

The 2nd. Amendment is Not Understood

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.

Recently, Biden announced his executive orders on gun restrictions. When fact-checked, many of his statements were proven false. Among his false statements were:

- Nothing that he says will impact the 2nd Amendment.
- No amendment in the Constitution is absolute.
- From the very beginning you could not own any weapon you wanted to own.
- Gun violence in this country is an epidemic.
- Reign in so-called “Ghost Guns.”
- You can buy whatever you want and no background check.
- Stabilizing brace for pistols make the pistol more accurate as a mini-rifle. As a result it makes the pistol more lethal.
- Red flag laws have significantly reduced suicides.

These false statements indicate that Biden and his fellow gun controllers do not understand the history of firearms, the epidemiology of firearm violence, the role of guns in suicides versus other suicide methods, and certainly not our US Constitution. Although these statements will not be discussed here, each of Biden’s statements needs to be researched without bias or presumptions.

History can be taught in several different ways. Most often it is taught as a series of events over a specified period of time. For example, the American Revolution, the Spanish-American War, the Civil War, etc. Rarely is time given for in-depth study leading from one event to another. An excellent example of this, are the precursors leading up to and the development of our **Bill of Rights**.

Although the lineage of our **Bill of Rights** is typically based on the signing of the **Magna Carta** in 1215, it actually goes much further back as we have read in the Bible (Luke 22:35-39, Joel 3:10, Samuel 13:19-22, 1 Samuel 25:13, Numbers 31:3, etc.). The **Magna Carta** however, as a written document, delineated individual liberties which took root in the American colonial charters (example. 1606 Charter for Virginia).

About 170 years after the founding of Jamestown, Virginia, the **Declaration of Independence** was signed. Although divided into four sections, the declaration is based on three basic ideas

1. God made all men equal and gave them the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;
2. Government's main business is to protect these rights; and
3. If a government tries to withhold these rights, the people are free to revolt and to set up a new government.

Thirteen years later (1789), the **Constitution of United States of America** was signed. As so eloquently stated in the Preamble of our Constitution, the rights and liberties of Americans were further delineate.

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

However many of the Constitution signers were not completely satisfied that personal rights and freedoms were sufficiently covered. Thus, six months after the signing of the Constitution, several of its signers started working on a series of amendments. Of the 12 suggested amendments 10 were ratified, became a permanent part of our Constitution in 1791, and are known as our **Bill of Rights**.

While most of us have probably read the 10 amendments at some time, very few of us have realized that like our **Declaration of Independence**, and the **Constitution of the United States of America**, our **Bill of Rights** also contains a similar preamble that supports those of both documents.

"THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution. "

Note: James Madison argued that a declaration of rights would help install the judiciary as "guardians" of individual rights against the other branches.

Now that we know a bit more about the **Bill of Rights** and its foundations, there are three very important aspects of the document that most Americans overlook. First, the framers were well educated. In fact, they were probably better educated than most of the politicians in our three branches of government. Additionally, their moral and ethical beliefs were deeply rooted in Judeo-Christian teachings, something, which again, most politicians lack today. An excellent article on the influence of Judeo-Christian on government can be found at: <https://nccs.net/blogs/articles/judeo-christian-roots-of-americas-founding-ideals-and-documents>.

The other two aspects deal with the amendments themselves. First, we should note the placement of the amendments within the **Bill of Rights**. At that time in history, it was commonplace to put the most important items at the beginning of any list. Thus the First and Second amendments were deemed to be the most important of the ten. The First, dealt directly with the very reasons why the American colonies broke off from Britain and assured the people's rights to religion, free speech, assemble and ask the government to address grievances. In many ways this amendment was about protecting a person's free will of choice.

The Second has been interpreted both in and out of court since its beginning. Most of the interpretations and discussions revolve around the phrases:

- "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State,"
- "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms,"; and
- the definition of "arms."

Grammatically the amendment is broken into three parts indicating separate and independent phrases for the two phrases above followed by an action.

This amendment is essentially a matter of survival; survival of the state, and survival of the people (protect, defend, hunt, etc.). In essence, again grammatically, the most important aspect of this amendment is to protect the First Amendment. These aspects have been ignored by politicians to argue for or against either amendment, but especially the Second. The first known court case to argue against the validity of the Second took place in 1876. Interestingly this case took place about the middle of the "Wild West" or "American Frontier" era (1865-1895).

In addition to the placement of the amendments, we should also be aware that of the amendments in the **Bill of Rights**, and all the ones since, only two (2) amendments are set in stone and government cannot change them. They are the First and Second Amendments. Note the words in bold print. These bold words mean that government

cannot tell us what can or cannot be done with respect to the items listed in each amendment. Despite Biden's assertion that no amendment is absolute, our founding fathers deemed that these two amendments are absolute. The other 25 amendments can be changed but these two cannot.

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

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.**

There is one interpretation of the 2nd amendment that evidently has not been discussed. That interpretation involves removing the amendment's grammar. Doing so would completely change the narrative of the gun takers such that, like Switzerland, citizens are part of its national defense force and take their weapons home.

The language in both amendments is plain, simple and clear. The definitions of the words use are equally simple and clear. The problem with these amendments is that some people want to assign their own interpretations, do not understand the terminology used or even the word definitions that have existed for centuries, or that they have a personal agenda to deprive people of their rights. We already see this with the various gun control advocates and groups, the Democrats, socialists, and leftists. For all of these groups the agenda is control of the people and has nothing to do with reducing violence in the United States.

While there are many so-called statistics used by these gun takers, consider this singular fact. There is no accurate count of how many firearms are in citizen hands. However government gun registries indicate that there are around 393 million guns owned by citizens and that people own an average of 3 guns (PEW research). This equates to 131million gun owners. Wikipedia indicated the gun to owner ratio is 120.5 guns owned per 100 people.

Biden asserts that gun violence is at epidemic portions and that gun account for more than 50% of suicides.

According to CDC statistics, in 2019, the number of vehicular deaths was 37,595 and the number of deaths via firearms was 39,707, a difference of 2112 deaths. However, CDC and other research indicate that the number of suicides, for this time period, was 47,511 of which firearm suicides were 23,941 (approximately half of all suicides). The CDC ranks suicides (gun and non-gun) as the tenth leading cause of deaths in the US. The only other non-medical cause that is higher are accidents which are considered the third leading cause of deaths.

However the above data does not paint the entire picture. CDC reported a total of injury deaths as 246,041 (75 deaths per 100,000 people). All firearm deaths represented 12.1 deaths per 100,000 people.

According to UC Davis studies, firearm deaths in 2019 were down from 2018. A Stanford University study claims “Men who owned handguns were eight times more likely than men who didn’t to die of self-inflicted gunshot wounds. Women who owned handguns were more than 35 times more likely than women who didn’t to kill themselves with a gun.” There are two flaws with this study. First is that men and women who owned firearms probably had better knowledge of how to use firearms than those who did not own firearms. Second, and for other studies as well, there is no indication as to the comparison of military or law enforcement employment to other types of employment. In other words, did PTSD or something other play any role in the firearm deaths?

As a final note we should consider Biden’s choice of the word “epidemic,” with relation to firearms deaths. It is obvious that Biden and others do not understand word definitions. There are four terms that we need to understand – endemic, outbreak, epidemic, and pandemic.

- **Endemic:** a disease that affects a large number of people within a community, population, or region. Endemics are a constant presence in a specific location. Firearms for example may be endemic to a gang controlled neighborhood.
- **Outbreak:** a greater than expected increase, often sudden, in the number of cases of a disease above what is normally expected for the population of a limited geographic area. If not controlled, it can become an epidemic.
- **Epidemic:** similar to outbreaks, an epidemic is a disease that affects a large number of people within a community, population, or region.

- **Pandemic:** an epidemic that has spread (travels) to multiple countries or continents across the world and affects a large number of people.

Associated with these terms are:

- **Prevalence:** the measure of disease that allows us to determine a person's likelihood of having that disease. There is no way that we can determine an individual's proclivity to murder or suicide via the user of firearms.
- **Mortality rate:** the number of deaths due to a disease divided by the total population. The CDC rates the mortality rate of all firearm deaths as 12.1 deaths per 100,000 people.

Using the above statistics and definitions, all firearm deaths represent less than 0.02% of the US population. There is no epidemic! Outbreaks however do occur. These may be in neighborhood that is not endemic to gun violence, and they do occur with mass shootings. Such shootings need to be called for what they are and not for what the media, Biden, gun takers, socialists, and leftists want to call them.

What would it take to overturn the 2nd Amendment?

The first process requires that any proposed amendment to the Constitution be passed by both the House and the Senate with two-thirds majorities. It would then need to be ratified by three-fourths of the 50 states – or 38 of them.

The overturning of any amendment is a serious matter that should never be driven by emotion or agenda. Following mass shootings, emotions nationwide run high, this is never a time to make decisions regarding the 2nd. Similarly, former Supreme Court Justice John Stevens, along with New York attorney general Letitia James and others have advocated getting rid of the 2nd because it will get rid of the NRA. These are NOT sufficient or good reason for overturning the amendment. Such actions and statements reflect a lack of knowledge and understanding as to why the Second Amendment is necessary for the protection of our nation, government, and its people.

While the **Bible** does not forbid Christians from bearing arms, wisdom and caution are of the utmost importance if one does choose to bear a lethal **weapon**. Anyone who owns and carries a firearm should be properly trained, and know and carefully follow all safety rules and **laws** pertaining to such a responsibility.