

*“Security is mostly a superstition. It does not exist in nature, nor do the children of men as a whole experience it. Avoiding danger is no safer in the long run than outright exposure. Life is either a daring adventure, or nothing.” Helen Keller.*

I was at the El Paso County courthouse Monday when the fire alarm went off - it turned out to be a bomb scare. People headed for the stairs and out the doors to into the frigid cold that was swirling with snow. Many men wore no coats, and most people didn't have hats or gloves.

“I just thought I'd walk from the car to the building,” they commented as they shivered violently, offering their excuses for leaving home without the proper cold weather attire.

Finally, the building was opened up and we all lined up to get back in. Naturally, it took some time since everyone had to pass through the metal detectors again, and there were only two. As we inched forward to the warmth of the building, the wind would whip through the courtyard sending up moans and complaints from those who didn't dress for the freezing weather.

“I wish they'd hurry up,” and “I understand why they have to do this, but. . .”

Well, I don't understand why they have to have the metal detectors. I don't like being searched whenever I enter a courtroom, or an airport, or whatever. This doesn't make me a potential terrorist or vigilante. I am opposed, in principle, to being forced to waive my right against unreasonable searches when I enter a building. They have no probable cause against me that would warrant such a search and this action violates my rights.

But it's for the good of society, you say, it protects the public safety. The rest of us have to endure unconscionable invasions of our privacy and lose the presumption of innocence just because a couple of random kooks brought guns into courtrooms and shot:

- a) an accused who was clearly guilty but who got off on a technicality,
- b) a sleazeball lawyer and/or,
- c) an incompetent judge

Excuse me - but what's the big deal? We all know the justice system is broken and we know who broke it. Levity aside, who bears the fault for these rare not-too-random acts of violence? You and me? Certainly not. The bailiff whose job it is to insure safety in the courtroom? The lawyer who got shot, or the judge? Perhaps. But the responsibility really belongs to the shooter. But now, society's attitude is that we will allow our rights to be violated, as penance for the sins of the shooters, just to obtain the illusion of safer courtrooms.

There's a whole lot more dangerous things going on in courtrooms; things that have

nothing to do with people toting guns. And all of these dangerous things are done under the 'color of law' by so-called 'respectable' lawyers and judges.

I just heard a story about a Texas lawyer who represents patriots. One such trial was well attended by 200 spectators, the majority of whom wore sidearms into the courtroom. This was possible because there were no metal detectors, and no rules against guns. When the prosecution complained about the armed spectators and asked to have them removed from the courtroom, the judge reportedly said, "I'm not going to do anything to upset those spectators."

I think it is safe to presume that this patriot got a fair trial.

Ain't it strange what the not-so-subtle threat of violence will do?

Those judges and lawyers are a whole lot more dangerous to the public's safety - and to our rights - than the occasional hot-headed vigilante. Speaking from experience, I'd rather take my chances against a room full of patriots with guns as opposed to the 'reputable' judges and lawyers any day. Shucks, those hotheads only shoot the bad guys, anyway.