## Can Reasonable People Disagree on the Right to Self Defense?

by Robert Pratt, www.PrattonTexas.com ©2009

There is no acceptable policy, or even property right, which says one person can turn another into a defenseless, helpless victim of crime. I do not have such a right even in my own home.

If I take away the right of self-protection on my property from another, I have a moral and legal responsibility to provide for that person's safety while he is on my property. I cannot, however, employ a policy which reaches beyond my property and denies his ability for self-protection, unless I continue to provide him with security at all points to which he may venture when away.

To suggest that any human has that right over another, without the one having forfeited such through his own felonious actions, is to agree with Monarchs and their Lords that some humans are more equal than others.

And this is precisely what a law that says an employer can effectively disarm a citizen does. Again, I cannot enforce a policy which reaches beyond my property and denies another his ability for self-protection, unless I continue to provide him with security at all points to which he may travel when away.

This is what does happen, when under the cover of law, no matter how unjust, an employer is able to prevent an employee from having lawful possession of a firearm stowed securely in that employee's vehicle in which he commutes to and from the place of employment.

God forbid that a rapist chooses to attack a young woman on campus, or in an employer parking lot, or while she is traveling from such place, and she is not able to fight back all because we were worried about some legal liability issues. The moral issue here surely trumps all minutia of who is liable for what and when. That is why Texas already allows for a positive defense on firearm possession, even if the possession was barred under some other statute, if one is justified in using deadly force.

This is not an issue upon which reasonable people can disagree. If you define as reasonable the acceptance of fundamental American values such as the supremacy of Life, Liberty and Property and equality of men under Law, which is supreme to any man, it is an issue upon which reasonable people *cannot disagree*.

In believing one man can make another innocent man defenseless, whether by political, economic, or social power, you've given over your intellect to the enemy of freedom. And Liberty takes yet another punch to the gut.

It is not now, nor has it ever been right to deny an individual's right to effective self defense. It was the tactic of the Klan and Southern Democrat bigots to attempt to disarm the law abiding black man to allow for his continued subjugation. Former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has spoken about her father keeping their house from being burned by his possession of a weapon. Others tell much the same story.

It is the tactic of the Leftist in every anti-Liberty country around the globe to make some men more equal than others, in practice as well as under Law. That those who enjoy such Liberty, material blessings, and power given them by their fellow citizens, specifically some members of our Texas Legislature, cannot understand this saddens and infuriates.

Robert Pratt is host of the top rated Pratt on Texas radio program which can be heard at www.PrattonTexas.com.