

# Gun Control and the Left's Continued Predictability, Hypocrisy and Disregard of Evil

I wouldn't bet we'll have three straight days of sunshine here in the Pacific Northwest, but I'd always bet on the Left's predictability, hypocrisy and disregard of evil when it comes to mass shootings. The Left's knee-jerk reaction will always be more "gun control."

Whether it is the Sandy Hook shooting, the Las Vegas shooting, or, now, the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting, the response is always the same. Chip, chip, chip away at the Second Amendment, as if more laws will prevent bad people from doing bad things.

So far this year, there have been 391 people shot and wounded and 91 killed in Chicago, a city with some of the toughest gun laws in the country. Where is the outcry for those shootings/killings and innocent lives taken? I never hear anyone on the Left talk about this to the degree that is expressed every time there is a school shooting. Considering the vast number of people involved in these shootings are black, can we then conclude the Left is racist, something the right is accused of on a daily basis?

At the time of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting, the cable networks reported on the story 24/7. In sharp contrast, the armed resource guard who shot and killed the shooter as he began his rampage at the Great Mills High School in Maryland this month, preventing a far worse tragedy, was overlooked on the CNN and MSNBC websites and I saw about 15 seconds of lip service given to the story on Fox News.

The loudest cries for gun control come from the hypocrites in Hollywood who've made millions making movies depicting gun violence and have probably spent millions of dollars for their own armed security guards. Yet, they don't want me to defend myself. Most recently, these same loudmouths were the recipients of the valuable time of the Los Angeles Police Department – 500 strong – to protect them while they displayed their naiveté at the Academy Awards. Exactly how much money did these clueless celebrities donate to the police officers' benevolent society as a “thank you” for this protective manpower?

And, of course, there's the National Rifle Association, which the Left would like to destroy and everything it stands for – safety and the Second Amendment. Do they even know anything about the NRA? Exactly how many of the criminal shooters have been members of the NRA?

I have no doubt that the far Left would be ecstatic if there was no Second Amendment. Until they're able to accomplish that, I have absolutely no idea what goes on in the mind of someone who thinks that if you remove guns from society, we will automatically live in Utopia. Bad guys are bad guys for a reason. They don't follow rules. They commit crimes. They don't care about laws. The notion that removing guns will solve all of society's ills is either naive or just plain stupid. The idea we can legislate evil away is absurd.

When drunk drivers kill innocent people while driving, where is the outcry to ban cars?

When terrorists drive trucks into crowds of innocent people, where is the outcry to ban trucks?

When terrorists create bombs that kill innocent people, where is the outcry to ban fertilizer? Plumbing supplies? Nails? Pressure cookers?

When kids are bullied online and driven to suicide, where is

the outcry to get rid of Facebook?

When terrorists fly planes into buildings and kill thousands of innocent people, where is the outcry to rid the skies of airplanes?

When terrorists cut off the heads of innocent people, where is the outcry to outlaw machetes? Knives?

When arsonists kill innocent people, where is the outcry to ban matches?

What the Left in this country continues to disregard and fails to recognize is that EVIL exists and is behind all these actions. These are conscious decisions to act, and, if that's someone's intent, they will find the means to do it – no matter what the law says. EVIL does not exist in inanimate objects. EVIL exists in people.

In my opinion, EVIL is ignored because it requires a judgment call and, of course, the Left doesn't want to be judgmental. Belief in God is waning while moral confusion is on the rise, particularly among young people. Anonymity is protected on social media which has allowed incivility to increase and empathy to decline. Personal interaction has decreased. Does the notion of right vs. wrong even exist today? I'll leave all this to the sociologists and philosophers.

When EVIL has been eradicated from the face of the Earth, I'll gladly turn in my weapons. Until then...

I don't get it, but if you do, God bless you.

---

# Can We Legislate Evil?

If you don't believe evil exists, you might as well stop reading and continue to believe that gun control will cure all of society's ills. I wrote about this at the time of the Sandy Hook shooting, and I'm writing again because the left doesn't seem to get the point.

Having worked as an attorney in the dependency field for over twenty years, I can tell you that evil does exist. Over my legal career, I saw the most unfathomable and unspeakable atrocities inflicted upon children by their parents that would give most people nightmares for the rest of their lives. Dependency laws do not stop the horror. Evil does exist.

Unfortunately, the left in this country either believes evil does not exist or that it can be legislated.

Enter Hillary Clinton, not twenty four hours after the horrific massacre in Las Vegas, who thinks the solution to this madness is gun control. And keeping with the lockstep mentality on the left, pundit after pundit, celebrity after celebrity, legislator after legislator, began the thunderous cry for gun control. Even Nancy Pelosi is hoping for the "slippery slope" that would eliminate the Second Amendment altogether.

What's different this time is the left's new mantra, and I've seen and heard it several times in the new from the pundits and on Facebook, "our prayers and thoughts are not enough – something must be done."

Well, what exactly should be done?

Does anyone actually believe you can pass a law and stop people from behaving a certain way? How many laws do we have on the books at this moment that people break every day? Why do criminal courts exist if passing laws stop illegal

behavior? Simple. Bad people do not follow the rules and definitely do not care about laws. You can see how well it works in Chicago, with one of the toughest set of gun laws – 58 homicides in the last month.

I'm sick and tired of hearing about gun control; get rid of guns; get rid of semi-automatic weapons; ban automatic weapons; get rid of bump stocks; get rid of the Second Amendment.

And then what? Will we be living in Nirvana? Utopia? Shangri-La? Sure.

In calling for the elimination of the Second Amendment, those advocating something so stupid don't realize that our brilliant Founding Fathers included this Amendment, not to allow us to hunt, but to allow us, the citizenry, to protect ourselves from a tyrannical government. Every tyrant in recent history, from Hitler to Stalin to Mao Tze Tung to Idi Amin to Pol Pot, disarmed their people FIRST in order to take control. And if anyone thinks democracy will protect us here in the United States, they are foolish. Just consider what's happening with the Catalans in Spain right now. Thank God our forefathers included the Second Amendment in our Constitution.

The loudest voices with the largest audiences come from people who live in gated communities, have armed bodyguards around them whenever they're in public, and those attending self-congratulatory events like the Academy and Emmy Awards all protected by, you got it, armed police personnel (paid for, no doubt, by the taxpayer) to protect them. I'd like to know how many legislators on the left appear in public without some type of security team around them. I doubt very many. Yet, they want to disarm me while they have the luxury of having armed protection for themselves. The hypocrisy is unbelievable.

What some don't understand or fail to recognize is that evil

will always find an outlet – be it with a gun, plane, car, truck, fertilizer, knife, machete, bomb or box cutter. Do we ban all these instruments of potential death because someone chooses to use them to do harm to others? To take this argument to the umpteenth level of absurdity – do we castrate every man because someone chooses to rape?

As I said, the current meme on Facebook is “Your Prayers and Thoughts are Insufficient.” Well, maybe there aren’t enough prayers these days. Some of you might not like to hear it, but perhaps more of us should be asking Our Father to “deliver us from evil” on a daily basis. Whether you want to believe it or not, the Lord is far more powerful than anyone in Washington D.C.

I don’t get it, but if you do, God bless you.

---

## **A Few Glad Tidings**

I don’t mind admitting I’m relieved that the Boston bombers were Muslims. While I regret the murders and mutilations committed by the Chechen brothers, I admit I was worried that the mayhem had been perpetrated by native-born Americans. That’s because I am so sick and tired of the politically correct crowd countering legitimate attacks on radical Islam by playing the moral equivalence game every chance they get.

You can bet that if they had been Americans, the liberal pinheads would have immediately identified them as conservative ideologues who were card-carrying members of the Sarah Palin Fan Club. Then they would have quickly dragged Timothy McVeigh and the Tea Party into the mix. The way some people insist on providing cover for Muslim jihadists, you would think that Islam was a major religion in America, when

in reality there are only about two million followers of Allah in the entire country.

For a while, I figured that Obama, in spite of his all-out crusade against the Second Amendment, would at most get his universal background check. But, in spite of pulling those Newtown parents out of his back pocket every 20 minutes, he couldn't even muster enough votes for that. It's beginning to look as if his lame duck status has already been recognized even by his fellow Democrats.

When it appeared that he would have to settle for the background checks, even after going full-bore after guns and bullets, I was picturing him running a series of victory laps, pretending he had landed a knockout punch on law-abiding gun owners. It would have been like a guy vowing to climb Mount Everest, going up five feet and coming back down. When asked about his failure to reach the summit, Obama would have said, "I said I would climb it. I never said how high."

But as things turned out, he couldn't even claim he'd set foot on Everest. The best he could do was mail Michelle a postcard from Nepal: "Having a wonderful time. Not climbing any mountains for the foreseeable future. Love to the kids."

Another piece of good news comes our way from Brevard Community College, where the administration fired Prof. Sharon Sweet for last year forcing her students to sign the following: "I pledge to vote for President Obama and Democrats up and down the ticket."

Aside from the fact that a college actually had the courage to fire a professor, the biggest surprise is that she's a professor of mathematics. I would have bet on political science, black studies, Hispanic studies or lesbian studies. Those tend to be the departments where the pinheads congregate, whereas math, science and engineering, tend to attract intelligent professors, along with those students

whose life plans generally include moving out of their parents' basements.

One of the things included in the immigration reform bill proposed by the Gang of Eight that caught my attention was the part where it mentioned that proof of the border being secure would be when Homeland Security managed to stop 90% of those people attempting to sneak in.

One, I know how to count those we manage to round up, but how on earth do you count those who elude capture? And, two, if you manage to do everything necessary to prevent illegal aliens from sneaking in, how and why would those ten-percenters continue to get through? How much lower can expectations go?

Wouldn't it be like the warden of Sing Sing addressing a convention of his fellow wardens, and saying, "Fellas, we're all doing a hell of a job. Only one out of every 10 prisoners is breaking out of jail! Drinks for everyone!"

©2013 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).

---

## **The Morphing of America**

I keep hearing from older Americans that the best thing about getting closer to the end is that they got to live most of their lives in an earlier and much better version of America.

A lot of that can be attributed to having lived during a time when you could trust what you read in newspapers so long as you discounted what ran on the editorial page. These days, just about every page reads like an editorial dictated by Barack Obama to his favorite ghostwriter, William Ayers.

One example of journalistic bias can be found in the way that the media covered the war in Afghanistan when Bush was the president and the way they've covered it since 2009 when Obama moved into the Oval Office. Over the course of seven Bush years, 575 American soldiers were killed in that war, and another 3,000 were wounded. Under Obama, the numbers soared to nearly 1,500 dead and 15,000 wounded. But if you judged by the coverage the war has received, you would imagine those numbers were reversed.

I still recall that when the war in Iraq was going strong, Garry Trudeau would occasionally devote an entire Sunday strip of "Doonesbury" to listing the names of the fallen warriors. Evidently, when they die with a Democrat in the White House, they don't matter quite as much.

Something I can't get my head around is how quickly public opinion can make a U-turn. Take gun laws. In December, 2012, 57% of those polled wanted them made stricter. In March of this year,, the number dropped to 47%. I am certainly not arguing for more legislation, but how it is that 10% of the people can do a complete reversal in three months? I mean, even the likes of Obama and the Clintons didn't have the gall to switch their stance on same-sex marriages quite that quickly. Instead, they evolved, which is political-speak for checking which way the wind's blowing.

Speaking of guns, the Second Amendment distinctly states that the federal government will do nothing to infringe on the rights of the people to own them. Clearly, when the government passed Dianne Feinstein's ban on assault rifles in the 1990s, it was definitely infringing. But, then, ever since Lincoln decided to ignore writs of habeas corpus, politicians, as well as Supreme Court justices, have increasingly come to regard the Constitution as nothing more than a list of suggestions.

Sen. Feinstein, who certainly has earned her place among the most hypocritical members of the U.S. Senate, last year

insisted she would get to the bottom of the scandal that saw this administration passing along security secrets to the NY Times...until she realized it could only be Barack Obama or one of his flunkies.

In a somewhat related matter, Richard Blum's firm was recently assigned the task of selling off 56 buildings housing post offices, meaning millions of dollars in commissions. In case his name doesn't ring a bell, Dianne Feinstein is Mrs. Richard Blum. (Have you noticed there's never an assault rifle around when you really need one?)

One of my readers, Randall Slafsky, called my attention to an article in the Washington Post. It stated that the Arctic Ocean is warming up, icebergs and glaciers are disappearing and in some places, the seals are finding the water too hot for their usual activities.

It went on to report that no white fish are being found in the eastern Arctic, while vast shoals of herring and smelts which have never before ventured so far north, are being encountered in the old seal fishing grounds. Moreover, within a few years it is predicted that due to the ice melt, the sea will rise and make most coastal cities uninhabitable.

The AP news story actually ran in the Post on November 2, 1922. Who would have ever guessed Al Gore was that old?

Apparently, I'm not the only person who has noticed that liberals are constantly giving new meaning to the word "hypocrisy."

Cartoonist Dixon Diaz pointed out in his takeoff on "Peanuts" that liberals oppose people having the right to smoke; drink large sodas; eat cookies; use gas, oil and coal; celebrate Easter and Christmas; use incandescent bulbs; or own guns. The only area in which they're truly pro-choice is when it comes to abortions.

In another strip, he had his version of Lucy telling Linus that he and his fellow conservatives are racist, sexist, homophobic, gun-toting, religious fanatics. When Linus points out that she and her fellow liberals support Muslims, who are racist, sexist, homophobic, gun-toting, religious fanatics, she replies, "That's their culture. You have no right to judge them."

To which I and most conservatives can only say, quoting that eminent philosopher, Charlie Brown, "Good grief!"

©2013 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).

---

## **Guns & Goons**

One way you can usually tell that liberals are merely grandstanding is when you find Joe Biden heading up a task force to look into the issue. That doesn't mean that the self-righteous pinheads on the Left don't wish that Obama could use his magic wand and make all the guns, along with the Second Amendment, simply disappear. That is to say, all the guns except those in the hands of men whose job it is to protect politicians and Hollywood prima donnas.

In case you missed it, Obama is so opposed to guns that he recently signed a bill that nullifies earlier legislation that offered an ex-president and his family Secret Service protection for only 10 years after vacating the White House. The Obamas, along with George and Laura Bush, will now be protected for life. I'm sure the Bushes were only included so that Obama could claim he was being bi-partisan. I suppose you'd really have to be a politician, one of those hypocrites who are forever referring to themselves as "public servants," to imagine that your life is more deserving of protection than

the folks whom you've sworn to serve.

My friend Mark Alexander, publisher of the Patriot Post, the most widely subscribed grassroots journal in the nation, not only saw red, but red, white and blue, when Joe Biden suggested that Obama could employ a presidential fiat to implement gun control measures. Mr. Alexander threw down the gauntlet by stating in terms reminiscent of those uttered so often by our Founding Fathers: "In keeping with the oath I have taken in the service of my country, I will 'support and defend' Liberty as 'endowed by our Creator and enshrined in our Constitution, 'against all enemies, foreign and domestic.' Accordingly, I will not comply with any defensive weapons ban instituted by executive order, legislative action or judicial dictate, which violates the innate human right to defend self and Liberty, as empowered by 'the right of the People to keep and bear arms.'

He went on: "What does this mean? It means I will neither register with, nor surrender to the government, any weapon in my possession, to include lawfully acquired weapons for the lawful purposes of defending myself and family, my home and property, and most importantly, for defense of Liberty in accordance with the Second Amendment."

That's the way Americans used to speak, as those of us who grew up reading American history books before the PC crowd revamped textbooks so that they demeaned the likes of Jefferson, Adams and Patrick Henry and denied that the foundation of our country was built on Judeo-Christian values. Instead, the dunderheads running public education today prefer promoting alternate life styles, pretending that the First Amendment calls for "separation of church and state" and playing up the nonexistent role that Muslims had in the creation of America.

Although I believe that there are enough patriots in this country who stand shoulder-to-shoulder with Mr. Alexander to

prevent this administration from confiscating constitutionally-protected weapons, I must hasten to add that I was also sure that Mitt Romney was going to defeat Obama.

The trouble with Obama and his stooges in Congress, in the media and on college campuses, is that, as Thomas Sowell said of intellectuals, "The more I study them, the more they seem like a wrecking crew, dismantling civilization bit by bit, replacing what works with what sounds good."

Well, of course, that's really only one of the troubles with Obama. But if you listen to the corn dogs on the Left, his cover-up of the Benghazi massacre, his ruination of America's economy and his dividing the nation along class, race and gender lines, are mere trifles; what really galls them is that he wants to appoint a bunch of white guys to his Cabinet. At times, I swear, places like Afghanistan and Pakistan seem less like backward tribal nations than our own. Does anyone actually think that John Kerry will be worse than Hillary Clinton or that Chuck Hagel would be a better Secretary of Defense if he were black, Jewish or named Charlene?

The real problem is that the Vice President is the only person who should serve as an echo chamber for the Commander-in-Chief, no matter who's residing in the Oval Office. All Cabinet members should be independent in their thinking so that the President has the benefit of their honest analysis. Unfortunately, it's obvious that Obama is only comfortable being surrounded by "Yes" men and, for that matter, by "Yes" women, although not in the sense that Bill Clinton was.

One of my readers, who had grown as weary as I have of listening to the left-wing weasels who are always insisting that law-abiding citizens don't need to own guns in order to protect their homes and families because that's what the police are for, sent me this pungent observation: "When seconds count, the cops are just minutes away."

Finally, someone else sent me a photo of a strange-looking instrument and asked me if I could identify it. I couldn't. It turned out to be a combination of a bellows and a tube that was widely used in the 18th century. The purpose of the contraption was to help in the resuscitation of drowning victims by forcing tobacco fumes into their rectums.

The warmth of the smoke was thought to promote respiration, but doubts about the smoke enemas ultimately led to the popular phrase "blow smoke up someone's ass."

Although it fell out of favor two centuries ago, it has not only been rediscovered by the Democrats in Washington, D.C., but Pelosi and Reid are insisting that it be mass-produced as an essential part of ObamaCare.

©2013 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).