Guns Are A Right: I'll Prove It

©1999 by Glen C. Davis



Glen Davis is author of Concerning the Militia available through Lulu.com

> *"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."—Bill of Rights Constitution of the United States, 2nd Amendment*

Liberals are quick to make sure that anti-gun control advocates add "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State…" when using the second amendment to the Constitution to their arguments. I could not agree more. After all, that statement says it all, but they do not

explain it correctly. If we want to be free as a nation, the people must be armed and, "…stand ready to defend their own rights and those of their fellow-citizens." The wording of the second amendment makes clear that the people are the militia.

Since that, alone, does not convince you, I will turn to your own liberal sources and documents to prove you wrong. If it makes you squirm and change your mind, I congratulate you on your intelligence and ability to reason. If, however, you still feel that guns should be taken away, you're wrong.

One argument I hear from liberals was that the founding fathers did not envision automatic weapons when they framed the Constitution. Since they witnessed the progression from knives and swords to powder weapons, I find it difficult to believe that they did not envision some future weapons more destructive than what they were used to. For the sake of argument, we'll assume that the liberals are right, for once. Let's say that the founding fathers did not envision automatic weapons, bombs, and nuclear devices. Perhaps that is why they did not specify automatic weapons in the Constitution. In fact, they did not specify guns. The correct wording is, "…keep and bear arms…" Guns are arms. Knives are arms. Swords are arms. Sticks are arms. Thus, it is illegal to regulate anything from the length of my knife to the size of my clip to the manner in which my gun shoots.

The founding fathers were probably not familiar with the World Wide Web, either. ***Thomas Jefferson*** was probably not thinking about the Internet when he wrote,

> *"No experiment can be more interesting than that we are trying, and which we trust will end in establishing the fact, that man may be governed by reason and truth. Our first objective should therefore be, to leave open to him all the avenues of truth.* ***The most effectual hitherto found, is the freedom of the press****. It is, therefore, the first shut up by those who fear the investigation of their actions."*

He was saying, though newspapers were best means of truth they knew of at the time, all avenues of truth should be left open to the public. Radio, television, books and the Internet. The ACLU recently dealt a blow to John McCain's policy of censorship by defeating the Common Decency Act in the Supreme Court. This was hailed by the liberal media as a win for pornography. What the ACLU did was successfully defend the first amendment. If you read the CDA you would understand that it did not define pornography. It outlawed anything that might be harmful to children. Such as this article, for example. Using the liberal logic, we can say that the founding fathers did not envision the Internet, therefore it's okay if we censor it. This argument is as invalid as that they did not envision automatic weapons.

To understand the phrase, "A well regulated militia,…" I turned to the Federalist Papers. The Federalist Papers were a series of articles in a New York paper that put forth the argument for the Constitution. These are the famous papers that cleared Clinton of any wrong-doing in the minds of Democrats. The Federalist Papers stated that the President should be removed from office for "High crimes and misdemeanors" without a stipulation that they be related to national security. The founding fathers expected the President to obey the law. Let's throw out, however, Chinese renting the Lincoln bedroom for campaign contributions and missile technology to China. Let's use those Federalist Papers to see how the founding fathers felt about "A well regulated militia."

One of the fears of the people of the United States, after just having defeated one of the best armies of the time, was a standing army. This includes groups that are really an extension of the federal standing army, such as the National Guard. Alexander Hamilton addressed this fear in the 29th article entitled, Concerning the Militia. This seemed like a good place to start. Hamilton wrote,

> *"The attention of the government ought particularly to be directed to the formation of a select corps of moderate extent, upon such principles as will really fit them for service in case of need. By thus circumscribing the plan, it will be possible to have an excellent body of well-trained militia, ready to take the field whenever the defense of the State shall require it. This will not only lessen the call for military establishments, but if circumstances should at any time oblige the government to form an army of any magnitude that army can never be formidable to the liberties, of the people while there is a large body of citizens, little, if at all, inferior to them in discipline and the use of arms, who stand ready to defend their own rights and those of their fellow-citizens."*

Very simply put, to take over the country, get a standing army and get guns out of the hands of the citizens. Then you can get rid of that pesky First Amendment. While we're at it, forget the rest of the Bill of Rights. Who, after all, will be able to make war against the beast?

This paper also dispels the myth that the founding fathers never envisioned advancing weapons. It is clear by the tone of this paper that Mr. Hamilton knew that only by allowing citizens to be armed and trained at the same level of any standing army could we hope to maintain our freedom. Put another way, the only reason to disarm a society is to enslave that society. Notice that Hamilton wrote, "…a large body of ***citizens***…" and not a group of citizens that are really an extension of the standing Federal army; a National Guard. Thomas Jefferson put it a little more succinct. He wrote,

> *"None but an armed nation can dispense with a standing army. To keep ours armed and disciplined is therefore at all times important."*

Thomas Paine admitted that he was no soldier and that the

extent of his contribution to the Revolution had to be his ability to write. There are people out there, after all, that do not want to own guns. In his work, ***Common Sense***, he wrote to the Quakers,

> *"Alas! It seems by the particular tendency of some part of your testimony, and other parts of your conduct, as if, all sin was reduced to, and comprehend in, the act of bearing arms, and that by the people only. Ye appear to us, to have mistaken party for conscience; because, the general tenor of your actions wants uniformity And it is exceedingly difficult to us to give credit to many of your pretended scruples; because, we see them made by the same men, who, in the very instant they are exclaiming against the mammon of this world, are nevertheless, hunting after it with a step as steady as Time, and an appetite as keen as Death."*

The people of the United States, at the time, were very much against passage of the Constitution because they feared powerful politicians and lawyers would twist the words around to their advantage. I wonder where they ever came up with an idea like that? In order to get the Constitution passed and proceed with the liberty we enjoy today, such as it is, they had to include the first ten amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights. In fact, they called it the Bill of Rights, not the Bill of a few suggestions we'd really like to see happen, but it`s okay if they don't. The 1993 Microsoft Encarta says that the Bill of Rights is the, "…first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution, **safeguarding fundamental individual rights against usurpation by the federal government** and prohibiting interference with existing rights."

At this point, frustrated that you are wrong, you are probably thinking that to live in today's society, I should give up my gun like a good American and be done with it. Your founding fathers had an answer to that. Mr. Jefferson pointed out that,

> *“The idea is quite unfounded that on entering society, we give up any natural right.”*

Now that I have unearthed all of your foundations and collapsed all of your arguments, why don’t you reveal your true agenda. Despite liberal arguments to the contrary, I am a person. I have certain inalienable writes granted to me by the Constitution. You can’t take them away. 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.

