It Isn't The Guns That They Fear...

I frequently receive copies of emails exchanged between a group of conservatives and a group of leftists. I am not sure how I got on the cc list, but I find some of the messages interesting. If nothing else, they give me an idea of what goes on (and doesn't go on) in the mind of leftists.

Some recent exchanges were about the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution—the right to bear arms. I usually do not respond to the messages because the individuals pretty much have their opinions set in stone. The conservatives believe in limited government and expanded liberties, and the leftists believe in a large, powerful government that can be trusted to solve all of life's little problems for them—even if it means sacrificing some liberties in the process.

But a recent comment is worth sharing. Its author was responding to a conservative who advocates gun ownership. The response was:

"You would soil your depends [sic] and hand over every god damn [sic] on [sic] of your guns. You would rat out your neighbor if he or she had a gun to the people who have taken your gun cupcake.[?]

You are [in] the minority as the last two elections have proven. We rule and will continue to rule.

I can picture a worthless old screwball like you staring out your window waiting for 'Them People' to come for your Guns. Jesus H. Christ you are one sad nut job."

One must assume that the author of that statement had a "liberal" education in the public school system, considering the spelling errors, grammatical errors, and profanity. I ignored those, but in defense of the Second Amendment I felt compelled to reply:

The Empire of Japan decided against an invasion of U.S. soil during World War II because they knew that millions of Americans had personal weapons. An entire army was fearful of American civilians with guns. That, of course, is another reason for the Second Amendment.

Do you think that even more millions of Mexicans wouldn't be swarming across dry Rio Grande gullies if they thought that no Texans carried guns?

If the Jews in Poland had weapons they could have resisted the Nazis and avoided the gas chambers. That is why the governments want to take away the guns of law-abiding citizens—to eliminate the possibility of armed resistance as citizens revolt against the loss of liberties. The governments do not care if *criminals* have guns, because they can readily get the criminals on the federal side during a revolution. Criminals are, by definition, amoral and will fight for whichever side appears to have the most power or will pay them the most. The politicians who support the confiscation of guns know full

well that the criminals will not turn in their weapons. The politicians do not care about those weapons. They don't want law-abiding citizens to have guns, because *they* are the ones to be feared in the event of a revolution.

Those who argue that because the U.S. Army has tanks and bazookas it can readily defeat American citizens with rifles and handguns do not understand the situation. First, they are assuming that virtually all U.S. soldiers would fire against their fellow Americans. That would hardly be the case. Members of the Armed Forces take an oath to defend the U.S. Constitution, *not* the temporary occupant of the White House. (The Posse Comitatus Act prohibits members of the Armed Forces from exercising nominally state law enforcement, police, or peace officer powers to maintain law and order on non-federal property within the United States. The law prohibits federal military personnel and units of the National Guard from acting in a law enforcement capacity within the United States except where expressly authorized by the Constitution or Congress. Unless there is an act of Congress signed by the President, federal troops cannot be "ordered into battle" to fight U.S. civilians. Of course, the Posse Comitatus Act has been illegally ignored, such as when Bill Clinton, Janet Reno, Eric Holder, and Wesley Clark used tanks from Fort Hood to kill 76 civilians—including 23 children—at the Branch Davidian compound in Waco, Texas.)

Second, the majority of U.S. soldiers are politically conservative; they are not on the left. (That should be obvious, because individuals who are afraid of guns and who believe in the sentiment "Better Red than dead" do not enlist in the Armed Forces.)

Third, U.S. soldiers are also U.S. citizens, with spouses, children, parents, and friends who are U.S. citizens. If millions of Americans felt justified in starting an armed revolution because they felt their rights were being violated by the federal government, would not those soldiers and their relatives and friends share the same concerns?

Lastly, any U.S. soldiers deployed to stop a revolution would be vastly outnumbered by armed civilians. Yes, a tank can cause more damage than a rifle... but 10,000 civilians with rifles and pistols would ultimately win the battle against that tank.

I am certainly not suggesting that there could, would, or should ever be a revolution in the United States—beyond a revolution properly waged in the voting booths. I am simply pointing out that the Second Amendment is in the U.S. Constitution because the Founding Fathers wanted to guarantee individuals their right to defend their liberties should they ever be assaulted in the future. *The Second Amendment right to bear arms is meant to protect individuals from their government; it is not for squirrel hunting.* Those who argue against the right to bear arms are essentially arguing against liberty. (That concept in and of itself should have kept Sonia Sotomayor from becoming a Supreme Court Justice and should also disqualify Elena Kagan from joining her. How can one be on the Supreme Court if he or she does not even understand or believe in the U.S. Constitution?)

The government *loves* the anti-gun lefties, of course. They are the "useful idiots" who

will *not* have to be rounded up and put into the box cars destined for the "re-education centers" or gas chambers, because they have already been brainwashed into believing that their primary allegiance is to the state or the collective. (An FBI informant who had infiltrated Obama pal William Ayers' Weather Underground witnessed a meeting at which the group discussed a future communist takeover of America in which some 25 million "diehard capitalists" would need to be killed. The members discussed a future in which Cuba, North Korea, China, and the Soviet Union would establish "re-education centers" in the Southwestern United States. Ayers and his buddies eventually changed their tactics. Rather than impose communism by force, they donned business suits and infiltrated the universities, newsrooms, and legislatures.)

Liberals have an anti-gun belief partly because they have an infinite contempt for humanity and no faith in their own ability to provide for themselves. It is therefore natural for them to believe in an all-powerful government that provides everything to everyone because it relieves them of the responsibility of caring for themselves. Guns frighten them *not* because they represent risk of death, but because they represent liberty, self-reliance, responsibility, and accountability. *Those* are the things they fear.

I think that bears repeating: Guns frighten them not because they represent risk of death, but because they represent liberty.

It is quite sad to see how we have been transformed from a nation of responsible, self-reliant creative, hard-working individuals who longed only for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—to a nation of irresponsible dimwits who need a federal guideline to tell them how to wipe their derrieres. But as much as I am annoyed by leftists who wish to take away my liberties, and as much as I try to help them "see the light," with my essays and books, I do not feel anger toward them. No, *I feel sorry for them.* After all, it must be torture to go through life having so little confidence in their own abilities that they feel obligated to rely on a government staffed by incompetents to take care of them.

Don Fredrick June 11, 2010