

Hi again, Grace. First of all, super cool that you commented on an older post! It seems like these get shuffled out of sight, out of mind pretty quick, so I always assume that after a month or so I have to give up hope for ever getting a response to a posting. I'm glad you combed through the rubble, lol! :)

Unfortunately, I ~~can't see what~~ wrote here that you're replying to, just the first few lines. I recall being interested in other ppl's thoughts on how to view and deal with occasions when you want to complain that someone is infringing on your right, especially to peace or privacy, but their answer to that is that your request/demand that they stop is an infringement of their right to do whatever they were doing. I remember being at my aunt's apartment one time, enjoying the heck out of some loud music I'd just bought. The neighbor complained. At first I took offence; "how dare you interfere with my enjoyment inside my own closed space!", but I went over and knocked on her door (her complaint was to bang the wall), and after we'd talked, I saw her point... my "joyous noise" was rattling her wall, and she didn't feel the joy at all. I had to swallow my pride and see how I'd wronged her. But... what if I hadn't? What if my position had been, "hey that's your problem, and now you're creating a problem for me by messing up my day!" How do you resolve the conflicting interests, here?

Since you wrote about a "vehicle law", then I'm sure I was bringing up one of my favorite issues, the no-cell-phones-while-driving laws. Is that right? These are very popular laws (yet also perhaps the most frequently broken laws, too), and my point is usually that ppl take sides on this issue very strongly, but rarely bother to consider a single fact — they just pick a team and wave the banner. One fact, which I tend to focus on, is that when no-phone laws became common around 2008, literally close to 100% of drivers ~~talked~~ on their phones at least occasionally while driving. Texting aside (as it was not the focus of the laws in 2006-2009), you'd think the push for anti-cellphone-in-cars laws would be based on a clear increase in traffic accidents due to phone use. That's certainly what the law-pushers all claimed. But... the data shows otherwise. I don't have the numbers in front of me right now, but more or less, traffic accidents (not deaths, a different issue) went from a peak around 1990 +/- and ~~slowly~~ declined up to 2020 or so, if I remember right. By 2020, about 60% of Americans owned cellphones, and the most popular place to use them was in cars. So, did the accidents increase from 2008 to the law-era of 2007? No! In fact, they decreased even more, I believe, as cell use went from 60% to almost 100%. They leveled out around 2010, and have held steady... that is with more cars and more phones on the road than ever. So... does this practice, as you said, "pose a direct ~~risk~~ threat to the life of another"? I'd say no, that even if talking on phones may occasionally contribute to or even cause an accident, it's a very rare occurrence, no greater threat to life or limb than, say, universal household access to butcher knives... and no one seems eager to ban sharp cutlery in our kitchens in the name of Safety (though any ER doctor might attest that it would reduce injuries). What do you think?