've noticed no changes in my cognitive processes or abilities. Just curious to see what long-term effects you think are associated with marijuana use, because so far I've noticed absolutely nothing at all other than being able to be pissed off more easily.

sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 26 October 2007 15:35 Oh btw, smoking weed has 4-5 times the tar of a cigarette.

This is D.A.R.E.-esque bullshit that has been proven false. Both contain about the same amount of tar, although marijuana users do inhale deeper and hold the smoke longer. However, you also need to take into consideration that most marijuana users smoke substantially less throughout the day than regular tobacco smokers.

Marijuana v.s. Tobacco smoke compositions

Regardless, if you're concerned about the health of your lungs, vaporize.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Hex](#) on Sun, 04 Nov 2007 20:47:32 GMT

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

I'd say the effects would not be the same for everyone, as I said, I stopped after 16 years of heavy toking (around a ounce a week) and it did affect my short term memmory and general attatude and I's say I'm alot more lazy than I used to be

For me and this is 2+ years after stopping (not completly stopping) I have found that my short term memmory has improved alot, im not as chilled/relaxed as I used to be and I have put on weight, saying this it has not been something that has happened straght away it has been over 2 years

What I have said above is my opinion based on myself, noone else.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Falco](#) on Mon, 05 Nov 2007 01:54:05 GMT

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

lol i smoke an 8ter (3.5) a day and all it does is make you lazy and stupid, if not i guess you're lucky as fuck.. i know this one girl who gets straight a's and tokes err day, and somehow passes drug tests...

idk some people are lucky, im not though lol

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Mon, 05 Nov 2007 23:57:45 GMT

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

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=rmxonXaq9NY>

In this video/recording, Noam Chomsky talks about the prohibition of Marijuana. Pretty interesting argument.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Hex](#) on Tue, 06 Nov 2007 19:44:49 GMT

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

I don't think you were too smart to start with DeAd3yE11 and btw an 1/8 is 3.4 not 3.5 grams

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 06 Nov 2007 20:51:41 GMT

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

1 ounce = 28.3495231 grams

Therefore, 1/8 of an ounce = 3.5436903875 grams

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Hex](#) on Tue, 06 Nov 2007 22:08:54 GMT

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

not dealers grams, unless its not the same in other parts of the world

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Falco](#) on Tue, 06 Nov 2007 22:54:14 GMT

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

Hex wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 14:44 I don't think you were to smart to start with DeAd3yE11 and btw an 1/8 is 3.4 not 3.5 grams
thanks for making a fool out of yourself

wtf are you talkin bout 'think you were to smart to start with DeAd3yE11, i dont get it

how about them ravens!

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 06 Nov 2007 23:57:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My dealer's a good guy so I usually end up getting 3.6 or 3.7 when I grab an eighth.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 01:32:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You "potheads" should try becoming "shitheads":

omgwtfThe Collier County Sheriff's Office in Tampa, Fla., recently released a bulletin warning of a new drug threat in America — jenkem — made by fermenting human feces and urine and huffing the gas produced...

A 16-year-old boy describes his preference for jenkem over other inhalants "With glue, I just hear voices in my head. But with Jenkem, I see visions. I see my mother who is dead and I forget about the problems in my life."

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 01:49:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WOW...jenkem isn't that hard to find! LMFAO!

Seriously, drugs/alcohol are bullshit. It does no good other than make the person dependent on it. Disgusting.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Matix101](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 02:30:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I heard about the sniffing shit and urine on the news last night. I was like, okay, I just watched 2girls1cup and I thought it was the end of the world for me, and then I heard people are sniffing shit, I was like, okay then, more retards in the world then we actually know...

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 02:35:21 GMT

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

Sounds like the modern day equivalent of 'whip-its' .

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 03:29:17 GMT

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

Matix101 wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 21:30 I heard about the sniffing shit and urine on the news last night. I was like, okay, I just watched 2girls1cup and I thought it was the end of the world for me, and then I heard people are sniffing shit, I was like, okay then, more retards in the world then we actually know...

you should try huffing ether and paint
that is some fucked up shit.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 03:52:18 GMT

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

Canadacd wrote on Mon, 05 November 2007 18:57 <http://youtube.com/watch?v=rmxonXaq9NY>

In this video/recording, Noam Chomsky talks about the prohibition of Marijuana. Pretty interesting argument.

Chomsky can blow it out of his ass. Even with him being revered as the "smartest man in academia", he's still a liberal (not classic liberal, mind you).

@Starbuzz

Quit being ignorant. I drink (on average) every weekend, and a little on Thursday nights (experimenting with mixed shots and drinks!). I am hardly "dependent" on it, at all.

As for it having no purpose other than to become dependent, maybe you should try reading medical journals and such. A couple beers a day can actually be quite beneficial to your health. So much for the "no purpose", eh? So, hey, have a drink to your health!

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 04:32:30 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 20:49: Seriously, drugs/alcohol are bullshit. It does no good other than make the person dependent on it. Disgusting.

Seriously, this unfounded opinion is bullshit. Smoking weed is the one thing that allowed me to have hours of deep, introspective thoughts that finally provided me with the motivation to get out and do something with my life. Take some time to do some fucking research, or hell, actually experience the shit you're denouncing before making such stupid blanket statements that only make your idiocy more apparent. Oh, and it's "alcohol."

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 04:51:55 GMT

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

Now I am being branded as being "ignorant" because I say weed is bad. Sorry but I will gladly be a "coward" and be proud of myself for firmly deciding to remain free of drugs, alcohol and other fucking bullshit.

SO MUCH research has been done that prove that drugs/alcohol damage the human body. Please don't tell me it isn't.

It's pathetic and shocking to see SO MANY people so aggressively defend their stupid actions especially the other drug addicts who have replied in this thread. Shocking.

I know beer has some health benefits and I have read the medical journals but no alcohol IN ANY AMOUNT for me please.

Alcohol is bad in the long run:

Smoking is bad too...and it's addictive properties keep you coming back for more and soon enough you get this:

Also please read this is very SHORT AND PAINLESS info:

http://www.brainsource.com/brain_on_drugs.htm

@xptek

Oh really? "Unfounded" bullshit? Go ahead and defend your idiotic addictions. And don't give me that "experience that stuff first" bullshit. Good excuse.

Alcohol and drugs HAVE a negative effect on your body.

If both of us are cut open and our organs medically scrutinized, I AM 100% SURE my brain, lungs, liver and other organs would be less fucked up than yours. Nice try man.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 05:05:05 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 23:51 Now I am being branded as being "ignorant" because I say weed is bad. Sorry but I will gladly be a "coward" and be proud of myself for firmly deciding to remain free of drugs, alcohol and other fucking bullshit.

SO MUCH research has been done that prove that drugs/alcohol damage the human body. Please don't tell me it isn't.

It's pathetic and shocking to see SO MANY people so aggressively defend their stupid actions especially the other drug addicts who have replied in this thread. Shocking.

I know beer has some health benefits and I have read the medical journals but no alcohol IN ANY AMOUNT for me please.

Alcohol is bad in the long run:

You said that there's no purpose other than to become dependent. How is that not being ignorant?

EVERYTHING hurts the body if it's done in excess. Eating food can hurt the body. Water can hurt the body. Are you going to tell me there's no such thing as hyperhydration or diabetes?

That's fine if you don't want any alcohol. Nobody gives a fuck if you drink or not. However, saying that drinking it has only the purpose of being dependent is just downright stupid and IGNORANT.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 05:08:34 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 23:51
idiotic addictions

Nice try, but I haven't had any THC in my body for nearly a month. The only thing I'm addicted to is nicotine, and nobody's arguing with the fact that it's extremely unhealthy.

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 23:51 Alcohol and drugs HAVE a negative effect on your body.

That depends entirely on the drug, frequency of use, and method of delivery. Vaporized/orally ingested cannabis usage poses no significant health risks. Oh, and it's "alcohol." You should be

able to figure that out with the increased cognitive abilities you gain from 100% sobriety, man.

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007 23:51 If both of us are cut open and our organs medically scrutinized, I AM 100% SURE my brain, lungs, liver and other organs would be less fucked up than yours. Nice try man.

...and? Unless the supposedly fucked up state of my organs are affecting my quality of life (hint: they're not!), why am I supposed to give a fuck? I might get lung cancer in 50 years, but that's the price you pay for being able to alleviate any stress with a handy little stick of legal death.

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 06 November 2007
23:51 http://www.brainsource.com/brain_on_drugs.htm

Wow, an outdated website citing NIDA (politically charged organization that has no problem providing false/skewed information to the public) as the only source. Bravo, sobriety patrol.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 05:59:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, and...

"Your D.A.R.E. officer was full of lies. Now, high school kids will no longer have to stand and mumble excuses like "it's a friend's!" after their parents find their stash. Instead, they'll be able to come back at them with legitimate scientific fact on the positive proponents of pot smoking. According to a study of 5,263 Swiss youngsters published on Reuters today, those who smoked marijuana only do as well or better in some areas as those who don't being "more socially driven ... significantly more likely to practice sports and have a better relationship with their peers" than abstainers. The study also shows that while more likely to skip class a la Jordan Catalano, to smoke under the bleachers or as in my hometown, hunched down in your car in the school parking lot hoping no one sees you, stoners "have the same level of good grades." Strangely, kids who smoked both cigarettes and weed did not have the same benefits. Stick that in your pipe, or er, bong, and smoke it."

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Falco](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 19:48:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the only thing i will stick in my bong is my dick, its very sensational

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Falco](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 19:57:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

for starbuzz:

sorry douche bag, anything you consider "healthy" can have a negative affect on your body, too

your insults are getting stupid, the only thing you should be defending yourself to are the actual 'alcoholics' and 'drug abusers'

i have a question for you,

Let's say Joe smoked weed every other day, his friend, Chris, took diet pills every moring, and every night. Both are considered to be "drugs" - does this make both of them drug abusers?

I ask this question becuase you are basically saying that only the people who do illegal drugs/narcotics/plants(Marijuana) are the drug abusers. I don't understand why you have built so much hate for people who have their own independent life, which you seem to think are so evil becuase they do 'illegal' things, alcohol isn't illegal but throw that in, too.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 22:30:49 GMT

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

DeAd3yE11 wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 13:57for starbuzz:

sorry douche bag, anything you consider "healthy" can have a negative affect on your body, too

your insults are getting stupid, the only thing you should be defending yourself to are the actual 'alcoholics' and 'drug abusers'

i have a question for you,

Let's say Joe smoked weed every other day, his friend, Chris, took diet pills every moring, and every night. Both are considered to be "drugs" - does this make both of them drug abusers?

I ask this question becuase you are basically saying that only the people who do illegal drugs/narcotics/plants(Marijuana) are the drug abusers. I don't understand why you have built so much hate for people who have their own independent life, which you seem to think are so evil becuase they do 'illegal' things, alcohol isn't illegal but throw that in, too.

How can I hate ya funny fucking potheads?! I love ya guys!

+1 Post.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 22:46:54 GMT

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

As idiotic as deadeye has been, he actually made a good point in his last post.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 07 Nov 2007 23:58:08 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 17:30DeAd3yE11 wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 13:57for starbuzz:

sorry douche bag, anything you consider "healthy" can have a negative affect on your body, too

your insults are getting stupid, the only thing you should be defending yourself to are the actual 'alcoholics' and 'drug abusers'

i have a question for you,

Let's say Joe smoked weed every other day, his friend, Chris, took diet pills every morning, and every night. Both are considered to be "drugs" - does this make both of them drug abusers?

I ask this question because you are basically saying that only the people who do illegal drugs/narcotics/plants(Marijuana) are the drug abusers. I don't understand why you have built so much hate for people who have their own independent life, which you seem to think are so evil because they do 'illegal' things, alcohol isn't illegal but throw that in, too.

How can I hate ya funny fucking potheads?! I love ya guys!

+1 Post.

When all else fails, a post containing only an ad hominem will help.

Way to respond to any of the points made in my last post. Sucks when the "fucking pothead" knows what he's talking about, huh?

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 08 Nov 2007 00:13:51 GMT

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

xptek wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 17:58Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 17:30DeAd3yE11 wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 13:57for starbuzz:

sorry douche bag, anything you consider "healthy" can have a negative affect on your body, too

your insults are getting stupid, the only thing you should be defending yourself to are the actual 'alcoholics' and 'drug abusers'

i have a question for you,

Let's say Joe smoked weed every other day, his friend, Chris, took diet pills every morning, and every night. Both are considered to be "drugs" - does this make both of them drug abusers?

I ask this question because you are basically saying that only the people who do illegal drugs/narcotics/plants(Marijuana) are the drug abusers. I don't understand why you have built so much hate for people who have their own independent life, which you seem to think are so evil because they do 'illegal' things, alcohol isn't illegal but throw that in, too.

How can I hate ya funny fucking potheads?! I love ya guys!

+1 Post.

When all else fails, a post containing only an ad hominem will help.

Way to respond to any of the points made in my last post. Sucks when the "fucking pothead" knows what he's talking about, huh?

And you assumed I have no argument left? I don't give up like that fool. Ha! You must be on drugs...I just abandoned the thread that's all. Why I did that? Well, no use arguing with a pothead(s) who thinks all negative information about drugs are cooked up falsehood.

So dream on O intelligent pothead!

Bye. Enjoy the life.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 08 Nov 2007 00:18:10 GMT

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

'Tis the way of the argument, though. Anything that supports your decision is "true and unbiased" while anything that does not support it is "false and biased anyway".

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 08 Nov 2007 00:34:49 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 19:18'Tis the way of the argument, though. Anything that supports your decision is "true and unbiased" while anything that does not support it is "false and biased anyway".

All I ask for is links to legitimate medical journals supporting radical claims. Not government organizations that have a very bad track record when it comes to misinformation. I should have elaborated, but the reason I called his links false is because NIDA bases the majority of their

claims off the infamous "Rhesus monkey study."

Bolded relevant parts of an article related to NIDA misinformation and the Rhesus monkey study:

Quote:After 15 days of taking testimony and more than a year's legal deliberation, DEA Administrative Law Judge Francis L. Young formally urged the DEA to allow doctors to prescribe marijuana. In a September 1988 judgement, he ruled: "The evidence in this record clearly shows that marijuana has been accepted as capable of relieving the distress of great numbers of very ill people, and doing so with safety under medical supervision . . . It would be unreasonable, arbitrary and capricious for the DEA to continue to stand between those sufferers and the benefits of this substance in light of the evidence in this record. In strict medical terms, marijuana is far safer than many foods we commonly consume marijuana in its natural form is one of the safest therapeutically active substances known to man."

Yet former DEA Administrator John Lawn, his successor, Robert Bonner, and current DEA Administrator John Constantine - non-doctors all! - have refused to comply and have continued to deprive persons of medical cannabis, according to their own personal discretion.

Wasting Time, Wasting Lives

More than 100 years have passed since the 1894 British Raj commission study of hashish smokers in India reported cannabis use was harmless and even helpful. Numerous studies since have all agreed: The most prominent being Siler, LaGuardia, Nixon's Shafer Commission, Canada's LeDain Commission, and the California Research Advisory Commission.

Concurrently, American presidents have praised hemp, the USDA amassed volumes of data showing its value as a natural resource, and in 1942 the Roosevelt administration even made Hemp for Victory, a film glorifying our patriotic hemp farmers. That same year, Germany produced The Humorous Hemp Primer, a comic book, written in rhyme, extolling hemp's virtues. (See appendix I of the paper version of this book.)

Yet even the humane use of hemp for medicine is now denied. Asked in late 1989 about the DEA's failure to implement his decision quoted above, Judge Young responded that administrator John Lawn was being given time to comply.

More than a year after that ruling, Lawn officially refused to reschedule cannabis, again classing it as a Schedule I "dangerous" drug that is not even allowed to be used as medicine.

Decrying this needless suffering of helpless Americans, the National Organization to Reform Marijuana Laws (NORML) and the Family Council on Drug Awareness quickly demanded Lawn's resignation. His successors, Bonner, and now Constantine, retain the same policy.

What hypocrisy allows public officials to scoff at the facts and deny the truth? How do they rationalize their atrocities? How? They invent their own experts.

Government Doublespeak

Since 1976, our federal government (e.g., NIDA, NIH, DEA*, and Action), police sponsored

groups (like DARE*), and special interest groups (like PDFA*) have proclaimed to public, press, and parent groups alike that they have "absolute evidence" of the shocking negative effects of marijuana smoking.

* National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, Drug Enforcement Agency, Drug Abuse Resistance Education, Partnership for a Drug Free America. All subsequent researchers found Heath's marijuana findings to be of no value, because carbon monoxide poisoning and other factors were totally left out.

When U.S. government sponsored research prior to 1976 indicated that cannabis was harmless or beneficial, the methodology of how each study was done was always presented in detail in the reports; e.g., read *The Therapeutic Potential of Marijuana* (1976) and you will see exactly what the methodology of each medical study was.

However, when our government bureaucrats deliberately sponsored negative marijuana research, time and time again Playboy magazine, NORML, High Times, etc. had to sue under the new Freedom of Information Act to find out the actual laboratory methodology these "experiments" employed.

What they found was shocking.

Dr. Heath/Tulane Study, 1974

The Hype:

Brain Damage and Dead Monkeys

In 1974, California Governor Ronald Reagan was asked about decriminalizing marijuana.

After producing the Heath/Tulane University study, the so-called "Great Communicator" proclaimed, "The most reliable scientific sources say permanent brain damage is one of the inevitable results of the use of marijuana."

(L.A. Times)

The report from Dr. Heath had concluded that Rhesus monkeys, smoking the equivalent of only 30 joints a day, began to atrophy and die after 90 days.

And ever since, dead brain cells found in monkeys who were forced to smoke marijuana has been given maximum scare play in federal booklets and government sponsored propaganda literature against pot.

Senator Eastland of Mississippi used it throughout the mid-1970s to horrify and stop national legislators from supporting NORML's decriminalization bills in Congress, mostly sponsored by the late Senator Jacob Javits of New York.

Reports of the study have also been distributed by the hierarchy of drug rehabilitation professionals as part of their rationalization for wanting to get kids off pot, based on supposed

scientific studies. It is used to terrorize parent groups, church organizations, etc., who redistribute it still further.

Heath killed the half-dead monkeys, opened their brains, counted the dead brain cells, and then took control monkeys, who hadn't smoked marijuana, killed them too, and counted their brain cells. The pot smoking monkeys had enormous amounts of dead brain cells as compared to the "straight" monkeys.

Ronald Reagan's pronouncement was probably based on the fact that marijuana smoking was the only difference in the two sets of monkeys. Perhaps Reagan trusted the federal research to be real and correct. Perhaps he had other motives.

Whatever their reasons, this is what the government ballyhooed to press and PTA, who trusted the government completely.

In 1980, Playboy and NORML finally received for the first time after six years of requests and suing the government an accurate accounting of the research procedures used in the infamous report:

When NORML/Playboy hired researchers to examine the reported results against the actual methodology, they laughed.

The Facts:

Suffocation of Research Animals

As reported in Playboy, the Heath "Voodoo" Research methodology involved strapping Rhesus monkeys into a chair and pumping them with equivalent of 63 Colombian strength joints in "five minutes, through gas masks," losing no smoke. Playboy discovered that Heath had administered 63 joints in five minutes over just three months instead of administering 30 joints per day over a one-year period as he had first reported. Heath did this, it turned out, in order to avoid having to pay an assistant's wages every day for a full year.

The monkeys were suffocating! Three to five minutes of oxygen deprivation causes brain damage "dead brain cells." (Red Cross Lifesaving and Water Safety Manual) With the concentration of smoke used, the monkeys were a bit like a person running the engine of a car in a locked garage for 5, 10, 15 minutes at a time every day!

The Heath Monkey study was actually a study in animal asphyxiation and carbon monoxide poisoning.

Among other things, Heath had completely (intentionally? incompetently?) omitted discussion of the carbon monoxide the monkeys inhaled.

Carbon monoxide, a deadly gas that kills brain cells, is given off by any burning object. At that smoke concentration, the monkeys were, in effect, like a person locked in a garage with the car engine left running for five, 10, 15 minutes at a time every day!

All subsequent researchers agree the findings in Heath's experiment regarding marijuana were of no value, because carbon monoxide poisoning and other factors were totally left out and had not been considered in the report. This study and others, like Dr. Gabriel Nahas' 1970s studies, tried to somehow connect the THC metabolites routinely found in the fatty tissue of human brains, reproductive organs, and other fatty areas of the body to the dead brain cells in the suffocated monkeys.

Now, in 1999, 17 years have passed and not a single word of Dr. Heath's or Dr. Nahas' research has been verified! But their studies are still hauled out by the Partnership for a Drug Free America, the Drug Enforcement Administration, city and state narcotics bureaus, plus politicians and, in virtually all public instances, held up as scientific proof of the dangers of marijuana.

This is U.S. government propaganda and disinformation at its worst! The public paid for these studies and has the right to the correct information and history being taught in our taxpayer sponsored schools.

In 1996, Gabriel Nahas, in France, sued Mishka, the translator of the French edition of this book, "L'Emperor est Nu!", for damages. Mishka wrote that Nahas' studies were viewed by the world as garbage. The French court, upon hearing all the testimony by Nahas, and after Nahas had spent an equivalent of tens of thousands of American dollars on legal fees, awarded him its highest insult: one franc, the equivalent of approximately 15 cents American for damages, and no legal fees!

Source: <http://jackherer.com/chapter15.html> -- Jack Herer, The Emperor Wears No Clothes.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 07 November 2007 19:13 And you assumed I have no argument left? I don't give up like that fool. Ha! You must be on drugs...I just abandoned the thread that's all. Why I did that? Well, no use arguing with a pothead(s) who thinks all negative information about drugs are cooked up falsehood.

So dream on O intelligent pothead!

Bye. Enjoy the life.

I generally assume people with arguments don't resort to posts that contain only insults. Sorry, I gave you too much credit. As I mentioned before, the only drugs to enter my bloodstream in the last month are nicotine and alcohol. Anyway, if you have any legitimate arguments left I'd be interested in hearing them. I'm genuinely interested if you have links to peer-reviewed medical journals that show cannabis does have detrimental effects. Nobody is arguing with the fact that it can have some (somewhat trivial) detrimental effects on some users, but with moderation and self-control these are largely avoided and most users of cannabis are able to lead productive, happy lives providing they don't have any underlying mental disorders or an addictive personality. I'm just tired of people getting on their soapbox and denouncing all drug users based on information that's largely false.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 08 Nov 2007 04:49:43 GMT

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

I didn't mean it as an attack on anyone in particular, just an amusing observation in regards to arguments.

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 09 Nov 2007 06:18:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

1 time i smoked weed and it was laced with some pcp n i went insane for like a day

good times

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [Falco](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 19:55:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

dear xptek

lol after reading the bold paragraphs/sentences, that just shows to you the monkeys are being forced down 30 joints a day? Columbian strength? Hmm, Chronic has (as they say on some websites) 17-23% THC.. Columbian strength (again) really has no meaning, but 30 joints a day? I'm sorry, I can't even smoke that much. It may add up to 30 joints in about, a week and half? 2 weeks? Excluding bong/pipes..

Eh i g2g but ill continue this shit later

Subject: Re: weed
Posted by [xptek](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 21:00:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeAd3yE11 wrote on Mon, 12 November 2007 14:55dear xptek

lol after reading the bold paragraphs/sentences, that just shows to you the monkeys are being forced down 30 joints a day? Columbian strength? Hmm, Chronic has (as they say on some websites) 17-23% THC.. Columbian strength (again) really has no meaning, but 30 joints a day? I'm sorry, I can't even smoke that much. It may add up to 30 joints in about, a week and half? 2 weeks? Excluding bong/pipes..

Eh i g2g but ill continue this shit later

Yeah, that was my point. The study had nothing to do with THC and brain damage, but ended up being a study on animal asphyxiation and brain damage. NIDA and other government websites still continue to cite this when touting the "harmful" effects of marijuana.

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [Falco](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 21:45:09 GMT

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

DeAd3yE11 wrote on Mon, 12 November 2007 14:55dear xptek

lol after reading the bold paragraphs/sentences, that just shows to you the monkeys are being forced down 30 joints a day? Columbian strength? Hmm, Chronic has (as they say on some websites) 17-23% THC.. Columbian strength (again) really has no meaning, but 30 joints a day? I'm sorry, I can't even smoke that much. It may add up to 30 joints in about, a week and half? 2 weeks? Excluding bong/pipes..

Eh i g2g but ill continue this shit later

anyway monkeys have smaller brains too, lol scientific fact i guess but shit

yes, i like to play donkey kong 64 with my friends

Subject: Re: weed

Posted by [xptek](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2007 23:06:54 GMT

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

Brain size is entirely irrelevant, but OK.
