Scott Adams is Still Wrong on Guns

The vilest anti-liberty bigots are those who pretend to be pro-liberty while misrepresenting liberty (or not even understanding what the word means). Anti-gun bigots who claim to be "pro-gun" are probably the worst subset of anti-liberty bigot.

Scott Adams is a case in point. He's been advocating anti-gun "laws" a lot recently, seasoning his remarks with the phrase "*I'm pro-gun*". It shows how deep his misunderstanding of the topic goes that he believes he's making sense.

The following is a point-by-point analysis of a recent podcast where he was pretending to be pro-gun while promoting anti-gun bigotry and government-supremacy. He's always blocking people for saying "*You're wrong*" without providing reasons. Since he likes reasons so much, here are a bunch of them.

> *"The government should make the decisions about gun policy… The government and the people should decide what our gun laws are."*

Nope. That option has been taken off the table by the Second Amendment. And "our" gun laws? I've decided what mine are. No one else has any say. Collectivism is ugly.

> *"But we get to change the Constitution, too."*

Not without abolishing the United States of America. The Constitution and Bill of Rights were a package deal which created the feral, ummm, *federal* government, and without which it has no existence. Change one word of the Bill of Rights (which, being amendments, over-ride the body of the Constitution where applicable) and the deal is off. I'm actually OK with that. Are you?

> *"I did not say 'take away your guns'."*

Only because you can't be that honest. You've parroted the dishonest claim of almost every anti-gun bigot, that "*no one is talking about taking away guns*". Maybe you aren't proposing door-to-door gun confiscations, but if you believe government has the power to ignore the natural human right to own and to carry weapons, and the Second Amendment's prohibition on "laws" concerning guns, then you're advocating allowing "laws" to be written which could (and *have*) result in actual law enforcers taking away people's guns,

and murdering them if they resist.

> *"I'm very pro-gun (...) but..."*

That's what they all say. And maybe you believe it. But without a clear understanding of the issue you say things that make you look foolish and dishonest. That "but" leaves you a lot of wiggle room but completely invalidates your first statement there.

> *"If the citizens of the United States, collectively, with their government, decided to make some gun laws, that I personally, Scott, do not think are the greatest, I'd still be inclined to go along with it, because the system produced that output. And I would trust the system."*

As long as a system isn't harming people I'll trust it. Provisionally. But as soon as it starts violating people, I'm out. The slave trade was a system. No one should have trusted it because it violated natural human rights. "Gun control" is a system which violates people's rights. In fact, government is a rights-violating system. None for me, thanks. I prefer my own system which protects everyone's equal and identical rights.

> *"Some of you are saying 'My Constitution gives me my Second Amendment rights, and the NRA is helping me defend them.'"*

Anyone who believes their rights come from the Constitution/Second Amendment or any document is uninformed. The Bill of Rights was written to place natural human rights– including the right to own and to carry weapons– off-limits to government meddling. Even the NRA seems weak on their understanding of this point. That's why *real* gun rights (*human rights*) advocates call the NRA "surrender monkeys".

As I recently posted elsewhere in response to a similar claim: *You seem to have been misinformed about what the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution does. It doesn't give anyone the right to own and to carry weapons; it makes it a crime for government to interfere in this natural human right in the slightest way. "Gun control" is a SERIOUS crime.*

The right existed before the Constitution was written— before the first government was a twinkle in the eye of a lazy thief, even— and it will still exist unchanged long after the last government is forgotten in the mists of Deep Time. No law or constitution can alter that

right in the smallest degree.

> *"You love the Constitution. So do I."*

I don't. And neither do you. If you did you would try to understand its purpose better; particularly the Bill of Rights– which is what you're discussing here. The ONLY thing the Bill of Rights was written to do was to limit what government could "legally" do. If you miss that point your claim to love the Constitution is patently ridiculous. It's like if I said I love dogs, but then talk about how beautiful and soft their feathers are.

> *"Do you know what else is in the Constitution? Well there's something about a representative government and presidents and Congress and all that."*

Yep. And that makes placing natural human rights out of their reach that much more important. Because you never know what those people might decide to do. Or what the majority of v*ters might decide to do. Placing natural human rights outside the business of government is necessary if you're going to allow government to exist.

> *"It gives the control of our decision making to our elected representatives."*

Not all of it. Some things were wisely taken off the table (by the Bill of Rights) before the game began. Including guns.

> *(About the NRA) "If it crosses that line into taking the job that the Constitution gives to the government…"*

Again, the government can't have the "job" to make up "laws" about guns. That is one of the things government is specifically and explicitly *not* permitted to do.

> *"The first thing I would note is that it's already infringed."*

Agreed. That means all those various infringements are illegitimate and need to go away. It doesn't justify more infringements. You couldn't have justified expanding the slave trade with the observation that there was already a slave trade. The slave trade needed to be

abolished. Gun “laws” need to be abolished… or ignored into irrelevance.

> *“Can you own a tank; a flamethrower?”*

Ignorance? Yes, you can.

> *About “Second Amendment rights” [sic]: “98% of it’s gone and you didn’t even notice.”*

Rights can’t “go away”. That the government– or other bad guys– violate rights doesn’t make them go away. It just violates them. Understand the difference.

And, *I* notice the violations. So do other people. Just because *you* don’t notice doesn’t mean others are that complacent and ignorant.

> *“Do you think that the Second Amendment, when it says ‘arms’, was just trying to limit it to muskets? I mean, that’s all they could imagine at the time…”*

No. The Second Amendment was saying “**You shall not pass!**” with regard to making up “laws” to violate the natural human right to own and to carry weapons.

And they *could* “imagine” more than muskets because more than muskets already existed. Some of the authors of the Constitution were inventors. Does Scott really believe they couldn’t have imagined anything other than what already existed at the time? Of course, they could. That’s what inventors do. They knew how guns had evolved from massive unwieldy things requiring more than one person to set up and use to tools easily owned, carried, and accurately fired by one average individual. They were perfectly aware of how gun development could progress from its current state– they were already witnessing it.

And it doesn’t matter. They placed guns on a high shelf, out of reach of government “laws”.

> *“I see all the gun rights people bristling, but so far I haven’t said anything you disagree with.”*

Seriously? See all the above if you actually believe you haven’t said anything an informed

gun rights person would disagree with so far.

And, I didn't bristle. I took it upon myself to educate and correct.

> *"… the key parts are 'militia' and 'necessary to the security of a free state'… "*

The militia is EVERYONE capable of using a weapon in defense– this was made clear by those who wrote and supported the Second Amendment. Using their weapons against whoever needed to be defended against. You display gross historical ignorance here.

Then you go off on a screed about "*giving you the right to own guns…*", missing the purpose and intent of the Bill of Rights yet again. Government-supremacists seem to love this train of thought, which I derailed above.

Now, I happen to understand what a "state" is, so I also understand "free state" is internally contradictory. I'll forgive you for your ignorance on this one.

> *"… a created right; a manufactured right…"*

You can't create or manufacture rights. Every human who has ever existed has/had equal and identical rights. Rights don't come from governments. Governments can either respect rights or violate them. Those are the only two options. That governments– states– *always* choose to violate rights to some degree says nothing about the nature of rights and everything you need to know about the nature of government.

> *"Even the experts disagree about what the Constitution said or meant or how it should be interpreted."*

Only willfully. If you go back and read the related writings and discussions between those who were writing it, there is no confusion. "Smart people" often find ways to avoid understanding things which would invalidate what they want. That's the most common thing in the world. It doesn't give weight to your anti-gun position.

> *"My take is the government can do whatever it wants, with guns, as long as it makes sense. As long as the people are with it."*

It probably can. But it would be wrong and the US government would be immediately illegitimized by passing even one gun "law". Oops. I guess that bridge has already been crossed and burned. But, again, this is the unethical government-supremacist position.

And "makes sense" to who? Everything makes sense to someone. Theft makes sense to people who want to justify stealing. Rape makes sense to rapists. Serial murderers always believe their acts somehow make sense. Violating your rights can't make sense to me. No matter my feelings, or my wishes. If I feel your rights "need" to be violated on my behalf, then I need to man up and defend myself– by exercising my rights– from you. Begging government to do that on my behalf is a loser move.

> *"If 99% of the people said 'Hey, government, take our guns away'…"*

So, mob rule, then. The belief that rights hinge on the opinions of the majority. The wishes of all the people *but one* can't excuse violating the rights of the one. Not if you call that violation "slavery" or if you call it "gun control". If someone doesn't want a gun in their house there is nothing to prevent them from getting rid of it. I'm completely in favor of allowing them to do so. If, however, they don't want guns in their own home this gives them no right to force everyone else to get rid of their own guns, or else. Not by "law" or anything else.

This is the same loserthink behind rich people who say "*Raise my taxes– I don't mind. I want to support government more*." If they want to give the government more of their money, they can. No new "law" is necessary. Just do it. To wait until a "law" is imposed forcing others to do the same is evil.

> *"…a vague statement in the Constitution hundreds of years ago…"*

It's only vague if you try really hard to not understand it. "Shall not be infringed" can't be more clear.

> *"We can do what we want as long as there's a system we all respect."*

Too bad for you, then. Or, do you not really mean "all", but just all government-supremacists and anti-liberty bigots? Because, as I've already pointed out, I don't respect systems which violate natural human rights.

> *"…'it's in the Constitution!' True, but does it matter?"*

Only if you want to keep your government. If not, that's OK with me. I don't need your government and don't feel like supporting it. I can't afford it and don't want or need it. So I'm not going to argue with you on that one. That's just a case of you arguing against yourself.

> *"To all of you who thought you were disagreeing with me, and were wrong, I say: your opinion I care about… If you disagree with me on guns, I care about your opinion. I might disagree, but I want to hear it… You and I are on the same page."*

OK. I'll send this blog post to you, then. I hope other people also forward it to you (@ScottAdamsSays) any time you talk about guns.

But, no, we are not on the same page. Not even close.

I'll close with one final admission on your part:

> *"I know one topic I don't understand: any topic on gun control"*

Yeah, that much is painfully obvious.

So, no Scott, I'm not interested in any system which makes it easier to violate the natural human rights of my fellow humans (or myself) and therefore makes it more likely those rights violations will occur. Just not interested at all. When you're right, you're right. But when you're wrong, you're probably advocating government-supremacy.