

---

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : State Rep. White Accused Of Attacking Shale Supporters Online

Re: State Rep. White Accused Of Attacking Shale Supporters Online

Author: : pcray1231

Date: : 2013/6/11 15:15:29

URL:

Quote:

they are really trying to say that any and all opposition is "emotional" as you say, when that is very far from the truth.

I'm not sure it is, at least in terms of most extreme opposition, in which the term is generally reserved for. It works both ways, though. There are always emotional extremes on both sides of issues like this.

Those who are taking an honest approach, getting both sides of the story, looking at actual data, weighing the trade-offs, and primarily interested in minimizing the problems while maximizing benefits are not in the "anti" group, despite sometimes being critical or calling for restraint.

For example, take gun control. If you have supported every gun control proposal ever proposed, get all your stats and talking points from the Brady campaign, are scared of the sight of a gun, and when it comes down to it, would support pretty much making all guns illegal for the general population, then you are an "anti", as in anti-gun. If you have opposed every gun control proposal ever, get all of your data from the NRA, and when it comes down to it, believe that it's ok for 2 year olds to carry fully automatic rifles if the parents say it's ok, then you are a pro-gun wingnut. Neither side is open to changing their minds. Ever. Even attempting to address their concerns is a fool's errand, because their concerns aren't logical.

The rest of us, well, we want to see the real stats. We want to examine what a proposal will actually do, rather than take the word of the wingnuts. We want to weigh it's positives and negatives, compare that to the status quo, and make an honest decision. It is perfectly acceptable to us to, say, support one gun control measure while opposing another. That's not being two faced. It's being objective.