



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 21, 2012

Proof the Left Wants All Guns Outlawed

It has been said that to identify a liar, look for contradiction, because it's hard keeping lies straight.

It's no revelation that leftists would like to effect gun confiscation (except for themselves and their bodyguards, of course), but they generally maintain plausible deniability so that the world's Dirty Harry Reids can convince the flyover-country bitter clingers that they believe in the Second Amendment. And they certainly do — the way the Devil believes in God. Nonetheless, leftists sometimes tip their hand, and such is the case with a recent *New York Post* [editorial](#).



The paper posits the idea that the “application of modern military design to civilian firearms” has produced weapons so dangerous that the Second Amendment is rendered obsolete. Of course, the editors are referring to what are incorrectly called “assault weapons,” such as the AR-15-type rifle Adam Lanza used to do his evil in Newtown. And they take, or at least imply, a position that low-information voters would consider reasonable: They don't propose to outlaw all guns, just those dreaded “assault weapons” (that aren't). These, the editors say, are so deadly that it's “time to get rid of them.”

Now we come to where they betrayed themselves. When describing Lanza's arsenal earlier in the op-ed, they noted that he had his rifle and, as they put it, “two equally deadly handguns.”

Well, well, if they're equally deadly, why pick on the AR-15? Some guns must be more equal than others.

If the “assault rifles” (that aren't) are too deadly to be legal, and the handguns are equally deadly, it follows that the handguns are also too deadly to be legal, no? Or did I just commit the sin of applying white male linear logic?

Actually, the *Post's* implicit position is the only consistent one. As the editors correctly point out — and I'll give them a smidgeon of credit for understanding that the AR-15 is not a machine gun — the rifle fires only one round with each trigger pull. In other words, its function is semi-automatic, just like that of the handguns. (This is why it's not actually an assault weapon, which would have a “special fire” feature allowing it to be operated fully automatic, semi-automatic, or in three-shot bursts.)

Semi-automatic — just like most guns owned in the United States today.

But consider what that implies. If semi-automatic handguns are too deadly to be in circulation, and most all guns in the United States are semi-automatic and, presumably, equally deadly, then...

So what are we left with? The possible exception of small-caliber, low-power firearms? Maybe not. Sirhan Sirhan murdered Robert F. Kennedy with a .22 revolver.

So what's the end game, libs? You never do say. You never tell us your vision: How many programs,



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 21, 2012

laws, mandates, and regulations will be enough, nor what should be allowed for self-defense. Bolt and lever-action firearms?

Flintlocks?

Bows and arrows?

Sticks and stones?

They may break my bones. I'd say we could still hurl names, but you libs like hate-speech laws, too.

Speaking of honest liberal agendas (an incongruent adjectival juxtaposition, I know), let's get to the *Post's* assertion that the Second Amendment is obsolete. For argument's sake, assume this is true. What logically follows from that?

Obviously, if part of the Constitution is insufficient for the times or handicaps us, amendment is in order. This is the vehicle the Founders gave us through which we can lawfully alter the supreme law of the land. But the *Post* doesn't even hint at such a course of action. Instead, the implication is that we should do what the Left always does with the Inconvenient Document: massage its meaning with a wink and a nod. Find living-document jurists enlightened enough to eschew literalism and melt black and white into a gray interpretation. As long as the children get what they want at the moment, right?

But the problem with juveniles is that they don't consider consequences. Once you set a precedent stating that the Constitution can be viewed as "living" and interpreted to suit the agendas and whims of those with clout, then all your rights are in jeopardy — including those you hold most dear. Of course, that precedent was set long ago, and now constitutional trampling is common practice. And you folks at the *Post* would exacerbate the problem further simply to achieve immediate gratification.

This is ironic, too, since you *Post* purveyors of pabulum are deeply involved in the use (and abuse) of the First Amendment. Of course, you can't imagine how what you sow today could germinate as weeds that would choke your pen and tongue tomorrow. You can't imagine at all. That's why people such as you are known as useful idiots.

Anyway, enough with the artifice. If you libs want to repeal the Second Amendment, say so. Start a movement. Marshal your lobbying groups. Put-up or shut-up. Or don't put-up and just shut-up. That's okay, too.

[Contact Selwyn Duke](#), [follow him on Twitter](#), or log on to [SelwynDuke.com](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe