

Scott Adams on Guns

Scott Adams of Dilbert fame wrote a post about the “gun debate” a few days ago. It’s worth a read, even if you won’t agree with his conclusion. Here’s the link to it, if you are interested.

Now I’ll point out where he’s wrong.

“The persuasion filter sees individuals with different risk profiles favoring policies they feel will keep them safer even if it makes someone else less safe.”

Maybe some people do that. Especially the anti-gun bigots. But I don’t. The only people truly less safe around guns are those intent on archating. And I don’t care about their safety, and I don’t believe you should, either. After all, how much do *they* care about anyone else’s safety?

“...no one involved in the gun debate, on either side, is engaged in honest, rational debate.”

Yes, one side is. You just want to spin it to be nice to the anti-gun bigots; to not make them feel bad.

“...you see people who are pursuing their own self-interest as they see it at the expense of other people.”

At the “expense” of who, exactly? Rapists, politicians, muggers, home invaders, etc.? Since when are you obligated to protect the feelings of those who want to molest you? It is in every decent person’s self-interest to encourage gun ownership for everyone. Even if I go crazy and try to kill an innocent person, and they shoot me in self-defense, I completely support their right to do so. Maybe knowing they are armed would help keep me sane, or scare me into not attacking them even if I go nuts.

“...gun ownership is a freedom granted in the Constitution”

Wrong, wrong, **wrong**. And this is the foundation of just about ALL anti-gun bigotry.

Gun ownership (and the carrying of guns and all other weapons) is not a freedom granted by anything. It is a fundamental human *right* which predates government. It exists now, *everywhere*, whether the ruling gang of bullies respects the right or not. It will still exist long after government is forgotten in the mists of time. It would exist if the Constitution had never been written, and will exist if the Second Amendment is abolished. No “laws” can touch the right, although they can give bullies excuses to murder and cage those exercising the right.

“...the unspoken part of those preferences includes the knowledge that some number of innocent people, including children, will die because of current gun laws.”

Yes. Gun “laws” kill. The answer isn’t more anti-gun “laws”, resulting in more innocent deaths. It is more wrong to “*do something*” that results in innocent deaths, than to fail to do something that might trade some of those lives for others. In other words, it is more wrong to shoot an innocent person than it is to fail to jump into the path of the bullet to save the life.

“We humans can’t say aloud that we prefer our position on guns (either pro or con) even though we know that getting our way will mean certain death to innocent people.”

Innocent people will die even if guns had never been invented. More innocents will die if you manage to take guns away from all the *good* people, leaving them only in the hands of criminals, police, and the military (and all the other government goons who would be exempt from the prohibition). Why make it even harder and less likely that those innocents will have the proper effective tools available for self-defense when they are attacked? That’s just *evil*.

“...we live in a political system that allows (and maybe encourages) people to vote for their self-interest, as they see it, even if the outcome would lead to the death of other citizens.”

And this is why rights and liberty are *never* legitimately up for a v*te. It is wrong to decide against human rights for other people, no matter how many people agree with you.

“...for some types of political decisions, people will die no matter which direction you go. And that means people will vote in a way that makes it less likely they will be the ones dying and more likely it will be some other class of people doing the dying.”

I will gladly help people of other “classes” learn to safely handle and use a gun. Again, this is why “politics” is a horrible thing to allow to meddle with a society. To me, there are really only two “classes” of people: those who archate and those who don’t. Or maybe it would be better expressed as those who make a habit of archating and those who avoid it. I want all innocent people to prevail against their attackers every time, no matter what their bank account, skin color, ethnicity, place of birth, religion, sex, or orientation. It’s not a difficult thing to explain, but apparently it is difficult to accept.

Honest Pro-gun argument: *“I realize the right to own guns will result in the death of thousands of innocent people. But owning a gun lowers the risk for my family, in my opinion, because of my specific situation, and so I favor gun rights.”* or... **Honest Anti-gun argument:** *“I realize that some forms of gun control could result in the deaths of people who would otherwise be able to defend themselves, but I’m okay with that because my family’s risk would be lower if there were fewer guns in circulation.”*

Well, I question the use of the word “honest”. Why are the words “thousands” and “innocent” omitted from the anti-gun argument? And how would the anti-gun bigot’s family be safer? They might *feel* safer, if they are oblivious. But if they don’t archate, the good guys won’t be shooting them, and not having a gun won’t protect them from the bad guys who will still have guns or another way to impose their will on unarmed victims. The anti-gun argument is based on wishful thinking. A belief in magic.

I want to do what I can to prevent the deaths of innocent people. Making sure it is easier for them to own and carry a gun is part of that. Making sure they don’t feel so hopeless they want to kill themselves is an even bigger part. Getting rid of anti-gun “laws” doesn’t result in innocent deaths—existence results in innocent deaths.

“I’m pro-gun, with a preference for a national no-buy list.”

Who gets to create this list? The bullies of government who want to find any reason they can manufacture to say as many people as possible are prohibited from having a gun? No thanks.

"Private gun owners stand no chance against a professional military"

Tell that to a growing list of private gun owners who have *humiliated* professional militaries all over the planet. But it sounds right if you don't actually think it through.

I understand Adams wants to look balanced on the issue. But there is no balance to the question of slavery verse liberty. The appearance of balance is a deception.