

- [July 2008](#)
- [June 2008](#)
- [May 2008](#)
- [April 2008](#)
- [March 2008](#)
- [February 2008](#)
- [January 2008](#)
- [December 2007](#)
- [November 2007](#)
- [October 2007](#)
- [September 2007](#)
- [August 2007](#)
- [July 2007](#)
- [June 2007](#)
- [May 2007](#)
- [April 2007](#)
- [March 2007](#)
- [February 2007](#)
- [January 2007](#)
- [December 2006](#)
- [November 2006](#)
- [October 2006](#)
- [September 2006](#)
- [August 2006](#)
- [July 2006](#)
- [June 2006](#)
- [May 2006](#)
- [April 2006](#)
- [March 2006](#)
- [February 2006](#)
- [January 2006](#)
- [December 2005](#)
- [November 2005](#)
- Meta
  -  [RSS 2.0 Feed](#)
  -  [RSS 2.0 Comments Feed](#)
- Stats and Stuff

[» Blogs that link here](#)

 **Technorati**



NetworkedBlogs

Blog:  
The Liberty Papers  
Topics:  
politics, libertarian

Follow my blog

“To argue with a person who has renounced the use of reason is like administering medicine to the dead.” *Thomas Paine*

## July 8, 2009

### You Don't Deserve That Right

by *Brad Warbiany*

Tell me, just once, where a government that has created a [million-name no-fly list](#) gets a legitimate power to ban people arbitrarily placed on that list from firearm ownership?

Ladies and gentlemen, I give you Rahm Emanuel, Chief of Staff to the Obama White House!



Critical text (h/t [David Rittgers, Cato@Liberty](#)):

“if you're on that no-fly list, your access to the right to bear arms is cancelled, because you're not part of the American family; you don't deserve that right. There is no right for you if you're on that terrorist list.”

I'm sure all those who have faced [false positives](#) on that list feel great about Rahm's statement.

**Share and Enjoy:**





[Permalink](#) || || Categories: [Civil Liberties](#), [Government Regulation](#), [Individual Rights](#), [Keep and Bear Arms](#), [War on Terror](#)

TrackBack URI: <http://www.thelibertypapers.org/2009/07/08/you-dont-deserve-that-right/trackback/>

Read more posts from [Brad Warbiany](#)

•••

## 11 Comments »

1. Apparently the words “due process” have now been excised from the language. Damn shame, that... The whole rule of law thing was pretty cool while it lasted.

*Comment by [Quincy](#) — July 8, 2009 @ [11:14 pm](#)*

2. You know, you really have to be a pretty cynical person to live in this country. I mean, to be able to listen to people fawn all over the politicians in this country and to actually see people *actually* claim that this is a free country requires a level of cynicism so unhealthy that it borders on mental illness. The idea that so many people can be so stupid as to be duped by Obama and his political machine is almost enough to make a person want to kill himself just to avoid having to listen to one more moron fall all over himself while praising the Galactic Savior, Jesus Obama. I mean, it really is sickening.

*Comment by [Justin Bowen](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [12:12 am](#)*

3. Please use credible sources to make your case if you want to be taken seriously — Wiki is not one.

*Comment by [skeptic](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [3:17 am](#)*

4. False positives aren't even the issue — true positives are just as problematic.

Suppose for the sake of argument that the no-fly list is constitutional, reasonable and inoffensive to libertarian sensibilities (big assumption, I know).

What Emanuel proposes here is that the (hypothetically appropriate) denial of a privilege (i.e., non-right), without traditional notions of due process (notice and a hearing before a neutral magistrate), be used to bootstrap to the denial of a full-fledged constitutional right (the Second Amendment right to bear arms).

This the Fifth Amendment simply does not allow. Not even close.

*Comment by [KipEsquire](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [5:54 am](#)*

5. [...] that. But one must go further and ask why there are so many false positives on the list. As I noted elsewhere: False positives aren't even the issue — true positives are just as [...]

*Pingback by [A Stitch in Haste](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [6:52 am](#)*

6. [...] there have been over a million names on the list, many placed there incorrectly, this is an [...]

*Pingback by [Loss of two constitutional rights in one swipe » Alabama Republican Liberty Caucus](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [9:48 am](#)*

7. SO, who decides what and who potential terrorist are?? THE GOVERNMENT??? Oh so what you are saying is the government can decide who gets to fly, who gets a gun just by putting them on a list and not convicting them of anything??? WHAT KIND OF BULL \*\*\*\* IS THIS??? Americans are being led to the 'slaughter-house' and what is weird.... they are doing it by consent...they are literally marching to it. Little by little...each of our freedoms and liberties are being stripped from us in the name of this new political fad called terrorism, and the masses are cheering for it....they want it....they cry for it, they believe in it. WAKE THE \*\*\*\* UP YOU GUYS!!! THIS IS MASS MADNESS!!!!!!!!!!!!

*Comment by Sarah — July 9, 2009 @ [9:48 am](#)*

8. I did some quick research and read that the FBI is claiming that 400,000 and not 1 million are on the list; and that only approximately 5% of them are even Americans (20,000); and most of them do not live in the US.

Not that this should lessen the concern. And who's to say whether the FBI is lying or not.

But if the Feds ARE telling the truth and not lying, 20,000 divided by 300 million Americans comes to 0.000067 of the citizenry who are affected in any way by this. None of whom should have constitutional rights (such as 2A) suspended just for being on a list of course.

Unfortunately, we can't assume the Feds are giving us accurate information about ANYTHING anymore, not just about stuff like this.

*Comment by southernjames — July 9, 2009 @ [10:04 am](#)*

9. I'm not really clear on what a difference this measure would make anyway- what does one thing have to do with the other? How would denying [potential, un-convicted] terrorists their Second Amendment rights change anything? So then people, who are bent on the destruction of our country, its citizens, and their way of life, cannot legally obtain a handgun? Really? Really? This is the kind of thing we're wasting time and taxpayers' money on in the legislature?

And that doesn't even touch on the ridiculousness of the idea in the first place.

*Comment by [Kathryn Rebecca](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [11:51 am](#)*

10. [...] Liberty Papers posted in: [...]

*Pingback by [The Crossed Pond](#) » [More Bushian Thinking from the Obama Inner Circle](#) — July 9, 2009 @ [1:51 pm](#)*

11. "We left what we knew was working because of ideology..."

That was what eventually heralded the Massachusetts invasion by witches in 1694. They only got their list up to 29 before reputable investigators like Mary Watkins recanted and let sorcerers like John Alden free to cast their incantations.

I think if we would just allow Mr. Emanuel to personally conduct the touch tests and bake the witch cakes, we could finally dismiss all these impractical ideas and ideologies – like defending rights until proven guilty– and get back to what *works*. I say: No explicitly guaranteed constitutional rights for witches!

Or we could just find out which of the people on the list [weigh as much as a duck](#).