

# Too Good for Socialist Amerika

Jason Gillman Jr.

Monday, December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2004



# Preface

As a result of intense fighting against British tyranny of the time, The United States of America was established over 200 years ago. The goal of this new government was to ensure the protection of individual rights. However, without constant upkeep, nothing lasts forever, including an honest government.

The founders of this country were not dumb people. They realized this fact and included a failsafe provision into The Constitution – the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment.

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Unfortunately, if you give a kid an inch, he will take a mile. This is evident in 1837 when The State of Georgia passed legislation banning handguns. Although the law was struckdown as being unconstitutional, it set a dangerous precedent. It showed that many individuals in office don't have any problem with limiting individual rights. Although in the preceding example, these restrictions upon personal freedom were overturned in the court system (as it was supposed to be by the design of checks and balances), today many restrictions upon personal freedom remain unchallenged, and even those that do get challenged aren't necessarily going to be overturned due to the fact that judges are on the bench with political ideologies and philosophies which agree with these restrictions.

It is this fact for which the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment was created – to enumerate Society's responsibility to violently fight tyranny of all shapes and forms. Unfortunately the same mentality of these Constitutionally irresponsible judges exists in the majority of the public as well. One might inquire as to what harm comes from this. It is these same people who look upon the use of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment as a taboo issue, one that a 'Civilized Society' would never need or use. After all, we have checks and balances, right? These people (sheeple as I like to call them) will quickly castigate those who even bring up the issue about using the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment in the first place. These sheeple do not belong to any specific political party either. The internet forum *Glock Talk* is a prime example of people who supposedly demand their 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights, but will be more than happy to cower and give into whatever decision judges rule on. That being said, these same people don't mind such legislation as the *Patriot Act*. Inconsistency at it's finest. The following is a prime case of someone

who outright states that they will be willing to cave in because “Our country is going through evolutionary changes, for the better”:

**Posted by goldflounder on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2004.** [1]

Revolution is a misplaced term here, concerning the ideologies of those who would instigate such a revolution. Our country is going through evolutionary changes, for the better. Our government may not always make the right decisions for everyone, but they try to the best of their ability, however successful they may be. A true revolution against the U.S. Government would have to be, in effect, a regime change - the elimination of the system in place and the establishment of a new government.

What I've heard thus far on GT are the cries of gun owners who claim they will turn vigilante if their gun ownership is threatened. This draws a cold, shallow chuckle from my lungs, as I assume any vigilante gun owners who value their gun ownership over their lives are familiar with the ATF / Branch Davidian mess at Waco, Texas. That was a government fight with an organized group of fanatics who, though religiously motivated, smack familiarly of the gun nuts who would instigate a revolution in the present day... Good luck and I hope you know what you will be getting yourselves into.[Sarcastic Smiley Here] I'll be practicing with my new bow & arrows.

Fortunately, someone was quick to call him on his lameness:

**Posted by fabricator on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2004.** [1]

Look everyone! A real live sheeple! Friends and neighbors gather round and rest your eyes on the quintessential 21st century Door-maticus Americanis Sheepis Bentoveris! This creature used to be very rare but its numbers are experiencing a huge surge in this first decade of the 21st century, take note of the jellyfish like structure and ample yellow markings, they like to be fed copious quantities of dung and can often be heard crying "more! more!"

In centurys past there were similar creatures who could often be heard crying "God save the king! Our king is to powerful, it would be insanity to rebel against him!"

Even though it was not explicitly stated, I am fairly confident that *fabricator* is willing to fight for his rights if the time comes. Although there are many other posts similar to his, I thought his post is a good example to show that these people have no qualms with calling out the sheeple.

Along similar lines, people know that Society will not react unless there is a sudden, drastic reduction of rights. These are stated well in the next two *Glock Talk* posts, although the first one probably states it best:

**Posted by M2 Carbine on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2004.** [1]

When bad things are brought on you slowly people mostly won't do

anything.

One of my favorite quotes was from a book about Dr. Josef Mengele, nicknamed “the Angel of Death”, the Nazi concentration camp Commandant.

A Jew trying to explain why 6 million Jews meekly went to their deaths.

Paraphrased, “People will suffer any hardship, even unto death, if it is brought on them slowly enough and they are given hope that things will get better or at least get no worse.”

“They” will continue to SLOWLY take your rights.  
This is always done in the name of some greater good.

It’s for the children.

Only gangsters need THOSE kind of guns.

You don’t need a semi automatic rifle to hunt deer.

We’re just putting these cameras up to protect you from the bad guys.

We need to look at everyone’s e-mail to see what the bad guys are doing.

etc, etc, etc

So, the “cold dead hands crowd” will never have a big enough excuse to fight and eventually nothing to fight with.

WE will slowly be killed by a thousand little stabs.

Metaphorically, Welcome to the “showers” my friends.

**Posted by MikeG22 on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2004. [2]**

We can do everything we can up until it gets passed. Once that happens we’re fairly screwed....see the state awb and now the .50 ban. It would almost be better if they just did an outright ban and confiscation of all guns. I think you would see some sort of revolt and hopefully things would then change. With them trying to erode our rights away slowly it makes it tough. But, until then I’ll do all the calling and letter writing I can to prevent things from getting worse.

Although these are just examples of the people few and far between who seem to support the true reasoning behind the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment, it offers some comfort that the support for total personal rights still exist. However, let me not get too far off the track as to why this right exists in the first place – facism. Upon looking for a quote by *President Bill Clinton*, I ran into many quotes in which people cry for the limiting of our rights in the name of government, or some meaningless thing called ‘Public Good’. The following are some more pertinent ones to get the point across. The first one is the quote I was originally

intending to look for, and one which accurately describes the ideals by which the statisticians believe in:

“If the personal freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution inhibit the government’s ability to govern the people, we should look to limit those guarantees.”

— *President Bill Clinton, August 12, 1993*[3]

“The purpose of government is to rein in the rights of the people.”

— *President Bill Clinton, 1993*[4]

“The individual’s right to bear arms applies only to the preservation or efficiency of a ‘well regulated militia.’ Except for lawful police and military purposes, the possession of weapons by individuals is not constitutionally protected.”

— *American Civil Liberties Union Policy #47, 1996*[4]

“The real point of audits is to instill fear, not to extract revenue; the IRS aims at winning through intimidation and (thereby) getting maximum voluntary compliance.”

— *Paul Strassel, former IRS Agent, 1980*[4]

“It is the sacred principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter to which the American people will henceforth pledge their allegiance.”

— *President George H.W. Bush, addressing the General Assembly of the U.N., February 1, 1992*[3]

These preceding quotes are just a few of the many quotes by people describing the removal of individual rights – the protection of which is the core duty of any government. A majority of the quotes involve the desire for disarmament of citizens. The only reason a government would wish to do such a thing is to allow the removal of individual rights to go unchallenged. Even one of the founders of this great nation, *President George Washington*, agrees on the importance of firearms in relation to the preservation of our freedoms:

“Firearms stand next in importance to the Constitution itself. They are the American people’s liberty teeth and the keystone under independence. The rifle and pistol are equally indispensable. The very atmosphere of firearms anywhere and everywhere restrains evil interference – they deserve a place of honor with all that is good.”

— *President George Washington, Date Unknown*[3]

One interesting issue that arises is that of law enforcement today and their willingness to assist in removal of rights. It's interesting to hear the response that someone gets when they gripe about a law from cops and other law enforcement personnel. It generally goes along the lines of "Well, we don't write the laws, we just enforce them. You have to talk to your legislators". You of course also have those who say they don't agree with the laws, it's just their job to enforce them, or they are "just following policy". In a *Glock Talk* thread regarding a story about a little girl getting hauled off to the cop shop because she had scissors[5], a law enforcement officer made a post in regards to the statements about the stupidity of law enforcement, which was countered:

**Posted by 1865 on December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2004.** [6]

Why would you jump on the officer in this case? If the school has a zero tolerance policy the officer has no discretion. He doesn't get to say 'that's a dumb law, I'm not going to enforce it'. Save your distain for the school board that passes such a rule and the parents that allow their schools to pass rules without any room for common sense.

**Posted by RickD on December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2004.** [6]

I'll jump on the officers. I'll jump on the school administrators. I'll jump on the Chief of Police. I am tired of them hiding behind "regulations" that violate rights and punish children (and their parents) for doing things that you and I did every day when we went to school...

There was more to that post, but it adequately got the point across that he saw the stupidity of the actions of law enforcement of this case. **1865** couldn't let this slide. In response to a sarcastic comment by **RickD**, he had this to say:

**Posted by 1865 on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004.** [6]

Really? I busted a 10 year old kid for shoplifting and he pulled a knife on me. Policy is made to deal with worst case scenarios. It's not fair and it isn't always right, but officers have to follow policy. If they don't they can wind up in a lot more trouble. Once again, we aren't talking about lining up Jews into the gas chambers. In situations short of that you have to work to change the rules, not just decide which ones you want to follow and which ones you don't.

See, the funny thing about this whole mess is that no laws were broken, so why was law enforcement called in the first place? This just proves the point that not only are there members of law enforcement who stick up for unjust laws, but stick up for officers taking action upon people who aren't violating laws in the first place. I also find **1865**'s statement that "...we aren't talking about lining up Jews into the gas chambers" rather fitting. Indeed, this is the sort of mentality that leads to that sort of thing. After all, members of Hitler's SS were just following orders, right?

These previous quotes and examples are what gives me the motivation to turn what was originally an exercise while learning a typesetting language into an actual story. The disregard for individual rights in favor of the bogus concept of 'Public Good' has generated enough disgust in me to write a novel in which the profits and might of *Capitalism*<sup>1</sup> are used to fight this logically bankrupt concept. The majority of the people of the United States of America are honest, and don't deserve such loss of liberties, as only criminals do. These people are too good for Socialist Amerika!

— *Jason Gillman Jr, December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2004*

---

<sup>1</sup>When I talk about Capitalism, I am talking about the Socio-economic philosophy, not just the common economic one most people think of.  
For more information, visit <http://www.capitalism.org/>

# Bibliography

- [1] [www.glocktalk.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=300592](http://www.glocktalk.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=300592)
- [2] [www.glocktalk.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=315648](http://www.glocktalk.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=315648)
- [3] [www.youdontsay.org/Quot2000.htm](http://www.youdontsay.org/Quot2000.htm)
- [4] [www.joebrower.com/RKBA/RKBA\\_FILES/QUOTES/Quotes\\_from\\_the\\_Enemy.pdf](http://www.joebrower.com/RKBA/RKBA_FILES/QUOTES/Quotes_from_the_Enemy.pdf)
- [5] [www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,141253,00.html](http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,141253,00.html)
- [6] [www.glocktalk.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=319219](http://www.glocktalk.com/showthread.php?s=&threadid=319219)