

le Why

So let's get past the legalistic concerns and focus on something that matters to almost everybody: personally protecting one's own life. It's not about the military and it's not about the National Guard.

Never mind that Title 10.311 U.S. Code already distinguishes between the organized militia (aka National Guard) and the unorganized militia (almost everybody else).

Never mind that the Supreme Court already ruled that no government agency is required to defend you (*Warren v. D.C.*, 1981, and *DeShaney v. Winnebago City*, 1989).

Never mind that the only Constitutional rights preceding bearing arms asserted that Americans do not (yet) need permission to speak our minds, to attend our church, or to meet whomever we choose. The topics *following* firearms ownership include unreasonable search and seizure, due process, and trial by jury. The Founders could hardly have been more specific in their priorities.

But our political enemies – those who wish to deprive us of the means to defend our right to life and liberty – do not care about facts, history, or logic. They are more driven by emotion; hence we're dealing with people who tend to think with their glands.

Therefore, it's more important than ever before that we marksmen begin taking back the culture the hard way: one doubter at a time.

But how?

Answer: start at the bottom of the political food chain. Challenge the opposition individual-

ly with emotionally relevant questions.

It's astonishing that such a fundamental question in "The Gun Debate" seldom gets asked: "Why *shouldn't* I be able to defend myself?" It's not merely a pertinent topic; at rock bottom it's the *only* topic. Granted, millions of citizens believe that we should possess the means of resisting an oppressive government if necessary. (Even Abe Lincoln said so in his First Inaugural, whether he believed it or not.) But from now on, before we

marksmen default to the Constitutional arguments we know so well, let's quit playing defense and seize the offensive initiative. Something like this:

"Tell me, Ms. Progressive, why you believe a woman should 'lie back and enjoy being raped' instead of having the means to defend herself."

"Tell me why African-Americans should submit to being lynched instead of fighting back."

"Tell me why homophobes should be free to beat up homo-

sexuals without the risk of being shot."

"Watch *Schindler's List* and tell me again why only the police and military should have guns."

"Tell me why I *shouldn't* be able to defend my life or my freedom."

"Tell me why I shouldn't have the *best* means of defending myself – a semiauto firearm with a standard-capacity magazine."

"Tell me why a woman's right to choose should not include weapon, magazine size and ammunition."

"More than that, tell me why *YOU* shouldn't have that right!

"Go ahead, Mr. Progressive: tell me why."

Why shouldn't I be able to defend myself? It's not merely a pertinent topic; at rock bottom it's the only topic.