

# *Please Carry a Gun Illegally*

I would like to start this chapter with a quotation from author Thomas Sowell:

*“It is hard to imagine a more stupid or more dangerous way of making decisions than by putting those decisions in the hands of people who pay no price for being wrong.”*

This quote represents the very foundation of the gun control fallacy since the people who make decisions about gun control very rarely have to pay the serious consequence for their legislation. Thus, I write this chapter to explain why you should ignore the law and carry a gun illegally to guard your life.

## **My theories and evidence**

I would like to start by giving you my theories on why you should carry a gun illegally and also reject my critics’ argument on why you shouldn’t carry a gun. Then I will move onto to a Supreme Court case to demonstrate, in real time, why you should break the law and carry a gun illegally.

## **Gun control fallacy #1**

*If nobody owned a gun, there would be less violence in the world.*

The most important reason why you need to carry a gun illegally is that *you can be killed, harmed or embarrassed* without a gun being present. Some anti-gun advocates

state that if the no one owned a gun, there would be significantly less violence in the United States and the world. But, consider these scenarios in which no party has a gun:

- Can a man who is 6 feet 5 inches tall and weighs 250lbs defend himself if his attackers are 4 other men who are just as tall and weigh the same?
- Can an unarmed woman defend herself from any man who wishes to rape her?
- Can any unarmed handicapped individual defend himself from any fully functioning individual?

The answer is the victims in these scenarios cannot defend themselves at all since they are either out numbered or over powered. There only options are to hopefully out run their predators, (except for the handicapped guy) plead for their predators' mercy, put up a futile fight or *be victimized!* This theory alone *proves* that you should violate the law and carry a firearm since your existence can still be taken from you with uneven odds or from being in a position of weakness! Furthermore, I did not even add the potential of there being a weapon other than a gun present; like a baseball bat, a knife, a brick or so on that could lead to death or injury.

## **Gun control fallacy #2**

*Guns bans or restrictive guns laws work to lower gun violence.*

A gun ban is a joke for criminals and dangerous for the law abiding citizen since criminals do not follow the law; this is why they are called criminals! Gun bans only handicap the person *willing to be handicapped by the law*. Therefore, you shouldn't comply with the law because the criminal will not obey it. We need to look no further than the current ban on narcotic drugs in the United States. Even though there is a ban on cocaine, marijuana and non-prescriptive heroin use, these drugs are still obtainable in every city and town. As mentioned in the Theories chapter, when a ban is instituted on something individuals want, a black market is created to service those needs. This is what will happen if there is a total gun ban instituted in the United States; a black market will be created to meet the needs of criminals willing to break the law.

### **Gun control fallacy #3**

*A strong local police department is the only thing a citizens needs to be safe from gun violence.*

The dilemma I have with law enforcement is that they arrive *after the fact*. So if you get raped, robbed or shot the police will only come after the confrontation has occurred. Keep this one thing in mind: if a criminal assaults you, the crook won't wait around to be arrested in comparison to two individuals involved in a car accident waiting for police assistance. Furthermore, even if the police find, arrest and prosecute the criminal to the full extent of the law, I do not see how that is equal to being able to defend yourself from being shot, raped or robbed in the first place. And, on the other side of the coin, what happens if the police do not catch the criminal? You have been shot, raped or robbed and you don't get *a GOT DAM THING* in return!

### **Gun control fallacy #4**

*There are other effective weapons like mace and stun guns that individuals can you use to protect themselves.*

To make matters worst, the police and other gun control advocates recommend less effective weapons for self-defense. No rational person can say that mace, a knife, a stun gun, a cell phone to summons the police or (and the most pathetic of all) a restraining order can defend your life from an attacker.

Let me give you a brilliantly violent model to prove my point that other weapons are not as effective as a gun. Let's assume a woman is walking to her car in a parking garage at nighttime. The woman hears "*I'm goanna make that bitch suck my dick*"! As she turns around she sees two men rapidly approaching her from 50 yards away and one of the men is loosing his belt. On the trunk of one of the cars she is next to, she has a bottle of mace, a stun gun, a cell phone, a blank piece of paper (*which is what a restraining order is*) and a gun. (And since this is my example, I can put weapons anywhere I want). What weapon should the woman choose from; keeping in mind that she has a couple of seconds to make a decision on how to defend her life, her anus and her taste buds from being victimized? With mace, if the victim does not spray both

attackers in the face, mace is ineffective. The stun gun is ineffective if she misses her targets or has a stun gun that needs close body contact first before the volt could be delivered. Furthermore, the stun gun is ineffective because while she trying to fight one attacker, the other attacker may subdue her. I don't think I need to discuss the restraining order and cell phone in this situation. It is only the gun that will allow an individual to miss on her initial shot and still have the ability to fire the weapon again and stop multiple assailants during the confrontation without the need for attackers to be in a certain range or make contact with the nose or the face. Also, the mere firing of a gun will usually cause any attacker to run away since the attacker realizes his life is now in jeopardy.

In a micro-summary on this one point, the government and gun control advocates are not only advocating against guns, they are advocating for the least effective measures of self defense. Which, to me, calls into question the integrity of the gun control movement since it appears they are putting their ideology over the safety of the individual.

### **Gun control fallacy #5**

*If you give the robber what he wants, he won't hurt you!*

Next, there is a pathetic theory that floats in the circles of pro gun control advocate that states if a person is being robbed they should simply comply with the robber and you will not be harmed. It is if there is a "*Gentlemen's agreement*<sup>1</sup>" between robber and victim; "if you give me your money, you'll be safe".

I find two main problems with this theory. First, what is this theories success rate? Is the theory successful 90%, 80% or 70% percent of the time? Because if it is less than 100% percent successful, whatever that difference is, means some victims have been shot or beaten after they complied with their robber's demands. Second, this theory is not affective when the predator is seeking to harm you. If a man wants to rape a woman, the theory of complying for safety just makes the rape that much easier since the female victim won't put up a fight.

---

<sup>1</sup> I borrowed this term from the documentary "*Michael & Me*". A movie by Larry Elder questioning the gun control movement.