

Democrats: Dissonance on Self- Defense

November 17, 2021

The Kyle Rittenhouse case, which I talked about on my podcast, This Week in Common Sense, reveals a deep divide.

One side thinks young Mr. Rittenhouse is guilty because he clearly sided with property-owners by cleaning up graffiti, putting out fires, caring for the riots' victims . . . and carrying a big, scary-looking rifle; the other points to the facts of the altercation between Rittenhouse and the three men he shot, judging the shootings self-defense.

The leftist/statist argument seems to be: You mustn't protect yourself with deadly force, instead relying upon the state —

On Monday, the lead prosecutor, Assistant District Attorney Thomas Binger, insisted that “You lose the right to self-defense when you're the one who brought the gun,” despite that not being Wisconsin law. Rittenhouse also wasn't the only one with a gun.

While the prosecution tried to undermine self-defense by declaring that Rittenhouse had instigated the whole scene, the media relentlessly



feeds a general prejudice *against* the idea that citizens should be armed and *for* the notion that we must rely upon the police alone.

Dissonant with this, however, were the months of leftists excusing, when not cheering, “protests” turned violent in which not only property was destroyed, but people *were* killed. To top off this cultural license to mayhem, progressive mavens pushed the opposite of state protection: let the mob run riot.

Followed by “defund the police.”

The leftist/statist argument *seems* to be: You mustn't protect yourself with deadly force, instead relying upon the state — except when *we* (the left) riot, then no protection for you!

This is a recipe for civil war or tyranny or both.

Not civil peace.

Meanwhile, as Rittenhouse's jury deliberates, everyone assumes that leftists itch to take an acquittal as another excuse to riot.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.