

## Right to Keep and Bear Arms

By the time you read this, the November national election will almost be over or it will be after the 8 November election day depending on when this issue is mailed. Nonetheless, in one case we will have a presidency where the executive will not put our Second amendment rights under attack and in the other case we will have a continuation of the current policies where the whole of the executive is dedicated to destroying our Second Amendment rights.

Whatever the outcome of the election, you can rest assured the anti-gun rights crowd will still not rest. Their objective of the repeal of the Second Amendment and totally disarming their fellow American citizens are still their motivations. Of course outright repeal of the Second amendment is not likely but they will seek to create restrictions through executive actions and legislative decisions (see the importance of the vacancy on the Supreme Court) that will make the Second Amendment just mere words in the Constitution.

Despite poll after poll where Americans say that we don't need more gun laws or restrictions to gun rights or even a recent Gallup Poll where 64% of Americans said that increasing the number of people carrying concealed handguns will prevent terrorism, the anti-gun rights crowd will work tirelessly, aided and abetted by their cronies in the national media.

One of the big tools of the anti-gun rights crowd is the language of the discussion. I use the term discussion guardedly because this discussion is never honest. The left in this country is invested in gun control, they drive the discussion with hyperbole, cherry-picked facts, outright lies, and extremely biased reporting by the media. Case in point is Katie Couric's so-call documentary "Under the Gun." At one point in the film she interviewed the Virginia Citizens Defense League and she asked "If there are no background checks for gun purchases, how do you prevent felons or terrorists from purchasing a gun?" Instead of the immediate response of the group to the biased and idiotic question, she edited in silence and showed the faces of the group as if they were stumped. Additionally Couric invited gun rights expert John Lott where they talked for four hours. Not one second of that interview made the cut. This is just one example of how the media totally skews their "journalism" to fit their agenda and excludes any fair opposing viewpoint.

The anti-gun rights left also controls the language in other ways. Let's look at some quotes as an example:

- "Sometimes we just have to acknowledge that the Founders and the Constitution are wrong. ...The Second Amendment needs to be repealed because it is outdated, a threat to liberty and a suicide pact." David S. Cohen, law professor in Rolling Stone magazine
- "It's our view that we shouldn't have assault weapons available. They're really dangerous." Valerie Jarrett, Senior Advisor to President Obama
- "We flood communities with so many guns that it is easier for a teenager to buy a Glock than get his hands on a computer or even a book." President Obama at the funeral of five slain Dallas police officers

- There is no difference “between automatic and semi-automatic guns. Both can kill 200+ people a minute.” CNN host Piers Morgan
- “If it is a constitutional right, then it, like every other constitutional right, is subject to regulation.” Hillary Clinton
- “You can go down to a gun show at the local community center and come away with a fully automatic assault rifle, without a background check, and most likely without having to show a ID card.” Harry Reid, (D) Nevada
- “The Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment. And I am going to make that case every chance I get.” Hillary Clinton, Sept 25, 2015
- “... whatever the scope of the Second Amendment may be. It simply does not extend to the carrying of concealed firearms in public by members of the general public.” Judge William Fletcher, writing the majority opinion in the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals

That is just a sampling of the outrageous things said by those who would abrogate our Second Amendment rights. But now let’s look at some of the words and phrases employed in the war against our rights and liberties related to the Second Amendment.

I will start with the term “gun control.” This was invented by anti-gun rights crowd because it infers that guns are out of control and must be somehow contained. This puts all the blame for any incident that involves a firearm on the firearm not the person who used that firearm. This is intended to convey to the uneducated public that the problem is the gun, not the criminal or terrorist. The real meaning is the word “control” because that is the real agenda for the anti-gun movement – control of individuals by the government.

An ancillary to “gun control” is “gun violence.” This term is designed to focus on the gun instead of the violence, crime, or terrorism. It as if the gun committed the violence, not the criminal or terrorist. There are more people killed with knives, hammers, or fists than with guns. So why not knife violence, hammer violence, or fist violence? The anti-gun media has created the term gun violence to get the public to focus on the idea that the gun is the problem, slowly turning the public against guns. Another related phrase being introduced is “gun violence prevention” instead of using gun control. What about enforcing our current gun laws, especially in the neighborhoods where gang killing is endemic? “Stop and frisk” worked to reduce killings in New York City but it was deemed racist by the anti-gun rights activists and parroted by the media. It worked to reduce deaths in the black community but that became secondary to the objectives of the agenda of the anti-gun rights people.

One of my favorites is “common sense gun control measures.” Who could possibly oppose something that is common sense? Then there are “responsible gun laws” or “responsible gun restrictions.” So if you oppose their viewpoints on their additional gun laws or gun restrictions then you are irresponsible; and who wants to be called irresponsible? Lately we have heard that we have to do these gun control measures “in the interest of public safety.” If these clowns were really interested in public safety then they would enforce current gun laws and go into these crime/murder-ridden neighborhoods and take guns from the gangs. It is also now politically correct to support these “common sense” and “responsible” proposals to restrict the Second Amendment rights and political correctness is just

another way of the left to restrict our First Amendment rights. These are just the anti-gun rights activist's means to control the narrative and to convince normal Americans that "something has to be done" and it should be done this way.

Then there is the whole hysteria about "assault rifles." This term was created by the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence. The military has no rifle that is called an assault rifle. But the scary looking AR 15 and its brethren needed to be vilified. These weapons have been bought by millions of Americans and no one buys them with the idea of conducting assaults. But the term ubiquitously used by the anti-gun rights crowd is specifically designed to scare; to scare the uninformed citizenry that no one should be able to buy a weapon designed solely for assaulting. Usually when some hysterical reporter or commentator is talking about some shooting they frequently conflate the term automatic weapons and semi-automatic weapons. This is done either in ignorance or on purpose to create more fear of these types of weapons.

Also in the anti-gun rights lexicon is "closing loopholes" and "stricter background checks." Of course the "loophole" most hyped is the so-called "gun show loophole" which is complete nonsense. But for the uneducated public who could possibly be opposed to closing to some "loophole" where bad people could get guns? The anti-gun rights activists create this strawman of "closing loopholes" and then propose new laws further curtailing the Second Amendment rights of the law abiding. Regarding background checks what is "stricter background checks?" It is what the anti-gun rights crowd say it is. Of course what they really want is "universal background checks" where EVERY weapon transaction is recorded and approved by the government. Don't forget the National Institute of Justice has stated the universal background checks cannot be implemented without creating a national registry of all weapons.

Another attack vector of the anti-gun left is now including ammunition. The ATF tried last year to restrict types of AR 15 ammunition and had to back off due to a massive pushback from the public. Now they are casting certain types of ammunition as "cop killer ammo." The gun banners are just making this ridiculous stuff up from thin air – as we all know there is no such thing as "cop killer ammo," but it sounds scary and who could be against a bullet designed to kill cops? This is just more of the language created and used by the anti-gun activists to further their agenda. Now we see California passing laws to require a license to even buy ammunition.

At whom is gun control directed? Obviously, at that portion of the citizenry that owns guns but doesn't use them to harm anyone. That is, primarily at conservatives, who are morally averse to doing harm to those who do not seek to harm them first. Most gun owners do not pose any risk to the public at large by their ownership of guns. They do pose a risk, however, to those whose pathway to totalitarianism would be vastly easier without hundreds of millions of guns in the hands of those whom they would see subservient to the government. The vast majority of gun owners understand that to be disarmed is to hasten the end of freedom and individual liberty. They understand that to own guns, and know how to use them, is to refuse to surrender. Gun control is purely and simply a political tool to achieve the disarmament of that portion of the populace that will not surrender to Marxists and fascists.

Richard Stouder

Oakridger48@msn.com