

# Liberty is The Only Reason You Need to Own Firearms

The question was posed about 7 months ago, "Gun owners of Reddit, what is your reason to own firearms?" My answer and a conversation about my answer went as follows.

---

**Skylar:** Australia right now, and every tyrannical government previously.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** What makes you confident that you will be able to judge if your government turned tyrannical?

**Skylar:** It's for everyone to judge for themselves, but protesting with a firearm around your neck is a lot more effective than not.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** And what do you do when the wrong people decide it's been to much for the wrong reasons? <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-58635103>

**Skylar:** Have your firearm ready to defend yourself and your property.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** So while terrorist kill innocent people you choose to hide? Then why even have guns?

**Skylar:** I don't follow. If you have a gun and see terrorists, then use it if it's prudent. Better to have the option than not.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Then explain the Las Vegas Mass Shooting? Why didn't anybody stop the gunman?

/s in case you can't tell. Because: More guns don't fix the fucking problem

**Skylar:** More guns won't fix a mental health problem, no.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Okay. So how are you supposed to keep guns out of the hands of the mentally unstable?

**Skylar:** Deal with the mental instability problem.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** By introducing legislation that not only provides mental health care but also screening to find such illnesses, right?

Right?

**Skylar:** No. Fuck legislation, always. Never the solution, and always creates more problems and unintended consequences. Think more grassroots.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Then the burden of proof lies with you! You have to prove that your solutions work and so far: They don't!

**Skylar:** I don't have to prove anything. You are the one claiming the right (presumably) to take my firearms or otherwise make it difficult to obtain them. Telling your victims that they must prove their right to life or property, or forfeit either, is tyranny.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Yes and I showed with multiple sources that Gun violence and gun ownership are related

Thus it is in the interest of the people and general health to lower the amount of guns.

After all you can't cook a meal with a gun, so it is hardly an essential tool

If you actually think you need guns to survive than you are part of the problem

**Skylar:** All of the is irrelevant to the question of what gives you the right to exercise that power over me.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** You becoming a sovereign citizen here? Tell that to the police.

Or the majority of Americans supporting more gun control.

[https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public\\_opinion\\_on\\_gun\\_control\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_States](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_opinion_on_gun_control_in_the_United_States)

**Skylar:** That seems totally irrelevant to the contention here. Whether you want to control my body or my property, you must justify your use of force against me. "By what right do men exercise power over each other?" Majorities everywhere and throughout history have supported the violations of life and liberty of other people. If that's your standard for right and wrong, you have a lot to answer for.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Making gun laws more strict isn't using force against you.

My standard for right and wrong is that everyone gets to live and gun violence is not heard towards that

**Skylar:** Do you understand that *law is force*?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Then swim out on the Pacific ocean or idk refuse to participate in society if you find it so outrageous that you can't shit in other people's beds

**Skylar:** How is owning a firearm shitting in other people's beds?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** You don't want laws to exert force over you so you have to expell yourself from areas where laws apply

**Skylar:** I absolutely want laws exerted over me when I've behaved criminally (aggression). Owning a firearm is not a criminal act. Pointing it at people (and shooting them) not in self-defense is, but owning it and using it in any other way is not. How exactly are you expecting the law to disarm me, anyway? By asking? Or by pointing guns at me? Seems hypocrritical of you to support such a thing.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** And what is my guarantee that you are a responsible person with access to fire arms, when there are so many unresponsive person out there?

**Skylar:** My actions. What's obvious from this conversation is just how responsible *you are* in using the law against things you just don't like. Someone here has demonstrated threatening behavior, and it's not me.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** You actions bow are now safe guard not guarantee for the future. I literally have no guarantee that this <https://abcnews.go.com/US/pennsylvania-neighbors-dead-fight-snow-shoveling-authorities/story?id=75666109> won't be you

**Skylar:** People kill other people with a thousand different tools. If you suspect me of being a danger to you, stay away, and/or arm yourself.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** So that is your reasoning for wanting a weapon whose only purpose is to either kill animals or humans? pretty weak on engl

**Skylar:** Self-defense from private criminals, self-defense from tyranny, hunting, sport shooting. I don't really need a reason for liberty. "just cause" should be good enough.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** A dog is literally better for all of this.

Also remember Waco? What makes you think you can take on the feds?

**Skylar:** Remember Afghanistan?

LOL.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Sure. Because a war on foreign soil and a war for the homeland are exactly the same.

**Skylar:** Not really sure what you're arguing here. Do you think the people at Waco deserved to die, or something?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** The, wouldn't have died if they had surrendered

**Skylar:** Are you blaming the victims now?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** I mean maybe don't lead a cult and kill children

**Skylar:** Are you saying that the Branch Davidians killed children? Do you have a source for that claim?

The ATF certainly did: <https://reason.com/1999/10/04/what-happened-at-waco/>

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Well shooting and poisoning children so they don't get "captured" .... Like it's not that hard.

And if your statement tries to justify the murder of children, you don't have a good statement

**Skylar:** I'm sorry, but where did I try to justify the murder of children?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** You just did by basically defending Waco. The cult killed children and you act like it was the atfs fault.

They didn't made the children drink the cool aid

**Skylar:** The ATF killed 21 children. I don't know how many the cult killed, but if they shot them to spare them being burned alive, maybe it was a mercy. Maybe they made the right decision? I don't know. I'm certainly not going to defend a cult, or a dangerous cult, but from my understanding, the reason they had so many guns was because it's how they made their living, by dealing in firearms. Is that not true? Does their weirdness or borderline insanity justify the ATF burning dozens of them alive, men, women and children? The ATF seems like the worser evil here, to me, and you want the ATF (and police, and FBI, and military) to be the only ones with firearms, and worse, correct?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** They shot and poisoned them. So no, the ATF didn't kill them. By that logic United would have killed all 9/11 victims

**Skylar:** You contend that all of the children were killed before the ATF firebombed what would have been all of them? What's your source on that?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** I mean you're the guy defending a high control group cult right now...

**Skylar:** Where am I defending them? Quote me. Are you defending the ATF?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** You claimed the ATF killed the Children at Waco, which

simply isn't true

**Skylar:** I don't believe they knew the children were dead. If that's true, then they believed they were killing them, along with the men and the women. It was a shit-show. Do you defend the actions of the ATF that day?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Yes because Gruss what? The cult idiots would all still be alive if they had surrendered

**Skylar:** So you *are* blaming the victims, then?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Lmao you are defending and victimizing a fucking cult!

Unless by victims you mean the killed Federal agents and the murdered children, in Wich case I would agree

**Skylar:** This is the second time you have alleged that I am defending a cult, but have not provided any direct quotes to prove that allegation as true. Put up, or shut up, as they say.

By victims I mean every person that was firebombed by the ATF. Do you support what the ATF did to the Branch Davidians, or not?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** So you are defending a cult! Because the cupt had plenty time to peacefully surrender. And I don't remember the ATF setting the fire, that was done by the cult themselves.

**Skylar:** Alright so you are defending the ATF on the grounds that the cult didn't surrender? So as long as you give people a chance to surrender, you can then murder them if they don't. In other words, "Surrender or die" an obviously coercive action, is a-okay. That is your ethical position?

And now you are also claiming that the cult firebombed themselves with ATF weapons, or their own weapons, or what? Source?

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Really seems like they left your brain in the birth room.

Like imagine actually siding with a fucking cult!

Couldn't be me

**Skylar:** Continues making allegations without evidence. Brilliant, this one. It's basically name-calling at this point, so I guess you're done.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Continues making up lies about how the ATF started the fire at Waco and killed the Children

Right back at you, buckaroo

**Skylar:** I'm asking questions that you're refusing to answer.

**TheOnlyFallenCookie:** Same for you! You make outlandish lies

**Skylar:** Quote me making these outlandish lies.

---

Remember, these people vote and believe in the cult of statism. Ironic, isn't it?