



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on October 13, 2017

Why I Oppose Banning Bump Stocks

The latest firearm-equipment boogeyman is  the “bump stock,” a device allowing one to fire a semi-automatic rifle more rapidly. Liberals learned of bump stocks because Las Vegas murderer Stephen Paddock had modified 12 of his rifles with them.

This has made them a target for prohibition, and an easy one, too. After all, almost no one wants to buy a bump stock, so even many Republicans — and the National Rifle Association — are willing to place greater restrictions on the device. I also have no plans to acquire one, but I wouldn’t even consider outlawing the stock. Why?

Remember last year’s Orlando massacre, perpetrated by Muslim terrorist Omar Mateen? In its wake the gun boogeyman, as it has often been, was the AR-15, the sleek black gun with military looks that makes libs cringe. We were told how outrageous it was that such a “[killing machine](#)” (is this the Terminator we’re talking about?) was available to the public. But notice something funny?

Paddock also had an AR-15 rifle.

Yet we haven’t heard a peep from the mice about this “killing machine.” The reason?

Right now leftists have bump stocks to focus on. Being driven by emotion and/or Machiavellian motives (depending on the person), the type of equipment targeted in an anti-gun push is secondary, at best. The only consistent theme is an effort to steadily, incrementally erode gun rights. It doesn’t matter what weapon or accessory is outlawed today because there’ll be another opportunity, and target, after the next high-profile gun crime tomorrow.

The argument for a restriction is always the same. Logically rendered it states: “This _____ (fill in the blank) is far too effective to be available to the general public.” What this misses is that Second Amendment rights don’t exist just to secure the opportunity to go target shooting or hunting.

They exist to *ensure that Americans can have effective weaponry*. Full stop.

Again, realize that the current gun-grabber proposal has nothing to do with bump stocks. It has more to do with bumps in heads passing for brains that can’t figure out that any given anti-gun proposal is just another step in an evolutionary process whose apparent end game is the elimination of all guns. This must be concluded since liberals never articulate a different end game. And there always will be another massacre, and then another, and each will be followed with a further drum beat to outlaw _____, because it’s just too effective for citizens to own. It’s a crumb here, a morsel there, a slice today, a half a loaf tomorrow.

In his book *Orthodoxy*, in the chapter titled “The Eternal Revolution,” philosopher G.K. Chesterton [wrote](#) something relevant here: “Progress should mean that we are always changing the world to suit the vision. Progress does mean...that we are always changing the vision.”

While this fault, lamentably, plagues most ideologists today to some degree, it characterizes liberals. They’re the situational-values set, and their goalposts are always shifting. This is why giving them an inch only means they’ll come back for a foot and, later, a mile. This is why you don’t give them even a millimeter. It’s why you must insist upon a certain prerequisite before considering *any* more anti-gun



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on October 13, 2017

laws: that liberals articulate a hard and fast, unchanging *vision*, to be presented for consideration, of what guns laws should forevermore be.

No more free-association legislating. No more shots in the dark. No more making it up as you go along. For example:

- You say bump stocks allow a person to fire too rapidly. Okay, what *exactly* is the maximum number of rounds per minute a weapon available to the public should be capable of firing? What's your reasoning?
- "High-capacity magazines" is an ambiguous term. *Exactly* what size magazine should citizens be allowed to own? What's your reasoning?
- Don't tell us about "high-powered rifles." Tell us *exactly* what the maximum muzzle velocity of a publicly available firearm should be. What's your reasoning?
- Another ambiguous (and misleading) term is "armor-piercing ammunition." What *exactly* should the maximum penetration power of a publicly available round be? What's your reasoning?

Once you formulate your concrete vision (for the first time in your lives), please present it. If we accept it, though, note what the agreement means: You don't get to ask for more anti-gun laws *ever again*. There's no more politicizing of the issue after every shooting. The vision is conceived, articulated, agreed upon — and then set in stone.

Of course, I'm sure there's no way to make such a thing legally binding, and no other agreement with liberals is worth the paper it's printed on. The point is that without such a vision's presentation we shouldn't even take anti-gun proposals seriously. Doing otherwise is akin to pandering to children when they stamp their feet and scream about what they want right now, "just because."

This doesn't mean we should be totally averse to compromise. So try this on for size: I propose reducing the 22,000 anti-gun laws currently on the books by 10,000. If that's unacceptable, however, I'll agree to a 5,000-law reduction — for now. There's always next year's negotiation, after all.

Don't ever let it be said I'm not a reasonable guy.

[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.



Subscribe

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.