

1/14/12

Constitutional and Natural
Right to Bear Arms

Laws of Nature -- Inherent, and independent of imposed laws.
The First Law of Life - Self-preservation, or survival!

Is it not an instinctive reaction to something that threatens one's safety, or existence to defend himself (or herself) with whatever means are available? Granted, that we are not automatically justified to use maximum, or disproportionate resources or efforts to deal with discernibly minimal, or limited dangers or offenses.

The foregoing distinction is relative to the circumstances that exist situationally. The question of appropriate, or justified force or reaction to harmful encounters is often not definable in specific established terms.

A sudden threat, or emergency may require a spontaneous decision of what to do to protect oneself, or others needing help, to manage, or resist, or possibly eliminate mortal danger that may be posed.

If time, and circumstances allow for extenuating reactions, they should govern what one does in the face of a particular crisis, or life, or security endangering situation.

Questions to Consider

1. How does one, or a country, prepare in advance for possible threats to their freedom, and security?
2. Does there not have to be means of self-defense. or survival reasonably equal, or superior to the degree of possible assault or danger?

The trouble with the majority of people's opinions on the subject is an under-estimation of realistically possible threats to personal, or collective liberty, and security! "To hope for the best, but provide for the worst", is a common sense, logical rule of life, or responsibility that should always be followed, whenever, and however possible!

But, there are too many simplistic, or half thought out

recommendations. and actions taken in regards to gun rights, and "controls" that undermine basic human rights, and potential needs, that can do far more harm than any assumed societal good that is imagined!

3. What type and capacity of firearms or weapons would be adequate for an individual to possess?

Before you might be inclined to make the usual knee-jerk remarks to that question, think back to the crucial principle involved in Question 1. Whether a governmental attack on citizens, which could always possibly happen, as modern world history attests in the massive murders by totalitarian regimes of many countries, or if an individual threatens the life of another--the means of defense and retaliation should at least be equal to the arsenal of the attacker.

Simply put, if my neighbor has higher capacity, and more advanced firearms, than mine, I am at the mercy of his weapons superiority, if I don't do something to correct that imbalance of security!

A militia with, i.e., 22, or 30-30 calibre rifles, is a pretty much useless defense against the sophisticated arsenal of a tyrannical government attack upon its citizens. Of course, it would be better than nothing! Though, isn't it common sense to say that if someone attacks me with an assault rifle, I am only realistically safe with enough firepower to counteract him. Anything much less, cannot reasonably protect me!

So, technically, one is virtually forced to keep up with modern technology in personal firearms! Hence, no limits on the capacity of equipment that can be owned! It appears that the framers of the constitution, purposely only used the word "arms" in the second amendment, so as not to limit the type, capacity, or quantity of firearms that might be developed, and personally possessed!

Life can have some terrible hard choices to make, but willful surrender, or capitulation to any enemy who threatens my God-given rights of self-protecton, and survival, would be either cowardly, or irresponsible acts that I will never be guilty of!

"Live free, or die", should be everyone's motto, or pledge, but unfortunately too many people are not committed to live by such a strong decisive principle, even if they do have it on their license plates!

I recall, and so should most of you not forget or minimize, cases like the Beverly Hills, or Boston stranglers, wherein one person terrorized whole communities for years, by raping and killing women victims. I do not remember to what degree any of them possessed guns, but let's take the example a step further.

How much greater the terror would be in a community which could not legally own firearms, or that would be seriously restricted by inadequate equipment! If you honestly consider the realistic possibility of that situation existing, why would you ever submit to such governmental authority and control of your life, when you could prevent or resist it, i.e., by the power of the ballot, or legal redress, to protect the power of the bullet!

Why don't people look at history, wherein countries listened and capitulated to the lies, and dishonest promises of eventual dictators, and tyrants who turned the tables on innocent, often naive, and vulnerable citizens, and established totalitarian control over their lives?

Adages, of such great, even critical importance as, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty", is not just idealistic poetry, or rhetorical philosophy, but an essential responsibility to maintain and defend our fundamental human rights of self-protection, freedom to pursue life's advantages, and opportunities, and if necessary, survival by any means possible.

Related in principle, on the negative side, is the fact of the widespread societal failure to speak out in defense of our common rights, and responsibilities.

So, whoever will not fight for his rights deserves to lose them, even as the saying goes, "He who will not stand for something (something right, that should mean), will fall for anything." The election of Pres. Obama verifies that!

The trouble is, in a majority-rule society, the minority has to suffer the consequences of majority wrong voting decisions, as well. The "progressive" politics of today is what drives the controversy, and adversarial activism against the constitution, as if that unique, wisely conceived, foundational document is not applicable to our times, but transitory and outdated, and no longer meets the "changing" demands of a different societal culture.

When, in fact, it is not the relevancy, or utility of the constitution that is questionable, but the increasing social changes of immorality, and the rejection of

ethical, and mutually fair principles, and authority, possible anarchy, and the political encroachment of socialism (which is completely contrary to the constitutional freedoms and governmental limits of our republic).

Surely, it is no coincidence, but an intentionally important act of the founding fathers that the first, and second amendments are interrelated, and at the top of the Bill of Rights. This should always be seen as an inarguable provision for our liberty, and protection that we should never allow to be threatened, or circum- scribed, or taken away from us!