

May Cops Defend Innocent People from Attack?

Fred asks a couple of questions about cops and violence, saying they won't be answered by folks of my sort because they'll trigger cognitive dissonance.

Well, let's see...

The Police: *A cop sees a man strike a woman in the head with a piece of pipe and grab her purse. He tries to arrest the perp, who resists. The criminal is 19, muscular, and weighs 220. **What should the cop do?***

Answer: He should do the same thing anyone else should do. He should defend the victim and himself. If necessary, he should fatally shoot the aggressor. "Arrest" (under the statist misunderstanding of the word) shouldn't be a goal, but that's a different subject.

Next...

*Second question: The perp is big, stoked on PCP, has a length of pipe, and does not want to go to jail. He attacks the cop. **What should the cop do when attacked with a deadly weapon?***

Well, unless the guy was archating—which if he's referring to the guy in the first question, he *was*—the cop should have minded his own business and the pipe vs. cop attack wouldn't have happened. Being on drugs, having some pipe, and not wanting to be caged are not *mala in se* acts (wrong in and of themselves).

However, if he *is* referring to the guy in the first question (as I believe he is), the answer is the same as the answer to the first question: he should defend the victim and himself.

The right thing to do **doesn't change depending on what your "job" is**—and that's the fatal error cop supporters always make. This really isn't that complicated, folks!

The rest of Fred's questions are either not directed toward me (being asked of archators of various sorts) and are thus irrelevant for this blog, or they are outside the scope of this blog. The answer to his religious question would make some of my readers mad, and the "question" has nothing to do with the proper way to live among other people. I'd rather unite people than divide them, so I won't answer that one here.