

On Gun Policy II

Alright, I'm calling it: homicides, suicides, and other such negative acts where a gun is used is not a "cost" of liberal gun policy. Are you familiar with the logical fallacy known as a *non sequitur*? It's Latin for "does not follow". It is a *non sequitur* to claim that a negative use of guns results from guns being more available than otherwise. The availability of guns does not cause a gun homicide or suicide. What causes those acts are whatever happened prior that motivated the person to homicide or suicide. These acts are rightly considered costs of things like childhood trauma, bullying, or whatever else happened in that person's life that lead directly to their choosing to commit these acts. Without those priors, all the guns in the world being available and easily acquired would not have caused these acts to occur. Therefore, it is illogical (and double counting) to claim these acts as costs of liberal gun policy in support of tighter gun control. And that's today's two cents.