

The Ronald Reagan
"Great Moments"
Commemorative Medallions



Limited to
5,000 Worldwide
Place Your Order Now!

Human Events™
Leading Conservative Media Since 1944




**The Politically Incorrect Guide to
THE VIETNAM WAR**

[Home](#)[RedState](#)[Video](#)[Contributors](#)[About Us](#)[Bookstore](#)[Subscribe](#)[Search](#)

Human Events



twitter



@HumanEvents is now on Twitter - Follow Us Today!

Share 28

13

ShareThis 49

Print

Forward



Prohibitionists: Leave Us Alone!

by [John Stossel](#)

01/05/2011

[Trackback Link](#)

27

[Comments](#)[Recommend](#)28 recommendations. [Sign Up](#) to see what your friends recommend.

Sometimes I drink Scotch and then, to wake myself up, I drink coffee. So what? Many people consume mixtures of caffeine and alcohol in drinks like rum and Coke. Again, so what?

But recently some college kids started drinking pre-mixed combos of alcohol and caffeine with names like Four Loko and Moonshot '69. Moonshot '69 is a pilsner beer with less than a coffee cup's worth of caffeine. Until recently, Four Loko contained 12 percent alcohol -- about the same as wine -- and as much caffeine as a cup of coffee. A few students, after drinking Four Loko, landed in the hospital with alcohol poisoning. Naturally, hysterical news reports followed.

A new bogeyman was born: caffeinated alcoholic beverages.

Ann Coulter on...

**Why You Can't
Trust Wall Street
with Your Wealth...**



As night follows day, the Food and Drug Administration in November ordered beverage companies to lose the caffeine or shut down. The FDA called caffeine an "unsafe food additive." Phusion Products says it will now produce only noncaffeinated Four Loko. Moonshot '69 is off the

Related Articles

"Saving" The Housing Market

by Thomas Sowell

Personal Well-being Overshadows Income Inequality

by Michael Barone

The Administration's Administrative Tyranny Marches On

by David Limbaugh

Coed Dorms Show Disregard for Student Well-Being

by Alyssa Cordova and Camille Hart

Christianity with Cojones Part 2: Rebels With A Cause

by Doug Giles

market for now, which is bad news for Rhonda Kallman, who founded the company that makes it, New Century Brewing.

"There is nothing new about adults combining caffeine and alcohol," Kallman writes on her company website. "Who hasn't enjoyed a rum and Coke, Irish coffee, Kahlua or espresso martini? ... Moonshot '69 is a beer for beer drinkers that has been enjoyed by craft-beer lovers since 2004."

Her online petition states: "We the undersigned support the right of responsible adults to choose the beer of their choice. We support Moonshot69 and the rights of craft brewers across the country to produce new and innovative offerings for the beer drinking public. ... We call on the federal government to adhere to responsible regulation of alcoholic beverages that allows adults to enjoy the beer of their choice."

Unfortunately, Kallman tries to separate her product from higher-alcohol FDA targets, but Nick Gillespie of Reason magazine argues that the FDA has no business limiting the sale of any of the alcohol/caffeine combos.

"This has been going on for as long as there have been colleges and universities," he said. "You can go back to the Middle Ages, and booze and students go together like, I guess, beer and caffeine."

Aren't some drinks more dangerous than others?

"I don't think so. But when we raised the drinking age to 21 ... we told young people ... you can vote, you can enter a contract, you can go to war, you can die for your country, but if you want to drink and you're going to college, you better go off campus into a basement apartment somewhere and chug like there's no tomorrow because you don't know when you're going to be able to get drunk again."

He points out that by forbidding pre-21 adults from drinking openly around their elders, we deny them the chance to be exposed to responsible drinking.

About the ban on caffeinated alcoholic drinks, he added, "You can't minimize the overreach by the FDA."

I asked the FDA why Moonshot '69 is included on the ban list when it's not marketed to pre-21 adults and it contains less alcohol than more sugary drinks. They replied that Moonshot was referred to the agency by state attorneys general concerned about alcohol and caffeine. The FDA asked New Century Brewing for data indicating the legal standard for safety had been met, but no data was provided.

Kallman points out that the FDA "didn't fully research it either. So they put the onus on the small entrepreneur to have a scientist. But at the end of the day, it's 5 percent alcohol by volume and less than a half a cup of coffee of natural caffeine. Where will they stop?"

Never. Government never stops.

Gillespie added, "What we should be having instead of bans (of) beverages that people like and ... consume responsibly is ... a national conversation about how, after a couple of hundred years of the American experiment, we can get past the prohibitionist mindset and teach people how to drink responsibly like they do in France, Italy, Spain and many other parts of the world."

America's Most Important Day in 50 Years...

It will change the way you travel... shop... invest... and even retire.

Watch this eye-opening video presentation HERE.

WARNING: This presentation is controversial, and may be offensive to some audiences. Viewer discretion is advised...

 **Stansberry & Associates**
Investment Research

More by This Author

Please Stop "Helping" Us
by John Stossel

Uncle Sam Will Help Buy You an Alpaca
by John Stossel

Why Do People Believe in Fantasies?
by John Stossel

Why Do the Poor Stay Poor?
by John Stossel

Making Parks Decent Again
by John Stossel

Happy Starvation Day
by John Stossel

John Stossel is host of "Stossel" on the Fox Business Network. He's the author of "Give Me a Break" and of "Myth, Lies, and Downright Stupidity." To find out more about John Stossel, visit his site at johnstossel.com.



Reader Comments: (27)

Welcome to our new comments section! We made this change to allow for a better user experience. In addition to requiring readers to register - which we trust will not be too much of an imposition - we will also be moderating comments 24/7. This will allow us to ensure that users stay on topic and treat each other with respect. Who knows, we may even produce a new product that features you our loyal audience. Let us know what you think.

Showing 27 comments

Sort by **Popular now** [Subscribe by email](#) [Subscribe by RSS](#)



Truncheon 4 hours ago

Alto writes: "one CAN make an EXCELLENT case why government SHOULD BAN alcohol consumption."

So instead of giving any example of such a case, you're just going to assert that a case can be made?

An "excellent" case can be made why government should take total control of everything, just ask Hobbes.

In a free society of free men, the government has no business interfering with appetites. All such interference is calculated to provide greater control and funding to government.

Any appeals to public health and safety are lip service.

In all cases of prohibition, the damage done to the public...the most venomous being the insult to our liberty...always far exceeds the damage said substance or its abuse is purported to cause.

Society is far better off dealing with a handful of alcoholics, drug addicts, and potheads then handing control of our personal appetites over to a central authority.

As should be perfectly clear now, giving government such authority is a time bomb. Everyone who thought it was cool to prohibit heroine and cocaine, instead of licensing and regulating it, must now admit how "The Blob" of government always expands, breaks its bonds, and consumes everyone.

There are otherwise good people rotting in prisons around this country for possession of tiny quantities of various drugs. Now there is a company under assault for selling...effectively...Irish Coffee.

The fact that there is no detectable general outrage demonstrates how well-conditioned the soulless robots we once called "The American People" really are today. I recoil with disgust on a daily basis at my fellow man, his weak intellect, and his absence of principled morals.

You don't give the slightest power to government, for there is no restraint. Once you make the slightest concession to government, you may as well write off whatever

Find us on Facebook



Human Events

[Like](#)

78,751 people like Human Events



Debbie



Mike



Craig



Brandon



Facebook social plugin

area...in its totality...that you conceded. For it is only a matter of time...

(Edited by author 3 hours ago)

14 people liked this.

Like

Reply



Brigade 3 hours ago [in reply to Truncheon](#)

Well, the main argument, as I see it, is that people below a certain age can't handle the responsibility of dealing with something that may have permanent repercussions. In the case of "fun" or "desirable" activities, younger people have the tendency to forgo thought consequences.

This is exactly why the age limit for sex is 18. Is there anything physiologically wrong with a human having sex before 18? No, the body is capable as soon as puberty hits. However, 15 year olds have been deemed unable, on the whole, to consider the negative consequences and huge responsibility sex can result in. Aka getting pregnant.

Drinking is the same way. Alcohol poisoning, or DUIs are the hallmark of irresponsible use of this substance, and children have been judged as being prone to irresponsible behavior. "The young think they're invincible", everyone knows what I'm getting at here, and I think it's the primary issue, not that drinking is actually any worse for them than it is for adults.

However, you're totally right that the government can not make a case for banning alcohol consumption all together. As much as I hate to use "We've always done it" as an argument.... We've always done it. It's a social staple. And you can't ban everything that is in some way unhealthy, or that may, under certain reckless use, be dangerous. You would have to get rid of everything from cars to power tools.

This isn't to say they don't think they can. Look at Marijuana. It's less harmful than Cigarettes, less behaviorally altering than alcohol, and yet it is an illegal substance. A lot of these types of decisions are based on social stigma, rather than fact, and it's a pity.

5 people liked this.

Like

Reply



Truncheon 3 hours ago [in reply to Brigade](#)

Brigade writes: "people below a certain age can't handle the responsibility"

I agree, however you can't regulate something that is illegal. Thus, it's a simple matter for a kid to score a joint, some cocaine, hash oil, etc. whereas it's a mighty chore to get a quart of vodka.

Brigade writes: "A lot of these types of decisions are based on social stigma"

Mostly, it's a way to purchase votes. Make empty promises of a brave new world where human weakness will simply be legislated away. Both the left and the right fail the test of that "Great Ring".

We can't legislate utopia, as every Conservative (otherwise) admits. But get on the "drug" thing, and the vast majority of Conservatives morph into people indistinguishable from the typical HuffPo enthusiast.

(Edited by author 3 hours ago)

1 person liked this.

Like

Reply

**Brigade** 3 hours ago [in reply to Trunccheon](#)

I agree that acquiring alcohol can be more difficult than cocaine, which is truly sad. But you can't make certain things legal just to regulate them. I've had to deal with cocaine abuse in the family, and no one should ever touch that stuff. It really changes people, in a bad way.

And I completely agree. People think "any-given-substance" is bad, so politicians ban it, and as a result they've essentially bought more votes. That will only be done away with by educating the public to the point where baseless bans won't -work- to buy votes.

Like

Reply

**Trunccheon** 3 hours ago [in reply to Brigade](#)

Brigade writes: "educating the public to the point where baseless bans won't -work- to buy votes."

I'm afraid I'm not among those who believe reasoning with the enemy until he sees life my way is a viable alternative. You defeat your enemy by...defeating him.

There will never be a time, on this Earth, where the number of virtuous, free, moral people exceeds the number of those willing to take a gimme no matter how many strangers suffer.

Thus, your recommended course of action is doomed to fail.

We don't "convince the people", we disempower the government. Attempts to weaken the government are not going to be met with the cheers and applause of the masses.

They will be met with shrieks and howls, pitchforks and torches, of the many animated mediocrities who siphon a fraction of their livelihood from the government trough.

Attempts to remedy prohibition will be met with the glazed-eyed resistance of the "Stepford" right, who will be unwitting allies of the organized drug cartels, resisting decriminalization. The "Stepford" right to maintain their particular tyranny, and the cartels to maintain their particular profits.

(Edited by author 3 hours ago)

Like

Reply

**Trunccheon** 3 hours ago [in reply to Trunccheon](#)

Brigade writes: "it's not about moral vs immoral people, it's about educated vs ignorant."

At the end of the day, it's about moral vs immoral, everywhere, everything.

Who wakes up one day, and resolves to deny a giant block of his fellow men their recreational choice? A good man, or a bad man?

Everything in this world, in this reality, in this existence,

comes down to good vs evil. That's the whole game. That's why we're here. It's like a test.

Perhaps you heard mention of such things in Sunday School once...

1 person liked this. [Like](#)



Brigade 3 hours ago [in reply to Truncheon](#)

Well it's not about moral vs immoral people, it's about educated vs ignorant. Someone can be immoral and educated. If this were the case, they would probably view Alcohol as a terrific financial investment, and instead of banning it, try and get the age limit removed all together so they can sell it to kids.

1 person liked this. [Like](#)



Truncheon 3 hours ago [in reply to Brigade](#)

Brigade writes: "But you can't make certain things legal just to regulate them."

That might be an interesting observation, if my argument was "legalize it so we can regulate it."

My points thus far are:

1. A moral government does not interfere with the appetites of its citizens
2. All such interference yields problems more dire than they seek to solve
3. The young are less imperiled in a society absent prohibition
4. Such efforts are merely cynical methods of purchasing votes and power

This isn't an issue of "making it legal" but rather the acknowledgment that it was never criminal in the first instance, it's an issue of correcting government from having declared illegal that which is not a crime. Thus, the topic and point of the entire article.

Continued defense of prohibition would indicate a moral blind spot, and tacit support of the FDA's power grab vis a vis these blended drinks.

(Edited by author 3 hours ago)

[Like](#) [Reply](#)



Brigade 3 hours ago [in reply to Truncheon](#)

I apologize, I took this: "I agree, however you can't regulate something that is illegal. Thus, it's a simple matter for a kid to score a joint, some cocaine, hash oil, etc. whereas it's a mighty chore to get a quart of vodka." to mean that a way to best regulate something was to make it legal.

and I agree with you on basically all your points, with the exception being number 1. If that appetite has the ability to cause significant harm to the person, or others around them,

than an argument can be made to restrict access to it. I think this is the bases for alcohol regulation, and indeed regulation of any substance of behavior.

I don't think I should be able to indulge in behavior that harms others, I know I wouldn't want others indulging in things that harm me.

Like



DaneChile 1 hour ago [in reply to Brigade](#)

The main point to me is that an "adult" is legally defined as a person who has reached the age of eighteen. For that reason, they can enter legal contracts.

It appears from some of the comments that the word "adult" is tied to differing ages depending upon the activity in question. I don't understand this.

- One comment states that a "child" of 18 to 21 years of age cannot handle alcohol responsibly but 21 is arbitrarily chosen as the age at which stunningly responsible alcohol use commences? Perhaps it would be more logical and less arbitrary if we study the injury, fighting, DUI, public disturbance, et al. statistics and choose the age of the 90th percentile as the legal drinking age? Might turn out to be sixty, though, so one can imagine the stink that this would cause.

- Minimum ages for women to engage in sex is equally illogical. As pointed out above, a female is ready with the onset of menstruation since that implies ovulation and, therefore, the ability to reproduce. That is the natural way. Eighteen is arbitrary and I tend to believe that it is related to the average age of the typical high school graduate. But many states permit marriage with less than 18 years of age and at least one state allows marriage at fourteen with _her_ parents' consent but not that of _his_ parents. A marriage license then is the government granting an exemption from the laws setting the minimum age for a female to engage in sexual intercourse.

I just find it difficult to believe that our lawmakers see no flaw in their reasoning that a person is old enough to vote responsibly, make responsible contractual decisions (such as entering the Armed forces) yet are not responsible enough to drink alcohol and coffee at the same time.

Does the FDA require certification of safety standards of every bar that serves Irish Coffee, every store that sells Kahlua and every restaurant that serves coffee to a patron who has consumed two cocktails and a bottle of wine with dinner?

Methinks these companies just did not pay off the right people: either the political appointees and desk monkeys of the FDA or the politicians by way of "donations".

Like

Reply



Chuck37 1 hour ago

I look at it this way. When I sell someone something - anything - I am acting morally if I can believe in good faith that it is a transaction that makes us both better off. For example, if I sell someone an old car that I know is about to need a new transmission, knowing full well that he wouldn't buy it if he knew, I'm acting immorally. If you sell someone something and later on they regret it - and you reasonably could have predicted this outcome, you are acting immorally. Bottom line, are you performing an action that is making people worse off? So now I ask: Can someone selling beer reasonably believe they are providing a service to their community? Do people buy and

consume beer, getting what they expected in the form of enjoyment and value for their money? I think yes. Now switch to cocaine or heroin. If I am a dealer of these substances and take my business to a new community, can I look at myself in the mirror and honestly believe I am providing a beneficial service? I think not. Cigarettes, in my view, fall somewhere in between, though I think they are on balance beneficial (note that I'm counting enjoyment in the equation).

1 person liked this.

Like

Reply


eewell 4 hours ago

Remember history. The last time prohibition was tried it made five Italians and an Irishman very rich.

2 people liked this.

Like

Reply


Stratosaurus 5 hours ago

Yet another example of the government gently reminding us that we are too stupid to make our own decisions. Gotta love it.

2 people liked this.

Like

Reply


Altosackbuteer 11 hours ago

I am amazed by the government's intervention in the steroid situation.

I am persuaded that steroids, if administered responsibly, under a physician's care, are nothing but a BLESSING. At most, they should be freely available via prescription, much like penicillin.

Sporting leagues are private enterprises. Steroid use may indeed compromise the integrity of their all-time records. But if so, then let THEM regulate steroids, and withOUT government interference. If Barry Bonds hits 73 home runs because he bulked up on juice, what is that to me? It doesn't affect MY life in the slightest.

Government has a legitimate role in regulating things like alcohol, cocaine, and heroin, because use of these leads to criminal activities. None of that is true with steroids, save to the extent that proscribing steroids actually leads to the very behaviors that banning was supposed to cure.

1 person liked this.

Like

Reply


Maryland_USA 5 hours ago [in reply to Altosackbuteer](#)

"Government has a legitimate role in regulating things like alcohol, cocaine, and heroin"

Oh, really? I would remind you that there were no restrictions on cocaine, alcohol, or heroin until the early 1900s. How did that Prohibition thing work out?

Like

Reply


Altosackbuteer 4 hours ago [in reply to Maryland_USA](#)

As for Prohibition itself: I remind you, there was a reason why Prohibition was enacted in the first place.

It is very difficult to pass anything via constitutional amendment -- yet, the arguments that alcohol abolitionists made were evidently so compelling AND POPULAR that they were able to overcome the hurdles that the Founding Fathers erected, and were able to change the Constitution itself.

How could such a thing happen? Easy. There is a strong and easy case one can make against alcohol consumption. Just look at the history of automobile accident fatalities. You know as well as I that several TENS OF THOUSANDS of lives are lost every year because of drunk driving.

Oh no -- one CAN make an EXCELLENT case why government SHOULD BAN alcohol consumption.

The ONLY reason why we repealed Prohibition was because we found that Prohibition was a cure that was worse than the disease it purported to cure.

So alcohol HAD to be made legal again. But be sure -- we relegalized it ONLY GRUDGINGLY. And for good reason, we have heavily regulated and monitored it ever since.

By the way, and just for your information, in Poland, it is universally possible to buy VODKA at ALL-NIGHT GAS STATIONS. Imagine THAT in the USA!

Like Reply



Maryland_USA 3 hours ago [in reply to Altosackbuteer](#)

"Oh no -- one CAN make an EXCELLENT case why government SHOULD BAN alcohol consumption"

You seem to imply that because tens of thousands die in drunk driving accidents, I should be banned from drinking a beer while watching a football game? You also state, "we have heavily regulated and monitored it ever since." Has that heavy regulation prevented highways deaths and were there drunk driving fatalities during Prohibition?

Like Reply



Altosackbuteer 53 minutes ago [in reply to Maryland_USA](#)

Because Disqus timed out a direct response, I have to do it this way.

You said, "You (meaning me) stated, "We didn't repeal Prohibition because it didn't work. We repealed it because, despite the good things it did, it was a cure that resulted in more social harm than the disease itself it purported to cure" In an earlier post you said, "The ONLY reason why we repealed Prohibition was because we found that Prohibition was a cure that was worse than the disease it purported to cure." Despite those comments, you seem to think Prohibition is a good thing.

As to your comment, "But I WOULD ban you from having that beer while watching a game inside Ye Friendly Neighborhood Tavern and driving home afterward." Alto, there IS a ban on drinking and driving. Would you ban Ye Friendly Neighborhood Tavern?"

My answer: 1) How on earth can you possibly claim that I think Prohibition was a good thing when you yourself quoted me as saying it was a cure that was worse than the disease it purported to cure? It -- and you -- make no sense at all.

2) Would I ban Ye Friendly Neighborhood Tavern? See response immediately above. They're too popular to ban, and trying to do so would cause more problems than it's worth. But none of that means they ought to be left unmonitored and unregulated, and closed down when necessary.

It happens all the time, but I know personally of one place on Dorchester Avenue in Boston, which was closed down for some time because of incessant drug dealing going on inside.

I myself used to sell beer at the old Schaefer Stadium in Foxboro, MA. There were numerous brawls in the stands in the 1970's. I remember one Monday Night game in particular. The Patsies were killing the Jests 41 - 7. I had a GREAT night selling beer THAT night. Indeed, I had a great 4-year run there, setting sales records which will never be broken because beer sales are closely restricted now.

There were dozens of beer-fueled fistfights all over the stands. Looking at a given section of stands, you could tell when there was a brawl because all of a sudden, it looked like a bunch of fly maggots at a garbage pit. If there weren't literally hundreds of fights that night, there were definitely several dozen.

I myself got into a fight that night. Someone tried to steal one of my beers; I restrained him; he swung at me, and I cold-cocked him.

There were lots of fights in the parking lot after the game was over too.

This all happened, I believe, in 1976. I moved out of the region the following year, and it was just as well, because the Town of Foxboro cut off beer sales afterward anyway. And cut off Monday Night Football from coming back for the next 15 years too.

You could say that the Town of Foxboro imposed its own Prohibition on beer sales after the brawls of 1976. And the result is a better environment for the fans. So, YEAH, Prohibition is FAR from a totally black and evil thing.

Like Reply

 **Concerned4America** 1 hour ago [in reply to Maryland USA](#)

I don't care if you kill yourself with alcohol or drugs but I don't want to you kill me or mine thus the restrictions are not to protect you but to protect the rest of us.

Like Reply

 **Altosackbuteer** 3 hours ago [in reply to Maryland USA](#)

1) You asked whether, because tens of thousands die annually in drunk-driving accidents, you should be banned from having a beer while watching a football game. Personally, I would say NO. However, that was NOT what I SAID. ALL I said was, a GOOD case COULD BE MADE for banning all alcohol consumption, including your beer, because of the undeniable existence of all those casualties. And that's on top who survive, but maimed for life.

Nope -- I wouldn't ban you from sitting at home with a beer. But I

WOULD ban you from having that beer while watching a game inside Ye Friendly Neighborhood Tavern and driving home afterward.

2) You also asked, "has that heavy regulation prevented highways deaths and were there drunk driving fatalities during Prohibition?"

That is a foolish question. The proper question would be, how many MORE deaths would there be in the absence of all regulation? The difference between that number and the actual number of deaths is a measure of the effectiveness of the current laws.

3) Were there drunk driving fatalities during Prohibition?" You bet there were.

It was, of course, a totally different age. There was a much lower automobile density. Cars and the roads they rode upon were far more primitive than today. It's hard to draw valid comparisons to today, rather like comparing baseball stats from the Deadball era with those of the Steroids era.

However, I'd confidently wager that the existence of Prohibition, making it generally far more difficult to find a drink, resulted in fewer fatalities than otherwise would have been the case, and in THAT sense, Prohibition actually worked.

We didn't repeal Prohibition because it didn't work. We repealed it because, despite the good things it did, it was a cure that resulted in more social harm than the disease itself it purported to cure.

Like Reply



ConcernedCitizenHilton 2 hours ago [in reply to Altosackbuteer](#)

"But I WOULD ban you from having that beer..."

You make me sick. Keep your fascism to yourself! It's interesting how we managed to survive and even thrive as a country before all you fascist busy-bodies started sticking your noses into people's lives. Stay the f*ck out of people's lives. You'll live longer.

2 people liked this. Like



Maryland_USA 2 hours ago [in reply to Altosackbuteer](#)

You stated, "We didn't repeal Prohibition because it didn't work. We repealed it because, despite the good things it did, it was a cure that resulted in more social harm than the disease itself it purported to cure" In an earlier post you said, "The ONLY reason why we repealed Prohibition was because we found that Prohibition was a cure that was worse than the disease it purported to cure." Despite those comments, you seem to think Prohibition is a good thing.

As to your comment, "But I WOULD ban you from having that beer while watching a game inside Ye Friendly Neighborhood Tavern and driving home afterward." Alto, there IS a ban on drinking and driving. Would you ban Ye Friendly Neighborhood Tavern?

Like

**ADRoberts** 5 minutes ago

I usually read the article and most of the comments. Today, I will not.

You strain at a gnat. Those who oppose alcohol are completely aware that the Bible does not forbid drinking. We also know that in moderation, there is NO problem. However, ever since the days of Prohibition, the evidence is clear of the destruction of lives, finances, relationships etc when people CANNOT be moderate. There are hundreds of thousands of people who have no mechanism to deal with stress and trouble.

I know that a great mass of smart and stupid people will clamor for their drug of choice, but it is still a problem.

So STOP TRYING TO DEFEND THE UNRESTRICTED USE OF ALCOHOL AND START TRYING TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM.

Otherwise, consider becoming a tea-totaler. Some of them are called recovering alcoholics.

Like

Reply

**foxnewszombie_nofactsplease** 1 hour ago

Stossel:

Thanks for giving Gillespie a hearing. He is spot on for all counts. We should have no drinking age at home and no more than 16 or so for pub/food settings in public.

The anti's are not just liberals. There is a subset of nanny liberals, but most are of the freedom mindset. Too much freedom to suit the majority of right wingers on this forum. Blame MADD and most fundamentalists for wanting to take your freedom. Blame George Bush for FISA and the Patriot act. I don't know who the hell to blame because I can't buy M-80's and cherry bombs, but I can buy a military style semi-automatic weapon.

I hope you are only imbibing a couple of ounces of that scotch, for the sake of your liver. But it's your own damn business as long as you can pay for your own transplant.

kdmeares
missouri

Like

Reply

**claims1** 1 hour ago

Good people! Stop your prohibition bickering. A very few students(perhaps one)had adverse reactions. Was this issue turned over to the CDC, or were any conclusive studies conducted? Are you serious? That was never intended. This is just another example of this Obama Administration's grab for more Government power and control. So long as we fail to act and/or drink responsibly, believe me there are those in Washington who will see to it that we do. Salud!

Like

Reply

**Truncheon** 3 hours ago

Brigade writes: "If that appetite has the ability to cause significant harm to the person, or others around them, than an argument can be made to restrict access to it."

Define harm. I take a hit of joint, my abdomen splits open, entrails spray out all over, and I collapse and die? That strikes me as harmful, though I'm unsure I'd outlaw someone from willfully doing it.

All other "harm" you could contrive to assign is purely subjective and abstract. My research indicates that everyone who tried to live a very healthy life....ended up dead.

If a person does not own his **own body**, then there is no such thing as property rights. If you can tell me what to do with my **own body**, than I am your slave, and you are my master.

Behold, yet another confused Conservative who...in the end...employs **EXACTLY** the verbiage and the logic of the neo-Marxist left. Who understands **SO LITTLE** of what is meant by liberty and the pursuit of happiness, he thinks nothing of advancing **STATE CONTROL** of one's own body.

Some days, it's just not even worth chewing through the restraints.

Like Reply



Altosackbuteer 4 hours ago

I said REGULATION, NOT Prohibition.

The United States continue to REGULATE alcohol very closely, to this day, and generally does it well.

As for heroin, I believe a case can actually be made for decriminalizing it and making it generally available.

But I will now tell you of my own experience with dope fiends. I have a dear, close friend, and for 30 years of her life, she hustled as a junkie. Boosting, hooking, dealing -- you name it, she did it, to support herself and her habit.

Her main drug of "choice" was heroin. I say "choice" guardedly because heroin physically enslaves and forces the addict to get more, somehow, anyhow, in order to stave off the intense discomfort of withdrawal.

I regard her as a Qualified Expert. And so it may surprise you to hear that she regards cocaine as the ultimate evil, not heroin. I think it's because, with heroin, as long as the addict has enough, he/she is sated and doesn't want or require any more.

But with cocaine, enough is never enough. Make more coke available, and the user will simply consume more.

People do wild things to get it, and do wild things once under its influence.

Government has a legitimate function and right to protect its citizens from criminal acts, right? Given that cocaine inevitably makes people crazy and leads to criminal activity, I therefore see no alternative but to continue to proscribing it.

I can't see how or why any REASONABLE, and halfway knowledgable, person could dispute that.

Like Reply

Real-time updating is **enabled**. ([Pause](#))

Add New Comment

Type your comment here.

Post as ...



[Advertise](#) | [Manage Your Account](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)
Copyright © 2011 HUMAN EVENTS. All Rights Reserved.