



## **Don't Blame the Left for the Student Anti-Gun Movement**

### **Blame the NRA**

© 2018 Joel Goodman

The Left blames the AR-15 and the NRA for mass shootings. The Right blames the Left for distorting the truth and wanting to disarm Americans.

But, of greater political consequence - blame should be laid on the gun lobby for the anti "assault weapon" mania. By suppressing an honest argument about why

citizens should own military style guns, they have left most citizens, especially impressionable youths, uninformed about citizenship and the Militia.

The gun lobby never references the Citizen Militia, and the weapons necessary to equip it. The only reference to the Militia on the NRA's lobbying ILA (Institute for Legislative Action) website, is: ["Virginia's House Sub-Committee Anti-Militia Taskforce."](#)

[The Second Amendment](#) reads -

*"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"*

Yet, the NRA refuses to advocate for the stated purpose of the Amendment - protection of the Militia.

In defending the right to keep and bear arms, the gun lobby ignores the Militia and the military style weapons necessary to fulfill its intended utility.

The NRA's avoidance of the Militia and the military style weapons it requires is ironic, considering the [NRA was founded](#) to advance citizen marksmanship with military weapons.

It is embarrassing when the NRA defends the AR-15 as a hunting rifle. Of course, it can be used to hunt, but there are many less militarily capable guns that can be used to hunt.

The NRA continues to portray all semi-automatic weapons as being the same, and paints the AR-15 as just another sporting rifle, instead of calling it exactly what it and others like it are, well designed combat styled firearms.

Even after Justice Scalia's [Heller](#) commentary, which details the pre-governmental right to bear arms, the gun lobby refuses to faithfully support the Second Amendment, possibly afraid that the absence of organized Militias might obviate the Second Amendment's reason for being.

But, 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 "A bill more effectively to provide for national defence, by establishing an uniform Militias throughout the United States" ([Militia Bill](#)) - Representative Wadsworth 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."*

A motion was made to provide the poor and the young with military guns so that they would be better armed when called to the organized Militia. It was defeated because it was feared that the guns provided by the government might later be confiscated by that same government. -

*"who would wish to see so large a portion of the community, ...armed by the United States, and liable to be disarmed by them?"*

The author of the template for what eventually became the Bill of Rights, George Mason, [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.

The gun lobby speaks of Second Amendment rights. Factually, we have no "Second Amendment rights." The Bill of Rights gives us no rights. The Amendments are a shield to protect those rights we already have from Central Government intrusion. Some of our rights were considered so essential, that it was demanded that they be enumerated in the Constitution before the Constitution was ratified.

The [Presser](#) Supreme Court decision, re-affirmed by the *Heller* decision more than a century later, made it quite clear that even if a state had no organized Militia, it could not disarm its citizens, because those citizens constitute the unorganized (reserve) Militia, which exists de facto, without governmental benefit.

The Constitution gives the Executive the authority to call the Militia into Federal service, and whether or not a state has organized the Militia, the state may do nothing to diminish its capability, so that if and when it is called into Federal service it could become an effective part of the Federal Militia.

Even if the Second Amendment were repealed, American citizens would still maintain their pre-governmental right to arms as they constitute the Militia. In other words, you can't take guns away from Americans. As said decisively in [Presser](#) -

*"It is undoubtedly true that all citizens capable of bearing arms constitute the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States as well as of the States; and, in view of the prerogative of the General Government, as well as of its general powers, the States cannot... prohibit the people from keeping and bearing arms, so as to deprive the United States of their rightful resource for maintaining the public security, and disable the people from performing their duty to the General Government."*

The NRA has consistently refused to promote the Militia in spite of anti-gun forces incessantly railing against "assault weapons".

The idea that a well-armed citizenry is the most natural defense of Liberty is being challenged today.

Few protesting students fully comprehend unarmed Jews shot by NAZIs, or unarmed middle class Cubans shot by Castro.

There is resistance to AR-15 style rifles because the public sees no connection between the individual citizen and the protection of Liberty and the protection of the public calm. Today, public safety situations are responded to by paid professionals. We are led to believe that there is no need for a well organized and well armed Citizen Militia.

The availability or restriction of the AR-15 will determine whether we remain a participatory democratic-republic, or continue becoming something more centralized, more tyrannical, less demanding of the individual citizen's participation - and ultimately less uniquely American.

-30-