

## Americans Don't Deserve Guns

© 2019 Joel Goodman



Gun rights advocates wave the Second Amendment much in the same manner and to the same effect as Neville Chamberlain waved his paper agreement with Hitler when he returned from Munich in 1938, confidently displaying a guarantee of “peace in our time.”

It is truly wishful thinking that things could be that simple, that waving a piece of paper will make everything right with the universe. But reality is not like that.

Agreements are not efficacious unless they are backed with the threat of capable enforcement.

Those who would prohibit military assault style weapons in the hands of American citizens have a goal and are on the offensive. Regardless of the terms in which they couch their justification for the elimination of this gun or that gun, their ultimate goal is the removal of guns from American society; and if you look at their goal from a larger perspective, their goal coincides with the goal of the world wide removal of all firearms from the hands of the individual citizen. Be it in New Zealand or New Jersey, in China or California – it is all the same. The message is the same. Guns are bad. Guns kill people. Only the state should be allowed to have guns, especially effective military style firearms.

If we look seriously at the cautious and relatively ineffective American gun lobby versus those who oppose guns, we see two different types of forces, only one of which has taken the offensive, those opposed to guns.

The anti-gun forces are willing to do and say pretty much anything that will justify their goal. What is not usually discussed by the Left is the numerous times when there have been specific warnings about a possible gun attack, and the threat was ignored by government officials or agents. These include gun tragedies executed by a youth on [psychotropic drugs](#) such as in the Columbine High School and the Aurora Century theater shootings, or the Parkland youth who obtained a firearm because he had no felony arrest record pursuant to an [Obama-era political policy](#) designed to reduce the “school-to-prison pipeline,” or even the most frightening situation, the enemy within, radical Muslims with a religious agenda of killing non-Muslim Americans. World wide, radical Muslim killings are the most numerous; and these are usually accomplished with fully automatic military weapons, such as in the [Paris 2015 theater centered attack](#) and the earlier 2015 Charlie Hebdo [attack](#).

The political Right has pointed out that those disposed to a large scale killing will find some way to commit mass murder, the actual number of gun attacks by parties who could have been stopped by some form of more stringent gun control is minimal and statistically irrelevant in a nation of 300,000,000 plus people. But facts are not what are at the forefront of the discussion, it is the servicing of an agenda using compassion as its promotional vehicle.

The anti-gun advocates will never discuss the largest single mass killing in the US, which took place at a social club in [New York City](#). Eighty seven people were killed with a gallon of gasoline and a match; or the 1927 Bath School bombing, which killed forty four.

When President Obama intoned the 2015 mass shooting at the Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino, California, he distinctly did not reference the explosive devices the Muslim Terrorists were carrying or their motive – to kill unarmed Americans celebrating Christmas.

Also, when Obama warned us that “*we have a pattern now of mass shootings in this country that has no parallel anywhere else in the world,*” he was incorrect. The US ranks [56th per](#)

[capita](#) in its rate of attacks and 61st in mass public shootings murder rate. Norway, Finland, Switzerland and Russia all have at least 45 percent higher rates of murder from mass public shootings than the United States. [Other politicians](#) have joined this false chorus of singling out the country with the most guns as being the only country with such a high rate of gun violence.

In fact, when one searches the web for mass murders in the United States, the search quickly segues to mass shootings, as if they are the only mass murders.

Those opposed to guns who want the elimination of “assault” weapons won’t discuss the massive number of dead and wounded from bomb attacks, such as those in [Bangladesh](#) or [Boston](#). Neither will they discuss the number of people killed by vehicle attacks such as those in [Germany](#) and [New York](#), even though vehicles are much more ubiquitous, and available without a background check to felons who have committed violent crimes.

Also never mentioned is the fact that according to FBI crime data, [deaths by knives](#) in the U.S. outnumber deaths by rifles by five to 1. In 2016, 1,604 people were killed by knives and other cutting instruments, while 374 were killed by rifles. A breakdown of assault style knives (fighting knives such as those carried by Marines), camping knives, machetes, axes, kitchen knives, pocket knives and illegal switch blades is never given.

But, again, facts are not important in the gun debate. Emotion is.

When discussing mass murder, anti-gunners won’t discuss the untold number of murders committed by governments against their own people, whether it be a Hitler or a Castro or a Mao or a Pol Pot. In these instances the citizens were all disarmed. In the case of Hitler, the citizens were disarmed just prior to his gaining total control of Germany, which once accomplished led to the initiation of Germany’s programs of mass extinction. The example of a state such as Germany turning on its own is most exemplary, when one considers that prior to Hitler’s rise, Germany was one of the most socially conscious, well educated nations extant. China and Russia, in which millions of disarmed citizens were killed by their Leftist Communist governments, were also advanced countries with established cultures.

According to Professor [Carol Quigley](#) the availability and use of inexpensive weapons by an army demands a large military force consisting of willing recruits; and requires an egalitarian government to support it. On the other hand, the use of expensive weapons systems demanding extensive training requires a smaller force, and the unnecessary citizenry not in military service is looked upon as a threat; which gives rise to a more authoritarian government. Since the 1970's, the United States has been committed to an expensive weapons system / small (select) military force. The use of a select force coincides with the rise of the anti-gun movement, starting with a call to ban mail-order guns and inexpensive Saturday Night Specials. It would appear that the growing demand for the removal of readily available inexpensive assault style rifles from the citizens' hands may not be as organic as it appears, but actually manufactured to some degree. If this premise is an accurate predictor or government behavior, it would appear that those most desirous of a free democratic government would support the ready availability of assault style rifles rather than oppose them.

None of the large amount of conscientious analysis done by gun rights groups has the argument winning value it is purported to have. Pro-gun supporters continually analyze the selectivity of gun death reporting by the anti-gun movement. Gun advocates are meticulous in their analysis of the number, background and type of each shooting, whether it be gang related, criminal activity, suicide, lawful self-defense, justified police shootings, terrorist attacks, or accidental shootings. The causality is analyzed ad nauseum. Gun supporters are incessant in their message that those who intend to kill will find a way to do it; that it is not, never was, never will be the tool that is at blame; that murder is committed by the murderer not the weapon.

Gun advocates religiously point to the hypocrisy of the anti-gunners' failure to compare the number of mass shootings to the number of drug / gang related shootings, and skew the reporting on the number of gun deaths in the US by not categorizing them accurately. There is little coverage of mass knife killings around the world, which are commonplace.

The information that Americans who believe in the ownership of substantial firearms disseminate is defensive in nature. The lack of an offensive posture is the reason that Americans don't deserve guns. Gun owners and their advocates have no goal. And, the status quo is neither adequate nor acceptable.

Gun advocates, though, do have that paper to wave – the Second Amendment - waved it as if it were magic. Well, it is not magic, and if not supported by action, it is no more than what it is - writing on a piece of paper. The seeming task of the pro-gun people is not to defend gun ownership and American Liberty, their task appears to be to defend that paper.

Here's what that paper says:

“A well regulated Militia being necessary for the security of a free state – the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.”

Odd, that the entity at the heart of the Amendment, the Militia, is never discussed by the gun-advocates.

Even more odd is the fact that after Justice Antonin Scalia's superb commentary in [District of Columbia v. Heller](#), which detailed the pre-governmental right to bear arms, the gun lobby refused to faithfully support the Second Amendment.

*“The “militia” comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense. The Antifederal-ists feared that the Federal Government would disarm the people in order to disable this citizens' militia, enabling a politicized standing army or a select militia to rule. The response was to deny Congress power to abridge the ancient right of individuals to keep and bear arms, so that the ideal of a citizens' militia would be preserved.”*

Of course, if you have never seen a Militia, and all you hear about “militias” has negative connotations – and you are never taught about the Militia, not asked to participate in your state's Militia because it may not be organized - you wouldn't understand the Militia, and apparently the pro-gun lobby has chosen to ignore it; ashamed that the Second Amendment is burdened with a prefatory clause that mentions a Militia.

The gun lobby ignores historical facts that reference the Militia, knowing, or should know, that even if your state or community does not have a Militia, that does not diminish your right to

own guns adequate to Militia participation. The lack of state-organized Militias was never a factor in the rationale for the continuing existence of the Militia or individual gun ownership in the early United States. In 1792, a year after the Second Amendment was passed, in a House debate on “*a bill more effectively to provide for national defence, by establishing an uniform Militia throughout the United States*” (Militia Bill), Representative Jeremiah Wadsworth of Connecticut said,

*“The Militia of the several states exist at the present moment more by the consent of the persons forming them in the several states, than in consequence of any laws of the particular states.”*

But exactly who is the militia? George Mason, whom many would rightly say was the true father of The Bill of Rights, inscribed protection of the Militia in [Virginia’s Declaration of Rights](#), a template for what eventually became the Constitution’s Bill of Rights. He described the Militia as “the whole people” — the individual American citizen. The citizens are the Militia. The Militia is the citizens. They are one and the same.

*“Section 13. That a well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms, is the proper, natural, and safe defense of a free state; that standing armies, in time of peace, should be avoided as dangerous to liberty; and that, in all cases, the military should be under strict subordination to, and be governed by, the civil power.”*

What is not understood by the general public, nor promulgated by the gun lobby, is that the concept and purpose of the Militia is not intended to protect the nation from foreign attack. While the Militia might be called into service to repel invasion, or serve in any number of capacities, its mere existence is its purpose.

At this point in time every person capable of bearing arms would be considered part of the (unorganized) Militia. Some of the functions that a Militia could perform could be replaced by such entities as the National Guard or military reserve forces, or the military itself - but the Militia itself cannot be replaced – that is if we are to remain America, remain a participatory democratic republic. Whether or not the functions of the Militia are ever completely replaced

by more select military organizations does not obviate the intended historical purpose of the Militia, the existence of an armed and prepared citizenry.

Many of those who would remove military style guns from the hands of the American citizen are the same people who are desperately trying to dilute American citizenship with “immigrants” who have little desire to become acculturated with American values and would rather ignore or even destroy the American republican culture – the foundational creed of the country. Those opposing guns speak of democracy, and yet they are the ones who don’t trust American citizens with effective firearms. The anti-gun solution for safety is to replace the Militia with government agents, as if government agents are somehow a superior class of beings, endowed with nothing less than altruistic loyalty to the defense of American Liberty.

There are those who oppose assault style weapons in the hands of citizens because they feel they are dangerous and a potential threat to public safety. Not all of these people are politically motivated, just good hearted. Still, they believe that assault style guns should only be in the hands of local, state or federal authorities. Regrettably, regardless of their motives, the end result is the same, and their feelings and concerns aid the anti-gun advocates’ agenda, which is to have the Federal Government remove guns from the hands of the citizenry.

This perspective on governance is best evidenced by the writing of Karen LeCraft Henderson, Circuit Judge, concurring in part and dissenting in part on the *Heller* case when it appeared before the United States Court of Appeals For The District of Columbia Circuit. In her commentary she intones an “interest-balancing” approach to judging an inherent pre-governmental right:

*"At the center of the debate is the fundamental question of whether firearms, specifically those owned and wielded by private citizens, do more harm than good in deterring violent crime."*

Judge Henderson refers to “guns” in general in her commentary, but one can only assume that her concerns regarding an assault style weapon kept for general use would be even more cautionary.

She clearly states the argument used in anti-gun rhetoric. Albeit that Justice Scalia and the prevailing Supremes stated that they look at the Second Amendment as a pre-Constitutional right, there is a current trend by the corporate media, radical leftist internationalists and their cadre of lost in the political woods bleeding heart liberal followers to embrace the perspective described by Henderson, basing the right to arms as a contest between the individual right to keep and bear arms and the pseudo "right" of public safety and freedom from gun violence.

Patrick Henry's words delivered in 1775, which were in essence a call to arms, may appear to be hyperbolic when describing the threat to our nation from today's government "rulers," still, any government intrusion into American liberty represents a clear and present danger, and from that perspective his words have continuing significance.

*"What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"*

But, it is Henry's words spoken a dozen years later during Virginia's Ratification Convention, during a time of tumult, and before there was an agreement for a Bill of Rights, which I believe state the terms of the argument.

*"Liberty, the greatest of all earthly blessing - give us that precious jewel, and you may take every thing else! But I am fearful I have lived long enough to become an old-fashioned fellow. Perhaps an invincible attachment to the dearest rights of man may, in these refined, enlightened days, be deemed old-fashioned; if so, I am contented to be so."*

*Twenty-three years ago was I supposed a traitor to my country? I was then said to be the bane of sedition, because I supported the rights of my country. May I now be thought suspicious when I say our privileges and rights are in danger."*

*There are many on the other side, who possibly may have been persuaded to the necessity of these measures, which I conceive to be dangerous to your liberty. Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect every one who*



*approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force. Whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined.*

*Let my beloved Americans guard against that fatal lethargy that has pervaded the universe.*

*The honorable gentleman who presides told us that, to prevent abuses in our government, we will assemble in Convention, and punish our servants for abusing the trust reposed in them. O sir, we should have fine times, indeed, if, to punish tyrants, it were only sufficient to assemble the people!*

*You will find all the strength of this country in the hands of your enemies; Your militia is given up to Congress. And, of what service would militia be to you when, most probably, you will not have a single musket in the state? For, as arms are to be provided by Congress, they may or may not furnish them... .*

*Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty! I say that the loss of that dearest privilege has ever followed, with absolute certainty, every such mad attempt.”*

To believe in the Central Government over the citizenry is a rejection of the entirety of the foundational principals of this nation. In a very certain manner, this is what is wanted by those who believe in a disarmed citizenry; an America composed of two classes of citizens – those working for the government(s) who can be trusted with firearms and civilians who cannot.

The man who spoke up most fervently in favor of the Second Amendment during its debate in the House of Representatives was [Elbridge Gerry](#) from Massachusetts; and while you constantly hear his name in disparaging terms as the man after whom Gerrymandering is named, his name is also found on the Declaration of Independence and on the Articles of Confederation. He was the sole ambassador John Adams considered as being politically impartial during the infamous [XYZ affair](#), and his dedication to peace rather than politics is considered to be the major factor in preventing a war with France. He was Governor of

Massachusetts and Vice President to Madison during the War of 1812. As involved as he was in the founding of the nation, you will not find his signature on the Constitution, even though he attended the Federal Convention. He refused to sign because, like the other Anti-Federalists who refused to sign, Mason and Randolph, he did not trust government – even the new government that he had helped create. Unlike those men popularized for promoting the Constitution and declaring how special the American citizen was, and how steadfast Americans would be in never allowing tyranny to overtake the government, Gerry didn't trust that the American people would never be misled. He and the other Anti-Federalists wanted a bill of rights enumerated within the Constitution before accepting it.

Having just fought a war with a tyrant, he knew full well what tyranny was; and he understood that what stood between America and complete subjugation was the armed citizen.

*“What, Sir, is the use of a Militia? It is to prevent the establishment of a standing army, the bane of liberty.... Whenever Governments mean to invade the rights and liberties of the people, they always attempt to destroy the Militia, in order to raise an army upon their ruins.”* (Floor debate on the Second Amendment)

Those who most ardently fought for independence and then opposed the Constitution did so because of one value held dear – Liberty. They considered Liberty the fundamental question affecting the nation, and the Anti-Federalists feared for the safety of Liberty under the proposed Constitution.

It is this fervor for Liberty above all else, this belief, shared by Patrick Henry, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, Richard Henry Lee, Elbridge Gerry and others of the same mind, that differentiates them from today's pro-gun advocates. The early patriots understood a simple fact that may be known today by those supporting the cause of gun ownership, but has little visceral sway over their actions - *History hasn't ended!* Just because we have freedom now, does not mean that we will always have freedom.

The enemies of freedom are relentless. They grow stronger each day, while the resolve of the average uninformed American to preserve Liberty weakens each day. What we have today, misinformation leading to acceptance of bad policy, is exactly what Gerry so feared.

In looking at the dynamics of the fight over gun ownership, one might analogize the anti-gunners to an offensive line in a football game. They have their goal. But, in this game there are an unlimited number of ball carries with no time limit. Ultimately, yard by yard, they will reach their goal. And, the pro-gun lobby, one could analogize, is very much akin to the defensive line. They have no goal. Their task is merely to stop the forward movement of the offense as best as they can. And, because they have no goal, while they may slow the offence, they can never win, because it is only the anti-gun forces who can score points.

The anti-gunners score points each time they move forward towards their goal; and when they reach their goal the game is over.

Defending the Second Amendment by declaring its importance or by referencing it as a part of the revered Bill of Rights is not nearly enough. It is not enough, because with all of the rhetoric and Chamberlain like “paper waving”— no pundit ever really answers the valid, very simple question asked time and again by the anti-gunners, “Why does anyone need a gun like that?” The question is inevitably answered by reaching for the Second Amendment and its guarantees. The reasoning quickly becomes circular – this is because of that, and that is because of this, and so on ad infinitum.

The question can be answered honestly and effectively, but not as long as the pro-gun Right is so disingenuous in their comparison of an AR-15 rifle chambered in 5.56 NATO to a hunting rifle. The gun lobby will speak about hunting, about shooting sports and about self defense. They will speak about anything except the Militia.

So, while Americans’ right to gun ownership does not rely on the Second Amendment’s protection of the Militia, the political battle over assault style weapons may – even if only in the uneducated public’s mind, and their power seeking elected officials – and that is where the battle will be decided, by those elected to Congress by a mix of unabashed caring people who dislike guns and their potential for violence, do-gooders of all stripes who can’t envision the precariousness of their own liberty and evil political charlatans who will do and say whatever is required to bring the other two groups into line.

It is only when the pro-gun lobby initiates a discussion about the Militia, will they be able to answer that basic question – “Why does anyone need an assault style rifle?” The answer is obvious once a defensive posture against attacks by anti-gunners becomes an offensive program to invigorate the un-organized and organized Militia on its original terms.

But, the gun lobby is afraid of the Militia. Yet, the Second Amendment and protection of the Militia was so important that it was placed in the Bill of Rights immediately after protection of speech, assembly and religion. The founders had no fear of enunciating their support for the Militia.

Referring back to the time soon after Chamberlain returned from Munich, ultimately, when it became necessary to confront Adolph Hitler, two things had to happen, appeasement espousing Chamberlain had to go, and England had to arm.

There is not a more awe inspiring image from the WW2 era than that of an American GI after an assault, his battle rifle slung over his shoulder, exhausted, usually unshaven, garbed in comfortably fitting military clothing, often dirty and wrinkled.

The American war fighter was not an ideologue or a religious zealot. He was not defending a revered leader. He quickly understood he was fighting a monstrous ideology, which if left unchecked, would soon devour his freedom. These servicemen were at heart private citizens, often reluctant to serve in combat. But, ultimately, one by one, they put their life on the line because the nation was in jeopardy. In too many instances these servicemen were left a mangled or dead casualty, but because of their sacrifice, the nation continued to live and thrive.

Over the course of the American experiment, Americans have learned to rely on the gun in the defense of freedom. That spirit of the armed citizen still exists, but it is under attack from a combination of America haters and idealistic do-gooders, too often driven by a globalist UN supported movement of world-wide citizen disarmament.

There is, though, one truth that wise citizens understand, *as long as governments have guns, citizens must also have guns*. If you are to be able to participate in the unorganized or

organized Militia– you require an assault style weapon because that is the minimum effective weapon needed by the Militia; and you need to train to use it safely, properly and effectively.

-30-