

The Anti-Gun Debate

Thanks to several mass shootings at home and abroad, the anti-gun crowd (i.e. the Obamas and Clintons of the world) never let a crisis go to waste. As soon as some nut job or terrorist decides to make a name for themselves by gunning down unarmed civilians in a school, theater, nightclub or any other “gun free zone” in America the liberals jump on their soap boxes or start writing articles explaining to us all why we must give up our right to keep and bear arms in the U.S.A.

For example, here is a link to an article (for as long as it lasts) written to propose yet another subversive method for limiting said right to only those who join a militia regulated and operated by the State. And below that link is my response...

<http://www.theweek.com/articles/629815/how-alexander-hamilton-solved-americas-gun-problem--228-years-ago>

To: David W Brown,

I found your article about “How Alexander Hamilton solved America's gun problem” to be of interest, but slightly flawed in its design. I find it curious that so many people can take such a simple concept, like the second amendment, and weave such elaborate arguments against it while using wholly unfounded justifications to support them.

As someone who does a lot of writing I suggest you try doing a bit more reading and listening... for comprehension.

Early in your article you claimed, via a web link to an [Obama/PBS town hall clip](#), that Obama has no desire as regards “taking away folks’ guns”. In context, that link triggers a video where a person asks Obama this question: Why do you and Hillary want to control and restrict and limit gun manufactures, gun owners and responsible use of guns and ammunition to the rest of us, the good guys, instead of holding the bad guys accountable for their actions? And, Mr. President, if I may, I’d like to use Chicago, your home town, a city that has some of the strictest gun laws in the nation, a city that for decades and still is under Democratic [party] control, a city that still has an outrageous and even embarrassing murder rate as my first example. Why can’t we round up these thugs, these drug dealers and gang members and hold them accountable for their actions *or* allow the good people in Chicago access to fire arms to protect themselves?

If you watch the video for comprehension you will get Obama’s typical dribble about how he is not trying to do anything negative on the gun control front. Yet he NEVER actually answers the basic question. Why more gun control instead of more law enforcement? That is the basic question. No answer. Why not more law enforcement and law enforcement resources so people will not have a great need for guns? Had Obama answered that question, however, he probably would have deflected and tried to blame the Tea Party, the NRA or the Republicans or what have you for not wanting to supply more tax funds, etc. He certainly would not have stood by the second amendment and said, yes, people should have access to protection in a city like Chicago and, yes, we should figure out how to remove the bad guys from society and protect the law abiding citizens, one way or the other. He had the opportunity to lead but he chose not to take advantage of it.

The entire town hall may be watched here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XvBh2FQRkSs>

As for Hamilton and the colonists... I will bet you that the colonists probably did not view the ownership of guns or muskets to be any “problem” at all. They probably viewed them as a great way to defend themselves against superior tyrants, wild animals (attacking them and their livestock), marauding

criminals and perhaps even natives bent on doing them harm. NOT having a gun at the ready was most likely more of a “problem”, something you seemed to brush away quite handily. Yet, those very same “problems” exist today, but to an even a greater extent, considering how many of us are unprotected, civilized sheep and considering whom we currently have sitting in the White House or who wishes to replace him if she gets her way. Obama the king will be replaced by Clinton the queen if she has things her way. Both have and will rule like tyrants always do, by ignoring the Constitution and manipulating Congress to bend to their will. Hopefully Trump will win out and we can sleep a little easier as a result.

Nothing in the Federalist papers which you referred to was actually intended to limit **Arms** ownership to just those that join any given militia, as you would have all your readers believe. In fact the exact opposite was stated within essay #29. Hamilton, for example, pointed out and was well aware of the fact that allowing ALL OF THE PEOPLE equal access to Arms served three very important purposes.

First, the government would not have to acquire Arms and disburse them to any armies they might need to form in order to defend the country against invaders. Thus they would have less need to tax people to pay for said Arms as well. In a country which restricts Arms, such as in Canada, should they be invaded they will be caught with their pants down and raising a defensive militia will be next to impossible.

Second, the PEOPLE have a right to defend themselves any way they choose. If they prefer to own Arms for self-defense, so be it. If they wish to own knives, bows and arrows, baseball bats, or running shoes, so be it. Hamilton did not say that he wished Arms to be limited or that he wished everyone to necessarily be required to own them either. And, BTW, the word Arms did not and does not mean muskets (as many often suggest). It means weapons of any nature; sling shots, bows and arrows, handguns, rifles, AR-15s, M16s, and/or canons. The PEOPLE (plural, all inclusive), not just some selected few as you would like to read things, have just as much right “to keep and bear Arms” (weapons) as anyone who joins the armed forces of the U.S.A.; because all of us, soldiers, police officers, CEOs or farmers, have EQUAL RIGHTS, so far, in this country. That is something you should pay more attention to in your essays.

Third, the only thing Hamilton wished, per #29, was that each State plan for some way to secure their own freedom against any government that became tyrannical and that is why there were warnings against forming standing armies that said tyrants might unleash against the citizenry if they were so empowered. That is also the reason why Hamilton **suggested** that any militias formed within each state meet a couple times a year as well. It was not a requirement but a sound **suggestion**. And it had nothing to do with forcing people to join said militia nor that joining a militia was a prerequisite for keeping and bearing Arms.

As for your suggestion that anyone owning Arms should first become a member of a militia or, on the flip side, become a sheep at the mercy of the many wolves out there who would like to slaughter them if they do not; I, like many others, think you should suggest instead that more of us learn how to safely own and use firearms. I have owned a hunting rifle for nearly 40 years. I stored it safely away about 15 years ago. Yet, even at 62, I decided it was high time to take it out and post a target 100 yards down range to see if I could scope the target and shoot my rifle like I once did in times gone past. I soon found out that putting 3 rounds grouped less than 1” apart was quite possible, even at my age. I sleep better now, knowing that I can still perform sniper duties should the need arise and should someone, like Clinton or Obama, try to take away my right to keep and bear Arms one of these days.

And, BTW, where do you get the idea that militias “belong” to the states or that “... the extremist so-called “militias” in Oregon, Ohio, and elsewhere — these people who live on compounds and confront federal agents — are not militiamen but rather *insurrectionists...*”? What country do you live in David??!! Militias do not belong to anyone. And perhaps it should be that more are formed now days

vs. less. The States and the government(s) belong to the people. We the people... not the other way around.

You need to go back to school and learn to read the Constitution before you craft any more articles like this one. While parts of it were good information, including mentioning Federalist #29. Other parts were quite flawed and need a lot of re-thinking... not unlike the way Obama and Clinton need to re-think things.

The second amendment:

https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/second_amendment

IMHO:

The way I read the second amendment is very simple. It is divided into two basic components.

The first component is a **justification** (not the only justification, but perhaps the best of many, and the one Hamilton and Madison clearly sided with) that protects each STATE (and its people) from a potential federal government which may easily become oppressive and tyrannical in the manner in which it grows in power and subverts the rights of the PEOPLE, and the STATES in which they reside.

After the revolutionary war, which was a direct response to a tyrannical and oppressive king and his monarchy, the founders knew that the recently formed republic/government of the U.S.A. could also become just as tyrannical one day (if people like Obama and Clinton have things their way). So, they wanted the **STATES** and the **PEOPLE** to be able to easily form well-regulated militias (such as, but not limited to, our National Guard(s)) for self-defense... even if it also meant that crazy people the world over might also get their hands on Arms as well. Thus they started the second amendment with this very important clause...

“A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, ...”

They did not, however, list every possible reason or justification for the right to keep and bear arms (such as self-defense or hunting, which the Supreme Court has also ruled in favor of). Had they done that it would have become a long laundry list of many reasons and possibly served to confuse the issue even more (unfortunately it has had the opposite effect when people like you, Obama and Clinton get going). So, they chose just one **very important justification** and let it go at that. **Once you have one reason that is all you need.** If you have 10 reasons it does not change a thing.

So, after providing one very good **justification**, they then stipulated the **right** they wanted to stipulate to begin with...

“... the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.”

You will note that the first clause specifies the desire or need to maintain “the security of a **free State**”. Yet the second clause specifies a **“right of the people”** themselves (not just militia members)... the right **“to keep and bear Arms”** {capitalized and w/o any limits}.

Anyone who interprets this amendment in some other fashion simply lacks the ability to read and understand the English language, and SHOULD NOT be allowed to become President of the U.S.A., as was the case with Obama who ignores nearly all parts of the Constitution at will. Likewise, they could care less about the history of the nation and the rights of everyone living within it. People like Obama

and Clinton think they know better than the rest of us what we should do and how we should live. They are tyrants who want to control the rest of us while conning us that less gun ownership and availability will somehow reduce the amount of death that terrorists and criminals might rain down upon us (something that terrorists and criminals could care less about). Simple as that. And such tyrants are the very reason why the people need to arm themselves, why they should be at the ready to join local militias if need be and why their state governments need to find ways to protect them from the federal government which does not always have their interests foremost in their minds.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions. And Obama, Clinton, and those who support them will be more than happy to lead us down it.

What is an Assault Rifle (that Obama and Clinton keep harping about)?

In a strict definition, a firearm must have at least the following characteristics to be considered an [assault rifle](#):

- It must be an individual weapon
- It must be capable of [selective fire](#)
- It must have an intermediate-power cartridge: more power than a pistol but less than a standard rifle or [battle rifle](#)
- Its ammunition must be supplied from a detachable box magazine
- And it should have an effective range of at least 300 meters (330 yards)

The AR-15 is NOT an assault rifle (the M16 is): <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AR-15>

Semi-automatic (i.e. one trigger pull per round fired but reloaded each time automatically vs. a bolt action rifle which is reloaded manually) AR-15s for sale to civilians are internally different from the fully automatic (many rounds fired per trigger pull until trigger released) M16s, although both are nearly identical in external appearance. The hammer and trigger mechanisms are of a different design. The bolt carrier and internal lower receiver of semi-automatic versions are milled differently, so that the firing mechanisms are not interchangeable. The design changes were done to satisfy United States Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) requirements that civilian weapons may not be easily convertible to full-automatic. Even so, the full automatic M16 bolt carrier is now the most popular type, and is approved by ATF.

Chuck