

3/6/14

Gun Ban
Threat to Survival

The specious reasoning, and twisted concept of gun ban advocates contradicts the fundamental, instinctive natural, first law of life, which is self-preservation. It is simple logic, that it is inviolable, and any attempt or action to deny the full exercise of that right is an unconscionable, and cruel restriction to be imposed upon man's God-given right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (which includes longevity).

Man-made civil laws, as necessary as they are to regulate various societal actions, and enforce consequences for offenses, should never impinge upon, or overrule natural law, which would be interference with what God has established and instituted. The logic of that assertion should be obvious to anyone. And, whether there are two people on earth, or two billion (actually, seven billion), the common right of man to do whatever he rightfully elects to do, whether of necessity or pleasure, should not be denied him, who has not abused or violated the inherent rights of others. That includes the ownership of adequate instruments of self defense, or for other activities.

Just because, as serious as it may be, that some inhabitants mistreat, offend, or harm others, is not reason enough to disallow innocent people the right to own, and properly use firearms as their choice for sport, hunting, and most importantly to protect themselves, and their families and others, if necessary, to sustain life, whether faced with human, or animal threat of attack.

Civil regulations, and penalties for criminal acts, correctly administered, can be adequate to punish offenders, but prohibition against ownership, and confiscation of guns from society is itself "criminal", by leaving citizens defenseless against not only individuals who may attack them in a life-threatening way, but also against possible tyranny from their own governmental authorities, or other invasive enemy attacks.

How can people be intelligent enough to be successful in business, with all the competition, regulations, and expertise involved, or maybe invent something ingenious, or be a competent lawyer, or doctor, etc., and yet be such a superficial thinker that he can't even project a common sense scenario of circumstances that would make it imperative that a person would be allowed to react to the natural law of self-preservation, with the adequate means to protect himself, and his family, etc., whenever he might be confronted with imminent mortal danger?

Does he have to die unnecessarily, because his governmental authorities outlawed his very possibly essential means of the hope of survival? When a society is subjugated to a mindless enactment of cruel, oppressive legislation, the only recourse they may have, if legal redress is not available, would be whatever form of revolution may be required!

What do the radical gun rights deniers think the founding fathers made the second amendment provision for? Certainly the actions of that wise, patriotic body of national leaders, and advisors, are timelessly logical and pertinent to the possible security needs of society, and for other naturally legitimate purposes.

Therefore, why wouldn't the blood of innocent victims be on the hands of those who might deprive them of those inherent rights? I am not trying to be militant or threatening to the powers that be, or to silence voices of other opinions, or dissent. But, rightfully believing that natural, human rights, that are not misused or abused, trump or take priority over civil laws that are wrongfully imposed upon mankind.

Regarding a particularly powerful activist, ex-Mayor Bloomberg, with tons of money to deceive many American citizens, and buy votes, in a concerted, ill-advised campaign to remove guns from innocent Americans--there is no moral or civic right to deny anyone's natural and constitutional entitlement to the means of self-preservation, or other innocent use of guns.

We should not ever have to submit to confiscation, or any restrictive gun law that could leave us vulnerable to mortal danger, without whatever resistance may

be available to preserve our natural rights.

It is very disappointing to me that people, even with above-normal intelligence, can let misguided, emotional over-reactionary ideas overrule logic, and wisdom; let alone common sense! And, then, to apply vast financial resources to try to enact legislation proscribing the legitimate human right, and need for citizens to personally and collectively be able to protect, and preserve their lives, if ever necessary. Which situation could well happen, even as it has throughout history in other nations, who could not, or inexcusably would not mobilize themselves as a militia to keep from being overtaken by ruthless, cruel regimes, or enemy invasions.

Why can't (or, don't) some people realize the very real possibility that they could face a life-threatening attack against themselves, and their loved ones? Or, that a naively trusted government could turn on the nation, and become, or be replaced by a tyrannical regime. that would remove their cherished freedoms, and dominate their lives, by any means of control and oppression?

I am not a aggressive-natured, or very hawkish person, but I would never leave myself susceptible to the power of anyone to deprive me of whatever means I could use to protect myself and others, by use of the natural right to survival, and the common resources to sustain and facilitate the pursuit of fulfilling my needs and desires that would not adversely affect the same God-given rights of my fellow inhabitants.

In an age where national sovereignty, and independence is continually threatened and lost, the natural rights of man are increasingly jeopardized by those who would ultimately hamper and destroy those precious institutions. Those fundamental freedoms are infinitely better for mankind than all the misguided, and fallaciously reasoned products of overly ambitious, power broking, would-be world changers, who often cannot rightly manage their own lives; yet they would go on making moves and taking action that undermines, and negatively affects the God-given security, and privileges of others.

Ironically, the idea of radical, extreme gun restrictions, including banning of the

manufacture and purchase of firearms, applies to the perpetrators (per original dictionary root meaning: *to bring about; achieve*), as well! They, unfortunately, are either unable to foresee, or refuse to consider the possibility of a personal crisis, in which they themselves would give up their fortunes to have the necessary wherewithal (an adequate weapon) to defend themselves.

I think there is an identifiable reason why a person could be so foolish as not to recognize the perennial need to provide protection for critically real possibilities of mortal danger that could happen to anyone. Is self-preservation not a simple enough, instinctive trait that is natural to everyone? Of course it is, so why would anyone deprive society of maximum, emergency personal security? The hippies had a good directive, in response to situations when anyone would violate their personal rights, which was, "Get out of my space"! And, there needs to be the implicit caveat, "or else"! But, with a firearms ban, it would be an empty warning; a situation that should never be forced to happen.

As to the rationale that motivates the radical anti-gun movement, think about this. Family, peer, racial, ideological, and political party biases can be so strong that they act as filters, or different lenses, which paralyze logical thinking*, making one subjective (self-oriented) vs. objective in judging issues, or answering related questions. So too can radicalism, or extremism do the same thing to gun control fanatics! *Thanks to Ann Coulter for that fitting observation of how a particular racial bias (filter) can "color" one's judgment.

When people can become so obsessed with a wrongheaded cause, that they do not act in their own best interest (and, in this case, anyone's elses), how many other things might they be foolhardy enough to adopt and promote? Yet, even one matter, as serious as the imposition of a firearms ban, subjecting their fellow citizens to the helpless situation of no ultimate means of personal protection and survival--is unconscionable and inhumane, in the vein of the book, "Man's Inhumanity to Man", even if done ignorantly, by not "thinking the thing through" to its inevitable bad results!

In fact, it could potentially bring about far more deaths than the murders or

terrorism, that the ill-conceived gun bans are designed to prevent. When the "day of reckoning" comes, and such ones are confronted either by their haunting memories, or divine judgment, for those bad decisions and actions they were guilty of, they will surely know then, what common sense, and logical reasoning, in the subject matter, should have taught them in the beginning!

If bad, or worse, outcomes develop after the possible imposition of such a "sitting duck" law that a gun ban would be, who would the real perpetrators be? They vehemently argue their position now, mostly with misinformed scare tactics, but they would eventually see, too late to help victims, what an egregious, devastating mistake they made! Good intentions never justify the possible minor good results of bad decisions, nor ever excuse foreseeable, probable major bad results!

A typical misuse of power, and authority is the irresponsible use of expediency in making decisions, or laws that often are unjustly applied across the board, or binding on everyone, without exception! Trying to prevent crime that may involve a small minority by penalizing, and restricting or disallowing the natural right of freedom of the great majority, is a heavy-handed abuse of power that can never be justified by any rational consideration of the question of possible public good vs. almost certain, great harm!

Expediency, meaning it is a lot easier for a governing body to stop everyone from doing a particular thing, than to take the time to fully discuss the issue before making a sweeping decision like total gun banning. It is irresponsible, and often a lack of proper effort, to rush through a procedure that requires sufficient, thoughtful consideration.

Excuses of workload, time, even cost of the administration and enforcement of better, fairer laws, cannot be acceptable reasons for not carrying out one's responsibility to the citizens involved in the decisions. Remedy the problems confronted, not railroad through an unjust ruling, especially as important as the life affecting issue at hand is!

I almost dare the gun control whackos to tell the country, specifically that their

ridiculous gun ban proposal would not ultimately cause far more innocent deaths, because of disarming citizens, leaving them defenseless against criminals (even enticing waves of others to become criminal opportunists), or to tell them that they can trust their government not to take advantage of their inability to adequately resist any use of force against them, or imposition of other controls

Can there be any doubt that the following criminal statistics would result from a national gun ban law?

1. Accelerated breaking in, and entering.
2. " property damage.
3. " robbery.
4. " abuse, including rape, and other molestation.
5. Possible acts of terrorism, domestic or global, including foreign invasion.

Simply put, a basic duty of government is to provide safety, and a peaceful environment for citizens, but, not to be the source and cause of the very opposite; fear and helplessness.

Please, don't anybody suggest that local law enforcement could do anything but a minor number of possible successful responses to cries for help. Immediate emergency prevention, or response, is only possible if the intended victim has sufficient means of self-protection!

It seems almost absurd to have to make common sense arguments against a ridiculous proposition (threat, in this case), when the advocates ought to easily come to the same conclusion, as everybody else! I have made reference, previously, to things that can block logical thinking, and acting--not as an excuse, but there has to be some explainable reason for such irresponsible, egregious action.

Everett Falvey
efal@comcast.net