

Driving Drunk

by

Sam Aurelius Milam III
c/o 4984 Peach Mountain Drive
Gainesville, Georgia 30507

This essay was first completed on Sunday, February 10, 2008 and was most recently revised on Thursday, February 14, 2008.

The essay is approximately 961 words long.

This essay is LiteraShare.

That means that it isn't for sale and that it isn't protected by a formal establishment copyright. As the author, I ask you to extend to me the courtesy that is customarily due. If you copy the essay, then copy all of it including my name and address as shown on each page, and this LiteraShare Statement. If you like the essay, then I invite you to provide such copies for other readers. If you quote from the essay, then do so accurately and give me credit. If you care to make a voluntary contribution to me, then I prefer cash. For checks, money orders, or PayPal payments, please inquire.

caveat lector

This page was intentionally left blank.

It's well known to statisticians and apparently unknown to most other people that statistical predictions apply to populations, but not to individuals. That is, it's impossible to calculate a prediction that applies to a population of one, an individual. Only populations greater than one are subject to statistical predictions. The failure to understand that principle is of great significance.

In the case of drunk drivers, it's possible to predict, using statistical methods, that within a certain population of drunk drivers, there will be some percentage of accidents. The larger the population of drunk drivers, the more confidence we can have in the prediction. The smaller the population, the less confidence we will have in the prediction. However, for a population of one, the prediction is impossible. That is, it isn't possible to predict, statistically, that a specific drunk driver will ever have an accident. He might drive drunk for his entire life and never do so. It's impossible to prove that he's more likely to have an accident than a sober driver, because it's impossible to calculate the probability for either of them. While statistical calculations that predict a certain probability of an occurrence within a population might justify some government policy regarding that population, it's utterly impossible to use a statistical consideration to justify the imposition of any requirement whatsoever upon an individual. Thus, to treat a drunk driver differently under the law than a sober driver, based only upon an unprovable theory that the drunk driver is more likely to cause an accident, is unjustifiable. Furthermore, a drunk driver, by the simple fact of driving drunk, doesn't harm anyone. Harm doesn't occur until someone is injured. Indeed, people are injured just as seriously in accidents that don't involve drunk drivers at all. The fact of being drunk is irrelevant to the extent of injury caused by accidents. Yet, such is the brainwashing that the police terminate any attempt to logically assign blame the instant that they discover that one of the involved drivers was drunk. He's instantly presumed to have caused the accident.

Obviously, if probability is the only available argument to the contrary — and it is — , then we ought to leave drunk drivers alone to go about their business. If a driver causes an accident, then he should be equally guilty, whether or not he was drunk at the time. Although a presumption of innocence for drunk drivers contradicts the brainwashing to which we've all been exposed, even the establishment media have reported results that support such a presumption of innocence. On the NBC Nightly News With Tom Brokaw, on Tuesday, January 7, 1997, NBC's Robert Hager reported the results of a study by the Centers For Disease Control. That study reported that there are about 1 1/2 million alcohol-related arrests each year in the USA but a mere 17,000 alcohol-related deaths per year. There are over 123 million **undetected** incidents per year of drunk driving that **do not** result in deaths, accidents, or even arrests. Mr. Hager conceded that the number of undetected incidents of drunk

Driving Drunk

driving is “a huge number compared to those arrested or causing an accident”. Nobody seemed to notice the obvious conclusion. There are fewer than .014% as many alcohol-related deaths as there are drunk drivers. Fewer than 1.2% of drunk driving incidents even come to the notice of the cops. Therefore, the study reveals a far different problem than its authors are trying to claim. When you realize that such a tiny fraction of drunk drivers actually causes a problem, then the conclusion is that drunk driving isn't really very dangerous. It isn't very likely to cause an accident. For that tiny risk, we've given up our right to be presumed innocent, our right to refuse to incriminate ourselves, our right to remain silent, our right to travel, our right to determine our own level of insurance, and even our right to own a car. To solve such a non-problem, we've allowed the creation an arrogant and repressive police state staffed by strutting gestapo-style thugs.

I'm tired of having my liberties trampled at the behest of alarmists who want the government to control everybody but themselves. The members of MADD are far more dangerous than the drunk drivers that they persecute. At least I can try to dodge the drunk drivers. If the self-righteous MADD alarmists really want to address a serious problem, then they should go to Cambodia or Afghanistan and walk through the mine fields. That would save the innocent children and farmers who'd otherwise step on the mines. Also, it would simultaneously reduce the number of arrogant reformers in the world. Yes, I know that the supply is endless, but every little bit helps.