

Speeding, Drunk Driving, and Guns

“...there are laws against speeding and drunk driving. Those are acts that endanger others. Yes, absolutely it makes sense to have such laws even though criminals won't obey them, because if and when they're stopped or caught they deserve to pay for the damage they've done. No one argues otherwise about guns.”

Well, not exactly.

I assume the anti-gun bigot he was responding to was trying to make a point that guns should be banned for the same reason speeding and drunk driving are banned (but I didn't subject myself to the video), but the gun rights activist quoted above also missed the boat on this one.

The “laws” against speeding and drunk driving are every bit as illegitimate as those against gun ownership, and for exactly the same reasons. Those caught and punished under those “laws” have usually caused exactly zero damage before they are “caught”. And yet, he's in favor of this. And it's the exact same argument made by the anti-gun bigots about the potential for damage by guns.

Every act is potentially dangerous. If the danger rises to the level of a credible threat, then defensive action can be taken without you being guilty of archating. But in the vast majority of cases, what passes for “speeding” and “drunk driving” falls short, and “drunk driving” has been redefined into absurdity.

Yes, if you cause harm to life, liberty, or property, you owe restitution. If you pose a credible threat, you can be stopped before you cause harm, but you probably “owe” nothing in that case. And “pre-crime”, the way the State conducts their war against “potential threats” as though they are actual harm, doesn't cut it. Not with cars or with guns.

This is why those on the side of liberty have to be extremely careful about supporting ANY government behavior, even on things they agree with. It can lead to the statist side so easily.

I realize people don't like to hear that. They want to believe “laws” help.