

Censorship Not The Answer to Evil

People like the murderer in the Buffalo, N.Y., grocery store will always find justification to be evil losers. He would have found some excuse even if no one had ever suspected that government is trying, for political purposes, to dilute the culture with those who don't share it.

The way to fight such ideas is to openly discuss them, not censorship. If you choose to censor ideas, I'll think you have no argument against them.

They will also always find something to use as a weapon, even if the anti-gun bigots ever manage to ban the type of weapon this one chose.

The effective way to defend from evil losers isn't with lone armed guards or with an armed class of enforcers, but with a universally armed population ready to stop any such attack in its tracks. An armed guard is too easy to notice and target, but when nearly everyone around you is ready to stop any attack, the cost of committing one is raised back to where it belongs.

Even so, the armed guard at the store gave his life to delay the evil loser and give more people the chance to escape. He saved lives.

There will always be evil people, and some percentage of those will decide to try to kill people who aren't harming them in any way — even if they must hallucinate that they are being harmed. You won't stop them by making everyone else helpless or by forbidding ideas that could inspire them to attack.

It might also help if government would stop actively radicalizing them with its actions and policies.

While government is constitutionally prohibited from regulating immigration, it is also not permitted to import people from other countries. Not that government stays within what it is allowed to do. There's a difference between something happening naturally and government forcing something to happen. The latter is more intrusive.

Maybe government hopes more of these attacks will occur. They always seem to happen right before some anti-gun legislation is under consideration — I'm sure it's only a coincidence. This attack — apparently spurred by ideas a weak mind encountered online — also happened, coincidentally, in the midst of a fight over censorship. It's all rather convenient, is it not?

Either way, I will not accept blame and be legislatively punished for things other people —

people I don't support in any way — do. Will you?