

Should “Criminals” be Disarmed?

I frequently find myself discussing the issue of who should be allowed to “keep and bear arms.” Most people (even those who claim to be “pro-gun”) support disarming at least *some* people — often those who have been previously convicted of committing a “crime.” Unsurprisingly to those who know me, I don’t support restricting this fundamental right at all or disarming anyone.

One of the greatest errors that come up in this discussion is the notion that those who violate the dictates of the state owe a “debt to society.” This is false. There is no such thing as a “debt to society.” (For that matter there is no such thing as “society.”) Restitution is owed *exclusively* to victims and the vast majority of so-called “crimes” are actually just victimless acts (or “freedom” as I like to call them.) Unless one can clearly articulate how the life, liberty, or property of someone was actually harmed (not “endangered” or some other BS term that is used to make freedom sound hazardous), the action in question was *NOT* a crime. **We must get past the ludicrous notion that actions which do not cause harm to others can be legitimately outlawed simply because some people don’t like them.**

As far as the right to keep and bear arms is concerned, it is an **inalienable right** which means that it cannot be given up or taken away. It is also an innate right much like the right to breathe. Why are we acting as if there are exceptions or proper times and locations for disarmament? Ultimately we must stop operating under the assumption that government is a legitimate entity. It isn’t. It is a criminal cabal dedicated to the subjugation of individuals to the will of an oligarchy (cleverly disguised as the will of the collective.) **Our goal must always be to minimize the power of government and to maximize the sovereignty and autonomy of the individual.** That is the only proper fight.

— Parrish