

SLUGNUTS radio hour

Guide to Winning Gun Control Arguments

(Or How I Learned to Stop Memeing and Won Unlimited Internet Points)

(If you enjoy this guide, check out our political comedy podcast on iTunes at <https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/slugnuts-radio-hour/id1214046083?mt=2> or directly at <https://slugnuts.com> where you can also find our political cartoons. If you DON'T enjoy this guide then it's obviously been written by Hillary with help from the Deep State and funded with George Soros dollars.)

So what are we trying to do here? Obviously our title is lighthearted for a serious subject and we don't mean for this to truly win any arguments. The intent is mainly to elevate the discussion around the gun problem in America. The NRA and the far right have, for decades, controlled the narrative through the use of outdated arguments and inaccurate talking points repeated over and over. This mindless parroting blocks all attempts at having a reasonable conversation and that's the intention - distort and distract. This guide is just a way to block those low-level talking points and get past them to facilitate a true discussion on the topic. This isn't about "winning" a gun control argument but, rather, getting people to think about and evolve their positions. So here it is, our retort to every argument ever made about gun regulation...

You're not taking our guns!!! - This is always the first argument and it's usually a knee-jerk reaction to ANY talk of gun regulation. Expanded background checks, bans on bumpstocks, restrictions on certain types of weapons or where you can carry them all equate to "taking our guns" even though nobody has ever suggested taking anyone's guns. Nobody is taking your guns. No laws have been proposed that will take your guns. Obama took zero guns despite the NRA's repeated warnings that he would. Even when they banned military-style weapons in the 1994 gun control bill it only applied to making new weapons. Nobody had their guns taken. Gun regulation does not equal taking your guns. Gun control does not equal taking your guns. Nobody is taking your guns.

Guns don't kill people, people kill people. You can't blame inanimate objects! - This is great except the NRA and Trump, specifically, turn around and blame the internet, video games and violent movies. Pretty sure those are inanimate objects.

Gun laws don't work! - They worked in Australia. In response to a single mass shooting in Australia they banned semi-automatic weapons and they have not had a mass shooting since.

Yeah but what about Chicago? They have the strictest gun laws in the country! - First, Chicago does NOT have the strictest gun laws in the country. They used to have a handgun ban but that was overturned and Illinois also now allows concealed carry. Also, they imply Chicago is more violent because Democrats are in control. This dismisses the

fact that New York, also led by a Democrat and having STRICTER gun laws than Chicago, has the lowest crime rate since the 50s.

There's no proof that gun control laws work! - See above. But also point out that we might have more data on this subject if the NRA hadn't forced the Dickey Amendment down our throats in 1996 which prevents the CDC from researching gun violence the way they do other public health issues.

It's a mental health issue!! - The important part of this argument is that, even if they believed this to be true, the GOP is going to do nothing to fund or 'fix' mental health support in this country. It's a scapegoat. Also, the NRA has fought any attempt to try to limit weapons to people who are experiencing mental health issues, most recently when Trump overturned an Obama regulation that would have prevented over 75,000 people diagnosed with mental problems from buying a gun. They also block laws trying to take guns away from people accused of domestic violence or who have had restraining orders against them. To be clear, we should absolutely be doing more to help people with mental health problems but not just for the sake of allowing them buy more guns.

The 2nd Amendment protects my AR-15!!!! - Individual states have bans on specific types of weapons that have been upheld at a Federal level. Maryland banned military-style weapons and it was upheld at their state Supreme Court level as well as Federal Court that the 2nd Amendment did not apply to all weapons universally. The NRA pushed to bring it to the U.S. Supreme Court but they did not take up the case. Also, the 1934 Firearms Act establishes categories for specific types of weapons and allows for them to be regulated separately by type.

You can kill someone as easily with a car! - That's why cars are heavily regulated, insurance is required on each vehicle, and drivers have to show proficiency in operating the vehicle. We've also reduced traffic fatalities over time through regulation, airbags, seatbelts, speed limits, etc. Compare our traffic fatality rate now to that of the 1950s and 1960s and you'll see that common sense regulation has drastically reduced the numbers. And pretty sure, when they enacted seatbelt laws, nobody screamed that the government was taking their cars...

You can kill someone just as easily with a knife or baseball bat! - Great, then you don't need a gun for self-defense I guess, just a bat.

I need an AR-15 for self-defense! - See above. Also this is literally the worst gun for self-defense unless you're fighting a horde of zombies. You'll be indiscriminately firing your 30-round magazine through all the sheetrock in your house and killing your kids 3-4 rooms down. Get a shotgun. Or a baseball bat, apparently.

Gun-free zones are sitting targets because these shooters pick them purposefully! - Parkland, Florida had an armed resource office who did nothing and the shooter was aware of and had interactions with him prior. He knew the school was patrolled by an armed guard and it did not prevent him from targeting the school.

Good guys with guns would have stopped this! - See above. Armed cop heard shots and stood outside doing nothing. Next.

Let's have armed security guards at every school! - See above but also realize the cost would be upwards of \$40 billion a year to protect every school. Congress isn't going to be able to afford that because they just gave corporations a \$1.5 trillion handout.

Okay, let's arm teachers! - The NYPD has an accuracy rate, when under fire, of about 18%, meaning 4 out of 5 bullets miss their target and go somewhere else. Untrained teachers will not have a better rate than that and in a crowded school those 4 bullets are going to hit something important. The problem is the NRA and far right are incapable of suggesting any improvements to the situation that don't involve adding more guns (and that's directly tied to so much of their funding being from gun and accessory manufacturers).

The president, banks, and other institutions all are protected by guns, why not arm teachers? - Pretty sure the people protecting the president aren't the White House cleaning crew or the head chef. They're solely trained and equipped to do that specific job.

Dummy, AR doesn't stand for assault rifle! Also, it's a magazine not a clip!!! - Pro-gun people love to derail discussions by focusing on technical specifications of guns and relishing that gun control advocates don't have their level of firearms knowledge. The argument is that because you don't know every detail of a specific weapon you're not qualified to even talk about gun control. But it should be pointed out that you could mess up all those terms, admit you know nothing about guns and that you've never even held one, and they'd be fine with you buying 20 AR-15s and as much ammo as you can carry. So your lack of knowledge shouldn't prevent you from actually buying the guns; you just can't talk about them...

(**BONUS:** If you ever get called out for the common semantic argument because you said it was a clip and not a magazine, just say you were referring to the AK-47 whose extended, curved "magazine" is known as a banana clip. Then admonish the other person for not knowing anything about guns and see how they like it...

No need to ban bumpstocks because you can learn firing techniques that are just as fast! - Cool, then you've made the case that we can ban them with no impact to you. Thanks!

This never happened when we were kids or we drove around and everyone had guns in their back truck window - Charles Whitman. 1966.

LOL, these kids eat Tide pods and now they want gun control!! - Yes, let's dismiss an entire generation as being idiots which in turn makes the gun regulation case by asking

why would we make it incredibly easy for these kids to have access to firearms if they're so 'dumb'? Again, just like with firearms details, the pro-gun crowd makes their own argument by implying a certain group is too stupid and irresponsible to TALK about guns but they're fine with that same group actually OWNING guns.

I need these weapons as a check on the government!!! - Everybody remembers when the well-armed Branch Davidians gloriously defeated the Federal Government and then rode off into the sunset, right? Oh wait. See how that AR-15 does against the tank riding up your ass. Also, who decides it's time to fight back against the government anyway? Do you need a quorum of like 10 guys and then it's constitutionally okay to shoot at the Feds because you've personally agreed they have overreached? How does that work exactly?

If a criminal wants to get a gun he's going to get one. No law will help! - If a criminal really wants to get into your house he will find a way, right? But I bet you lock your doors and windows at night. Because you don't want to make it easy. The best part of this 'argument' is that it can be applied to ANY law ever made. No reason to have speed limits because if a criminal wants to speed they will. No reason to outlaw murder because murderers will still kill people. It completely misses the point of what laws and regulations are meant to do. If you're only criteria for a law is that it completely, 100% prevents the action it applies to then NO law would ever be passed.

When guns are outlawed only outlaws will have guns - Let's close with this oldie but goodie. Mostly the same argument as above but I love the semantics of this argument because, yes, by nature if guns are illegal and you own a gun then you are a criminal, thus you are an outlaw. But that's not really what they meant...plus, repeat it with me, nobody is taking your guns.

