

Answer to The “Unanswerable Challenge”

A prominent gun rights blogger* calls this his “challenge no one has been able to answer.” There’s a reason no one has been able to answer it: it is unanswerable *by design*.

Here’s his “challenge”:

“Produce credible data – something that can be independently validated – that ‘amnesty’ and a ‘pathway to citizenship’ for MILLIONS of foreign nationals in this country illegally (and even legally, with current culturally suicidal policies) WILL NOT overwhelmingly favor Democrats and anti-gunners. Show us your sources and methodologies for determining this WILL NOT result in supermajorities in state and federal legislatures that will be able to pass all kinds of anti-gun edicts.

Show us how this WILL NOT result in nominations and confirmations of judges to the Supreme and federal courts who will uphold those edicts, and reverse gains made to date. The sudden passing of Justice Scalia, and the precarious balances of the Heller and McDonald decisions, ought to drive home for all how dangerously critical that is. [S]how how all credible estimates putting the disparity at over 70% Democrat and anti-gun are wrong.

How about some verifiable numbers to refute my concerns?”

I knew the answer almost *immediately*, but kept quiet for a long time for the sake of politeness. But it just keeps being brought up over and over, and it’s a little embarrassing. It’s almost as bad as a supposedly knowledgeable gun owner lecturing a newbie about the “shoulder thing that goes up” and why it should be “illegal.”

So here is my answer, and I know it won’t win me any friends.

Let’s look at an equivalent “challenge” first and see why it is unanswerable...

“Produce credible data – something that can be independently validated – that a government big and powerful enough to “secure the

borders", keep track of all immigrants, deport illegal immigrants, and control immigration to the extent you demand WILL NOT abuse that power and become a Soviet- or Nazi-style tyranny. Show us your sources and methodologies for determining this WILL NOT result in the further degradation of property rights, the right of association, the right to be secure in your home from government invasion, and the right to travel without being stopped to show "your papers, please". Show us how this WILL NOT result in nominations and confirmations of judges to the Supreme and federal courts who will uphold those edicts, and reverse gains made to date.

How about some verifiable numbers to refute my concerns?

I'm waiting. *Show me*. Not speculation. Not guesswork. Not anecdotes. Hard verifiable proof of how the future *WILL* turn out; not how it might.

You can't, can you. Because I am demanding the impossible, just as his "challenge" does.

The "challenge" is an illogical, emotional demand without a rational, logical answer. This is worse than asking "*Have you stopped beating your wife yet?*" It's a trick of sophistry, not an argument.

The fact is, the only way to enforce any "immigration policy" is by violating life, liberty, and property (and the Constitution, if that matters to anyone). It requires a massive growth in government power and intrusiveness. Today. Now. Not in some speculative future.

My solution remains the same: Stop driving those you fear into the arms of your enemy.

Of course, this anti-"immigration"/pro-gun hysteria is predicated on the political delusion that some Republican politicians are "pro-gun," and that is simply not even slightly true. I repeat: There is no such thing as a "pro-gun Republican." The average Republican politician (or bureaucrat) may be *slightly* less anti-gun than the average Democrat politician, but they aren't "pro-gun" at all. I have yet to see a single Republican politician who knows that weaponry of any kind is none of the government's business whatsoever—not subject to any "laws" of any kind. Republicans are statists first. Anything else comes a distant second. You can't be a statist and really respect rights. Statists can *pretend* to respect rights, and they can say things that seem to indicate they do, but they lie. The proof is in what they do, not what they say.

And, the assumptions in the “challenge” may not even be realistic, anyway, although the writer of that piece may have an ulterior motive to make you believe him so you’ll let down your guard and stop putting my solution into practice.

This blog post is not going to change *anyone’s* mind, of course. In fact, I expect borderists to dig in their heels even more if they happen to read this. I realize I’m a nobody. My opinion isn’t worth a hill of beans. But bad arguments for bigger, more powerful and intrusive government really bother me, especially when constructed poorly or deceptively. Doubly so when advocated by those who should be on the side of liberty.

-

*This isn’t to say I don’t like his blog. It has some *very good* information, but he’s just got this gigantic mote in his eye that is causing him to stumble and side with the *real* enemy of gun rights on this issue. And it seems to be growing larger and more obsessive by the day.

I even understand his concerns. It bothers me too. I *hate* the fact that people are foolish enough to allow a “system” to exist which enables people to vote to violate the rights of others- which brings this “challenge” back to its own foundation: The State is YOUR enemy, even if it is doing things you approve of. Supporting it in any way is suicidal in the long run.

This is why my solution is *so critical*, and why advocating anything else would be shooting myself in the foot.