

1-1-2005

## Gun Control

Kurtis Davidson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/yr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Davidson, Kurtis (2005) "Gun Control," *Yalobusha Review*: Vol. 10 , Article 24.  
Available at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/yr/vol10/iss1/24>

This Fiction is brought to you for free and open access by the English at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Yalobusha Review by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

Kurtis Davidson  
English 101  
Dr. Robicheaux  
February 13, 2004

Gun Control

In the history of the United States, few issues have been as controversial as the issue of gun control. To this day this issue separates Americans who are liberals and conservatives. The liberals who are pro-choice are suddenly pro-life because they say that people don't kill people, guns kill people, while the conservatives who are always pro-life are still pro-life because they want their second amendment right to protect their families by owning guns because if they don't only the criminals will have guns when they pry them out of their cold dead fingers. Gun control must not be allowed because of liberals and our second amendment right to defend ourselves, like when my father caught Gordon Foster attacking my mother in the bed of his Ford F-150 behind Wal-Mart.

The second amendment states that "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" (U.S. Constitution). If you infringe me, which the second amendment says that

you are not allowed to do, it means that you take away my guns, and if all the honest people are infringed, it means that only the dishonest people will have guns, which the second amendment says that they are not allowed to have. So if Gordon Foster had a gun and my father didn't, then Gordon Foster would have finished attacking my mother and my father would be dead. Or if Gordon Foster being a liberal didn't have a gun, and my father being infringed didn't have a gun, then there might have been a knife fight, and in knife fights both men can be killed at the same time and not even know it. Even my mother, who didn't do anything wrong except for taking a ride with a liberal in a pick-up truck, might have been killed, too. This is what they call the slippery slope. Slopes get slippery when they get smooth from being used a lot (like laws), so if you stand at the top of a hill (or slope, which is like a problem), then you are going to slide down the hill (which is like more laws). Finally, at the bottom of the hill, you have infringement, which is giving people stars and taking away their guns like with the Jews. When the Nazis (like Gordon Foster) wanted to control the Jews (like my father, even though he's not a Jew), first they made them wear yellow stars, so people could tell they owned guns, and then they took their guns away from them. Gordon Foster said that laws are good for people, but that's because liberals want to control you with their laws and their taxes because laws mean

*Yalobusha Review*

taxes and taxes mean people like him can have the power to take away your guns and they might even think that they can do whatever they want to with your mother even if she doesn't want to do it.

People have to want to do things like killing people in order for them to happen. As much as a gun might want to kill somebody, it can't do it without the help of a person like my father killing Gordon Foster. But this isn't the problem. The problem is that there are bad people who want to kill people, and the liberals think that we will stop the bad people by taking away the guns of the good people, the law-abiding citizens, but not of the people who don't obey the law, like criminals, and like the liberals, who don't obey the law to prove points against conservatives. Now the second amendment is a joke and only the criminals have guns and the liberals, even though they don't have them, will try to pretend they have them. As a result, many people will die, and not all of them will deserve to die, like Gordon Foster.

In conclusion, the things that made this country great are God, guts, and guns, and where would we be without them? Think of it this way: If the Pilgrims didn't have guns to fight the Indians, where would we be? We'd be a lot worse off than Gordon Foster, that's for sure.