

(continued from page 3)

who argue for the banning of arms ask for automatic rule by the young, the strong, and the many, and that's the exact opposite of a civilized society. A mugger, even an armed one, can only make a successful living in a society where the state has granted him a force monopoly.

Then there's the argument that the gun makes confrontations lethal that otherwise would only result in injury. This argument is fallacious in several ways. Without guns involved, confrontations are won by the physically superior party inflicting overwhelming injury on the loser. People who think that fists, bats, sticks, or stones don't constitute lethal force watch too much TV, where people take beatings and come out of it with a bloody lip at worst. The fact that the gun makes lethal force easier works solely in favor of the weaker defender, not the stronger attacker. If both are armed, the field is level. The gun is the only weapon that's as lethal in the hands of an octogenarian as it is in the hands of a weightlifter. It simply wouldn't work as well as a force equalizer if it wasn't both lethal and easily employable.

When I carry a gun, I don't do so because I am looking for a fight, but because I'm looking to be left alone. The gun at my side means that I cannot be forced, only persuaded. I don't carry it because I'm afraid, but because it enables me to be unafraid. It doesn't limit the actions of those who would interact with me through reason, only the actions of those who would do so by force. It removes force from the equation...and that's why carrying a gun is a civilized act.

This article is no longer available on the Internet from its original source but was cached by *Unfiltered News* and can be viewed at <http://ep.yimg.com/ty/cdn/realityzone/UFNguncivilization.html>

www.freedomforceinternational.org

Everything There Is to Know about Gun Control in 99 Words

© 2007 January 07 by G. Edward Griffin,
Founder of Freedom Force International

There have been millions of pages and billions of words written on gun control, and thousands more are added almost every day. How preposterous to claim that all there is to know about this topic can be said in just ninety-nine words. Yet, after reading a substantial sampling of the books and essays (pro and con) that comprise the body of this literature, I have concluded that it all boils down to just two concepts. One has to do with protection against crime; the other with protection against tyranny. All the rest is historical and emotional support for these two main theses.

Since the proper function of the state is to protect the lives, liberty, and property of its citizens, gun-control legislation would appear to be a legitimate sphere of state activity based on the claim that it saves lives. If that claim could be substantiated, such laws would be reasonable. The claim, however, *cannot* be substantiated. In fact, just the opposite is true. The record now is bulging with data showing that private ownership of firearms results in less crime and less tyranny simply because potential victims are better able to defend themselves. In short, gun-control laws lead to the *loss* of life, liberty, and property, not to their protection.

Here is my ninety-nine-word summary:

Gun-control laws do not control crime

because crimes are not committed by guns; they are committed by criminals. Criminals will always have guns because they do not obey laws, including anti-gun laws. Those without guns are easy prey for criminals with guns. Gun control encourages crime. The right to bear arms was included in the Bill of Rights, not to deter crime, but to deter oppressive government. Just governments honor and protect the right to bear arms. Oppressive governments fear and prohibit the right to bear arms. Guns are dangerous. The only thing more dangerous is not having them.

HISTORY OF GUN CONTROL

- 1911, Turkey established gun control. From 1915 to 1917, 1.5 million Armenians were exterminated.
- 1929, the Soviet Union established gun control. From 1929 to 1953, 20 million dissidents were exterminated.
- 1935, China established gun control. From 1948 to 1952, 20-million dissidents were exterminated.
- 1938, Germany established gun control. From 1939 to 1945, 13 million Jews and others were exterminated.
- 1956, Cambodia established gun control. From 1975 to 1977, one-million 'educated' people were exterminated.
- 1964, Guatemala established gun control. From 1964 to 1981, 100,000 Mayan Indians were exterminated.
- 1970, Uganda established gun control. From 1971 to 1979, 300,000 Christians were exterminated.
- Summary: In the 20th Century, 56-million people were exterminated following gun control.

WHY THE GUN IS CIVILIZATION

Published in *The Munchkin Wrangler*
Friday, March 23, 2007

Human beings only have two ways to deal with one another: reason and force. If you want me to do something for you, you have a choice of either convincing me via argument, or force me to do your bidding under threat of force. Every human interaction falls into one of those two categories, without exception. Reason or force, that's it.

In a truly moral and civilized society, people exclusively interact through persuasion. Force has no place as a valid method of social interaction, and the only thing that removes force from the menu is the personal firearm, as paradoxical as it may sound to some.

When I carry a gun, you cannot deal with me by force. You have to use reason and try to persuade me, because I have a way to negate your threat or employment of force. The gun is the only personal weapon that puts a 100-pound woman on equal footing with a 220-pound mugger, a 75-year old retiree on equal footing with a 19-year old gangbanger, and a single gay guy on equal footing with a carload of drunk guys with baseball bats. The gun removes the disparity in physical strength, size, or numbers between a potential attacker and a defender.

There are plenty of people who consider the gun as the source of bad force equations. These are the people who think that we'd be more civilized if all guns were removed from society, because a firearm makes it easier for a mugger to do his job. That, of course, is only true if the mugger's potential victims are disarmed either by choice or by legislative fiat. It has no validity when most of a mugger's potential marks are armed. People