

The Biggest Gun Lie Is Being Told By The Right – And, It May Just Cost Us Our Liberty

©2019 Joel Goodman



Photo – Military-Today.com

The AR-15, chambered in NATO 5.56, is not just another semi-automatic hunting rifle - contrary to what many on the Right claim. Can the AR-15, the Mini-14, the AUG, the “AK-47” – and all of the many variants of a modern assault style weapon be used for any number of purposes? Yes. But, so can many other weapons be used for the shooting sports or for hunting or home defense.

If the Right keeps up this preposterous claim that assault style semi-auto weapons are just like all other semi-autos, we may lose all our gun rights. The Left may be ignorant when it comes to most things about firearms, and may not know a cartridge from a bullet, or semi-auto from selective fire – but, they understand that you don’t need a 30 round magazine to kill a deer. A 30 round magazine is useful in a serious confrontation against multiple targets; and the smaller, lighter rounds like the 5.56 NATO, while they will kill, are not the optimal choice for hunting animals much larger than varmints or coyotes.

The Second Amendment is not about home defense, concealed carry, recreational shooting, hunting or competition. It is about protecting the Militia – the disparaged and almost completely

ignored Militia. And, if American's who cherish Liberty don't start talking seriously about the Militia, we will soon lose our militia capability along with our freedom before too very long. We may have freedom now, but history hasn't ended and we may not have freedom forever.

If you don't understand the Militia, I suggest you learn about it.

Of course, if you've never been taught about the Militia, or seen a Militia, and all you hear about "militias" has negative connotations – and you have not been 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; befuddled that the Second Amendment is burdened with a prefatory clause that mentions a Militia.

"A well regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free state..."

Said in today's language and with more expansive terms:

"Because an organized, well trained and well armed Militia is necessary to guarantee the continuing freedom of a country..."

Yes. The founders believed that a proper and unencumbered Militia was necessary to keep a country free. That is what the phrase "*security of a free state*" means. Security as in to "secure," "maintain," "keep," "protect," "hold onto." Looked at from this point of view, suddenly there is nothing befuddling about the Second Amendment. It is about *Liberty*, about keeping a "*free state*" - "*free*."

The fact that your state or community may not have an organized Militia 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 the House debate on "the 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.”

Justice Antonin Scalia’s superb commentary in [District of Columbia v. Heller](#) detailed the pre-governmental right to bear arms and the purpose of the Militia.

“The Antifederal-ists feared that the Federal Government would disarm the people in order to disable (the) 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.”

It was George Mason, who many would rightly say was the true father of The Bill of Rights, who 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.

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

Some of the functions that a Militia might 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 citizenry.

Patrick Henry’s 1775 call to arms galvanized thirteen Colonies into a confederation. But, in 1787, at the Virginia Ratification Convention, when faced with a new consolidated government without a Bill of Rights and protection for a well armed Militia, he again proclaimed his fear for the nation’s Liberty.

“Guard with jealous attention the public liberty...Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force. Whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined...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?”

During the debate on the Militia Act of 1792, the suggestion was made to have the government supply the most modern military guns to the poor and the young so that they could be properly armed for the Militia. But, it was feared that at some time in the future a government might lay claim to those guns and confiscate them. Therefore, it was agreed that all men would bring to the Militia whichever guns they possessed.

There is 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.

And, what gun would you need for your militia participation today? The answer is simple, a weapon close to what the military uses, a modern combat style weapon, an AR-15.

So, next time someone asks you, “Why do you need a gun like that?” Your answer won’t be, well it’s not so different from any other gun. Your answer will be, “Because it is the weapon I own to practice with alongside many of my fellow citizens, so that we are all prepared as part of our state’s militia - whether or not it has been organized.

-

The author has held a FFL for more than 30 years, and is an NRA Safety Instructor. He states that he knows a good deal about guns.

-30-