On GUNS

PEOPLE ASK WHY? Why I Carry a Gun My old grandpa said to me son,' there comes a time in every man's life When he stops bustin' knuckles and starts bustin' caps and usually it's When he becomes too old to take an ass whoopin'. I don't carry a gun to kill people. I carry a gun to keep from being killed. I don't carry a gun to scare people. I carry a gun because sometimes this world can be a scary place. I don't carry a gun because I'm paranoid. I carry a gun because there are real threats in the world. I don't carry a gun because I'm evil. I carry a gun because I have lived long enough to see the evil in the World. I don't carry a gun because I hate the government. I carry a gun because I understand the limitations of government.

I don't carry a gun because I'm angry. I carry a gun so that I don't have to spend the rest of my life hating Myself for failing to be prepared. I don't carry a gun because I want to shoot someone. I carry a gun because I want to die at a ripe old age in my bed, and Not on a sidewalk somewhere tomorrow afternoon. I don't carry a gun because I'm a cowboy. I carry a gun because, when I die and go to heaven, I want to be a Cowboy. I don't carry a gun to make me feel like a man. I carry a gun because men know how to take care of themselves and the Ones they love. I don't carry a gun because I feel inadequate. I carry a gun because unarmed and facing three armed thugs, I am Inadequate.

I don't carry a gun because I love it. I carry a gun because I love life and the people who make it meaningful To me. Police Protection is an oxymoron. Free citizens must protect themselves. Police do not protect you from crime, they usually just investigate the Crime after it happens and then call someone in to clean up the mess. Personally, I carry a gun because I'm too young to die and too old to Take an ass whoopin'. .(author unknown)

A LITTLE GUN HISTORY In 1929, the Soviet Union established gun control. From 1929 to 1953, about 20 million dissidents, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.

In 1911, Turkey established gun control. From 1915 to 1917, 1.5 million Armenians, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.

Germany established gun control in 1938 and from 1939 to 1945, a total of 13 million Jews and others who were unable to defend themselves were rounded up and exterminated.

China established gun control in 1935. From 1948 to 1952, 20 million political dissidents, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated

Guatemala established gun control in 1964. From 1964 to 1981, 100,000 Mayan Indians, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.

Uganda established gun control in 1970. From 1971 to 1979, 300,000 Christians, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.

Cambodia established gun control in 1956. From 1975 to 1977, one million educated people, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.

Defenseless people rounded up and exterminated in the 20th Century because of gun control: 56 million.

Gun owners in Australia were forced by new law to surrender 640,381 personal firearms to be destroyed by their own Government, a program costing Australia taxpayers more than \$500 million dollars.

The first year results are: Australia wide, homicides are up 3.2 percent. Australia-wide, assaults were up 8.6 percent. Australia-wide, armed robberies up 44 percent (yes, 44 percent)! In the state of Victoria alone, homicides with firearms now up 300 percent. Note that while the law-abiding citizens turned them in, the criminals did not, and criminals still possess their guns! While figures over the previous 25 years showed a steady decrease in armed robbery with firearms, this has changed drastically upward in the past 12 months, since criminals now are guaranteed that their prey is unarmed. There has also been a dramatic increase in break-ins and assaults of the ELDERLY. Australian politicians are at a loss to explain how public safety has decreased, after such monumental effort, and expense was expended in successfully ridding Australian law abiding society of guns.

The Australian experience and the other historical facts above prove it. You won't see this data on the US evening news, or hear politicians disseminating this information.

Guns in the hands of honest citizens save lives and property and, yes, gun-control laws adversely affect only the law-abiding citizens. Take note my fellow Americans, before it's too late! The next time someone talks in favor of gun control, please remind them of this history lesson.

With guns, we are 'citizens'. Without them, we are 'subjects'.

If you value your freedom, please spread this anti-gun control, Pro-Rights message to all of your friends.

SWITZERLAND ISSUES EVERY HOUSEHOLD A GUN! SWITZERLAND 'S GOVERNMENT TRAINS EVERY ADULT THEY ISSUE A RIFLE. SWITZERLAND HAS THE LOWEST GUN RELATED CRIME RATE OF ANY CIVILIZED COUNTRY IN THE WORLD!!! IT'S A NO BRAINER! DON'T LET OUR GOVERNMENT WASTE MILLIONS OF OUR TAX DOLLARS IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE ALL LAW ABIDING CITIZENS AN EASY TARGET. I'm a firm believer of the 2nd Amendment! If you are too, please forward. (True at Writing - author unknown)

They who would give up an essential liberty for temporary security, deserve neither liberty, nor security. ~ Benjamin Franklin

Second Amendment - U.S. Constitution

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.

That's it...

What is a Militia - It is not the Army, it is not the Police. It is a self organized & regulated Armed Citizen group.

What is a free State - It is a State/Country that allows individual Rights and Liberty.

Who are the people - That is you, the average person, a citizen.

What are Arms - These include Guns that generally send a projectile of some sort with an energy sufficient to be destructive or deadly upon striking a target.

What is an infringement - Any means by law or force that interferes or impedes in any way.

2nd Amendment Annotations:

Prior to the Supreme Court's 2008 decision in District of Columbia v. Heller,1 the courts had yet to definitively state what right the Second Amendment protected. The opposing theories, perhaps oversimplified, were (1) an "individual rights" approach, whereby the Amendment protected individuals' rights to firearm ownership, possession, and transportation; and (2) a "states' rights" approach, under which the Amendment only protected the right to keep and bear arms in connection with organized state militia units.2 Moreover, it was generally believed that the Amendment was only a bar to federal action, not to state or municipal restraints.3

However, the Supreme Court has now definitively held that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that weapon for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home. Moreover, this right applies not just to the federal government, but to states and municipalities as well.

In Heller, the Court held that (1) the District of Columbia's total ban on handgun possession in the home amounted to a prohibition on an entire class of "arms" that Americans overwhelmingly chose for the lawful purpose of self-defense, and thus violated the Second Amendment; and (2) the District's requirement that any lawful firearm in the home be disassembled or bound by a trigger lock also violated the Second Amendment, because the law made it impossible for citizens to use arms for the core lawful purpose of self-defense.

The Court reasoned that the Amendment's prefatory clause, i.e., "[a] well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State," announced the Amendment's purpose, but did not limit or expand the scope of the operative clause, i.e., "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." Moreover, the prefatory clause's history comported with the Court's interpretation, because the prefatory clause stemmed from the Anti-Federalists' concern 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.

Further, the Court distinguished United States v.Miller,4 in which the Court upheld a statute requiring registration under the National Firearms Act of sawed-off shotguns, on the ground that Miller limited the type of weapon to which the Second Amendment right applied to those in common use for lawful purposes.

In McDonald v. Chicago,5 the Court struck down laws enacted by Chicago and the village of Oak Park effectively banning handgun possession by almost all private citizens, holding that the Fourteenth Amendment incorporated the Second Amendment right, recognized in Heller, to keep and bear arms for the purpose of self-defense.

The Court reasoned that this right is fundamental to the nation's scheme of ordered liberty, given that self-defense was a basic right recognized by many legal systems from ancient times to the present, and Heller held that individual self-defense was "the central component" of the Second Amendment right. Moreover, a survey of the contemporaneous history also demonstrated clearly that the Fourteenth Amendment's Framers and ratifiers counted the right to keep and bear arms among those fundamental rights necessary to the Nation's system of ordered liberty.

pon enlisting in 1949, I them or take them." spent my young adult life being intimate with military weapons and was required to be proficient in use of them, as were all military men of that era.



I volunteered for a tour in Korea, 1951-1952, mandating a Colt 45 being strapped to my body or an M1 rifle slung over my shoulder everywhere I went.

Holding a civilian aviation rating, I even volunteered for Vietnam (helicopter training) in 1964, but that war needed younger pilots than me. Good thing, too. I likely would have been one of the first killed.

This brief intro is not meant to point out my attraction to war, only that it qualifies me to talk the talk, and walk the walk. The value of my military background, though it made me familiar with weapons, also made me appreciate their value and recognize their necessity during peacetime.

Nevertheless, I don't own a gun, never have in my adult life. And I don't have any future plans on buying a gun. But guess what? I recently joined the National Rifle Association (NRA), anyway, to help bolster the Second Amendment - one's constitutional right to own and/or carry a gun.

Now take notice. The antigun people, (Democrats, liberals, leftists, however you wish to label them) whom want to get rid of guns (and the Second Amendment), are gun-control zealots. They have an obsessive-compulsive attitude about getting rid of guns of all kinds and seem to live in a fool's paradise, a utopia that doesn't include firearms and violence.

Consider the following excerpt from Wayne LaPierre's reply, CEO of the NRA, who spoke in response to President Obama's inaugural address.

"Obama wants you to believe that putting the federal government in the middle of every firearm transaction - except those between criminals - will somehow make us safer. ... He wants to put every private, personal transaction under the thumb of the federal government, and he wants to keep all those names in a massive federal registry. There are only two reasons for that federal list of gun owners — to tax

Comments that Obama made as a state senator in 2001 bear his position out. In an interview with the Chicago Defender, he stated, "I'll continue to be in favor of handgun law registration requirements and licensing requirements for training."

Let's take a look at the history at what happened in some cases over time - people who registered their guns to government in democratic societies.

- (1921) New Zealand, registration of revolvers required ownership allowed in the name of personal defense. In 1974, this list was used to confiscate all revolvers.
- (1921) The United Kingdom instituted handgun registration. About every 10 years or so, they further restrict what can be owned and use the registration rolls to collect what is illegal.
- (1967) In New York City, a registration system enacted for long guns was used in the early 1990s to confiscate lawfully owned semiautomatic rifles and shotguns. The New York City Council banned firearms that had been classified by the city as "assault weapons."
- (1989) California revoked a grace period for the registration of certain rifles (SKS Sporters) and prohibited certain semiautomatic long-rifles and pistols. Upon the death of the owner. they are either to be surrendered or moved out of state.
- (1990) Chicago enacted registration of long guns and used that same registration to confiscate semi-auto long guns.
- (1995) Canada prohibited previously legal and registered small-caliber handguns. The guns are to be forfeited upon death of the owner with no compensation to the estate.
- (1996) Australia banned most semiautomatic rifles and semiautomatic and pump shotguns, then used its list of registered semi-auto hunting rifles to confiscate all those weapons.

Moral of this story: Gun registry of any kind is a smokescreen for eventual gun confiscation and violation or abuse of one's Second Amendment rights. Government will always lie about true intent when it comes to gun registration. It's the nature of the beast.

Burke Nelson of Exeter is a semiretired real estate investor/