

# Militia

THE HOUR OF THE TIME

Tape No. 463: "The Militia"

Tuesday, October 18, 1994

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I want to make sure that you have pen and paper by your side; for tonight I'm going to cover everything that you need to know, and all the references for you to begin your research, to legalize your militia unit.

Now, I want you to understand that this is important. You cannot form a militia unless you conform to the letter--and I mean the letter--of the law.

You MUST follow the instructions that I give you tonight. If you do not, you will be in danger of being publicly branded an outlaw, armed group of terrorists. And if you allow the wrong people in your militia unit, and if you do not have a well-regulated, well-disciplined unit, with rules, regulations, officers who are obeyed, and a foundation in the law, you are courting total, one hundred percent disaster.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, gun control is translated to be "unilateral personal disarmament". We covered the plans to disarm the United States and the people of the United States of America in our Treason Series.

The Second Article and Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America states this, and I quote:

"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."

Now, there are some points in this Amendment, this statement, that need to be brought out.

It makes plain the fact that a free state cannot exist--the very security of a free state depends upon a well regulated militia.

It also states that the right of the people--not a military group, not the National Guard, but the right of the people--to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Why did our Forefathers state this so strongly? You will find out, ladies and gentlemen, when I give you the definition of the militia under the law.

"'To keep and bear arms' means to own and carry guns," said Mark Moritz <sp?>.

A popular bumper sticker says: "Control government, not guns."

The Second Amendment is currently under attack, ladies and gentlemen. And this attack is a brilliantly orchestrated campaign which zooms in on highly emotional coverage of school yard and restaurant massacres, or drug gang warfare.

And we will cover the cause and the source of those irritations when we commence our series on mind control Monday night. Don't miss it.

By coining such knee-jerk phrases as "Saturday night special" and "assault rifle", the gun controllers try to create a Pavlovian emotional response from the public. Their sheep message is, and I quote:

"Guns are Baaaaaaaad. And only Baaaaaaaad people own guns."

Jeff Cooper, in the "Gargantuan Gun Sight Gossip" said this:

"RESOLVED: That the timid are not philosophically qualified to comment on the activities of the courageous."

The push for gun controls in the United States has little to do with efforts to protect lives and control crime. It has much to do with a culture conflict between what have been called "cosmopolitan America" and "bedrock America".

You see, cosmopolitan America associates guns with crime, war, and/or

the cruelties of the hunt--the Bambi Syndrome.

"Bedrock America", the foundation of the nation, associates guns with security, freedom, and wholesome recreation.

Gun control, ladies and gentlemen, is a cosmopolitan attempt to impose its anti-gun-ism on a pro-gun bedrock. And since cosmopolitan views permeate the media and educational establishments, cosmopolitan America has a propaganda advantage. This was stated in "USA Today" by Bill Tonso <sp?> in his column.

The liberals' anti-gun strategy takes advantage of several points: (1) they rely on emotionalism and ignorance; (2) they utilize the Hegelian principle; (3) we are inundated with their propaganda onslaught; (4) they attack the pro-gun groups; (5) they extend the ban to handguns and ammunition; they link guns to drugs and the drug war; and then they split off gun owners from the law enforcement community.

Law-abiding, good Americans are portrayed to the law enforcement community as some kind of strange, weird lunatics.

And somehow, the term "right wing" always emerges in all of this. And the right wing is always portrayed as wearing swastikas and looking like Nazi storm troopers, when actually it is the opposite.

You see, ladies and gentlemen, let me clear up one point here that the Marxists don't want you to know: every scale has two ends. The ends of the scale are always opposing to each other. On the scale of right and left, you have one end that has total control, and one end has absolutely no control. This is the scale that measures right and left.

Now, folks, if liberalism equals socialism equals communism, and those things lead to more control by bigger and bigger government, then the left must be the side of the scale which has control. And indeed, it is. Witness, the old Soviet Union. Witness, Cuba's communist regime. Communism is just an extreme of socialism.

Now, how can the right wing be portrayed as Nazi-like if the extreme of the right wing is the complete absence of control--in other words,

anarchy?

Both extremes are bad.

The truth is, "Nazi" means "national socialism" and is on the left. It is on the left, ladies and gentlemen, just a little above communism.

Somewhere toward the middle of these two extremes is what is known as a "republic" which is what this nation was founded to be. It's not anymore. But that's what it began as--a republic.

Right wing, traditionally, is for less government, less control, more freedom.

As the Marxists begin their campaign to bring more control into your life, the way they get you to oppose less control is by portraying the right of the spectrum as Nazis wanting to enslave you, control you. And it is a lie.

People on the right want less government, less control, more freedom.

The extreme of the right, anarchy, is bad. It cannot work.

The extreme of the left wing, communism, is bad. It cannot work.

We all must work somewhere toward what this country was supposed to be, and that is a republic.

I hope you all understand what I am conveying to you.

Now, why is unilateral personal disarmament so dangerous? Well, first of all, it's unconstitutional. Our Founding Fathers knew that defence of life, liberty, and property is impossible without firearms.

Personal disarmament leaves honest, law-abiding people at the mercy of violent criminals and--most important, ladies and gentlemen--government tyranny, which is the real reason why we were given the Second Article and Amendment--not to give you right to hunt, as the NRA wants you to believe when they send out their literature to join the NRA and protect

your right to hunt.

The NRA is not on your side. I can guarantee you that. And for a whole people who are so opposed to registering their guns, it's really beyond my comprehension how you could register your guns by joining the NRA, but you do that, because you are lazy. You cannot write the letters. You cannot lobby. You cannot pound on your Senators' and Representatives' desks, so you join the NRA and want them to do it for you because you are lazy. You can always rationalize how you don't have time to do anything because you're so busy with work and your family.

Well, dear sheeple, so, so is everyone else.

Of what use are fancy laws and flowery constitutions when you are denied the proper tools to defend yourself?

What if we all gave up our weapons tonight?

Who can guarantee us, and what good is their guarantee that government will not become tyrannical and oppressive and enslave the citizens of the United States of America?

I say no one can guarantee us that, and no one can guarantee their guarantee enough to make me even think about it, much less do it.

John Adams said that:

"Arms in the hands of the citizens may be used at individual discretion for the defence of the country, the overthrow of tyranny, or private self-defence."

You should know who John Adams is.

James Madison, in "The Federalist Papers" said that:

"Americans need never fear their government because of the advantage of being armed, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation."

And of course, you know who James Madison is, don't you?

Noah Webster said, in an examination into the leading principles of the Federal Constitution, 1787, this:

"Before a standing army can rule within its own country, the people must be disarmed as they are in almost every kingdom in Europe. The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword because the whole body of the people are armed and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops that can be, on any pretence, raised in the United States."

The American Federation of Police issued this statement:

"There are many Americans who fear for their lives. They know that at some point they will have to protect themselves, their own families, and their own property. Should these people be disarmed? No. We don't need to disarm our loyal citizens, our friends, and our neighbours."

A prominent Houston police official made this statement:

"The police cannot prevent most crimes. They cannot be everywhere at once, nor can they anticipate where a criminal will strike next. They can only pick up the pieces..."

They can only pick up the pieces.

"...or bodies, after the fact. Armed citizens have to protect themselves. We cannot. It is the law of the jungle."

Charles Reese <sp?> in King Features said this:

"The situation is this: the environment is safer for the criminal than for the innocent. If we lack the will to reverse this situation, we do not deserve to be free."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when our Founding Fathers wrote "militia"--militia--they meant all able-bodied men with personal firearms, not government-paid soldiers, or soldiers who can be

conscripted by the government.

What was the purpose of the militia? To guarantee a free state by repelling foreign invasions, domestic insurrections, and federal government tyranny.

This is why, ladies and gentlemen, the State Governors, not the President, commanded their respective Army Reservists, to have troops available to fight an oppressive federal government, should the need ever arise.

Article I, Section 8, (15) through (16), of the Constitution says this:

"The Congress shall have Power...to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union,..."

Not of the Federal United States.

"...suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;...."

It is the duty of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, not the Federal United States, ladies and gentlemen, but the Union of the several states, united for their mutual benefit and protection. Not the phony, foreign government, constituted within the boundaries of the Federal District of Columbia.

You see, there are as many as three different definitions for the term "United States". It also says:

"...To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States [of America], reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;...."

Now, the gun controllers are trying to distort the Second Amendment by saying that "militia" means the National Guard, not private citizens. I'm going to clarify that for you, tonight, where there will be no misunderstanding whatsoever, and you will be able to procure and site

the law, the necessary studies and reports, and no one will be able to prevail against you.

"Militia" does not--"militia" does NOT--mean a professional, National Guard. The people--the people--are the militia.

In the "Officers Guide", ladies and gentlemen, in the "Officers Guide", Section 57, of the National Defense Act, the militia is defined, and it states this:

"The militia of the United States consists of all male citizens of the United States and all other able-bodied males who have, or shall have declared their intention to, become citizens of the United States, who are more than eighteen years of age and not more than forty-five years of age, and said militia shall be divided into three classes: the National Guard, which our Forefathers described as the 'select militia' separate from the term 'the militia'; the Naval Militia; and the Unorganized Militia."

Again, that's Section 57 of the National Defense Act, Officers Guide.

The United States citizenship issue notwithstanding, the militia is composed of able-bodied males who are between eighteen and forty-five years of age.

The National Guard is merely one of the classes of the militia, not the militia itself. And as you will hear later, has been absolutely stated by the United States Senate to not be any part of the militia.

Is a slice of pie the pie itself? No. Of course not.

Not being in either the National Guard or the Naval Militia, most men are therefore part of the so-called unorganized militia.

Now, what does "well regulated" mean? It means simply "well trained" or "to put in good order".

When reading law, the definitions of its day apply, not modern, different definitions. The intention and the definition that existed



when the militia was created by our Forefathers is the definition that applies to the militia today, then, and tomorrow, and one hundred years from now--unless the definition is changed by law. This is why law libraries keep dictionaries hundreds of years old, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, "well regulated" does not mean regulated by some bureaucracy. The militia was to group and train several times a year to remain a potent fighting force in our Forefathers' day. They met upon the village green, elected their officers, and at stated intervals, would meet upon the green to drill and to train.

Had our Founding Fathers meant a government-paid, standing, reserve army, they would have said so. In fact, they prohibited such an army except in times of invasion, insurrection. And they limited the funding of such armies to a period of two years, after the expiration of which, Congress either had to fund the standing army again--and only if there was an invasion or insurrection could they do it under the Constitution.

That should tell you something, right there--if you have a brain.

The Second Amendment says:

"..the people...."

The people--not militiamen soldiers--have the right to keep and bear arms.

I find it especially illuminating that the Founding Fathers considered this right second in importance only to the right of free speech.

Switzerland, for example, insists that every male of military age must keep a powerful, fully-automatic rifle in his home. Every home must be armed by law. Some even keep rocket launchers, grenades, and mortars.

Yet Switzerland has one of the most law-abiding people, the lowest crime rate, the least violence of any country in the world, and has remained free for over a thousand years; and no wonder! What thief, what robber, what murderer, what rapist, would dare to attempt to enter a home where the owner possessed a 3.5-inch rocket launcher, an automatic rifle, and

maybe a mortar? Not to mention hand grenades.

Now, for your information, over 99% of all guns in America are owned by honest citizens. Robert A. Heinlein states:

"An armed society is a polite society."

And he is absolutely correct.

John F. Vanziff III <sp?>, President of the National Law Center, George Washington University, said:

"Personal...."

Excluding police and military use.

"Personal defence with firearms in America occurs more than 2,000 times per day."

Do you understand what I just said?

"Personal defence with firearms in America occurs more than 2,000 times per day."

Well out-numbering any harm that firearms could possibly cause ever in any given day in the history of this country. He goes on to say:

"There is now a significant body of evidence which indicates that citizens' firearms use is a major deterrent to crime. The threat of being shot by a citizen is a far more effective deterrent than the threat of being caught by the police."

Gary Kleck <sp?>, February 1988 issue of "Social Problems", said:

"Civilian ownership and use of guns has a deterrent and social control effect on violent crime and burglary."

Jeff Cooper, the American Pistol Institute, said:

"Clearly, the ideal society would be one in which the good guys were armed and the bad guys were not. Since that is both technically and politically impossible, the preferred alternative is a society in which everybody is armed, since there are far more good guys than bad guys."

Simple, isn't it?

Luke, chapter 12 [sic-chapter 11], verse 21 says, and I quote:

"When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace:...." [Luke 11:21]

Unquote. Contrary to "Time" magazine and other anti-gun megaphones, this country is NOT rampant with misuse of privately-owned firearms. The Stockton school yard massacre, committed by a man who had been jailed and released by liberal judges seven times--and in our series on mind control you'll find out where he really came from--and Coline <sp?>, Texas shooting are the front page, less-than-one-percent exception.

What if George Henner <sp?> didn't use guns to kill two dozen people, but simply drove his pickup truck over the diners after crashing through the restaurant window. Should personal vehicles then be outlawed? And the truth is, death by personal vehicle--cars, trucks, buses--are so numerous each year, it's absolutely insane to even complain about death by firearms.

Statistically, it would make more sense, as a several-ton car is much deadlier than even the most powerful firearm, and cars kill 25,000 more Americans each year than all shootings combined. Yet no one is screaming about getting rid of the cars.

Nope. It's all the fault of guns.

Don't believe the media propaganda that accidental gun shots are commonplace. There are fewer cars in America than guns. Yet cars kill nearly thirty times more people each year.

Falling from heights kills over ten times more people than guns. In

fact, fewer people die from accidental gun shots than from choking on food. Yet no one is raising a cry to outlaw food.

Based on the hard statistics, it would seem that we need car control, height control, and eating control much more, ladies and gentlemen, than gun control.

Do you understand what I am talking about?

Ask a Pole about gun control.

Ask a Lithuanian about gun control.

Ask a Russian about gun control.

Ask a Cuban about gun control, ladies and gentlemen.

Unilateral personal disarmament actually invites and promotes crime. William Ralph Inge <sp?> said:

"It is useless for sheep to pass resolutions in favour of vegetarianism while wolves remain of a different opinion."

Roy Innes <sp?>, National Chairman, Congress of Racial Equality, said:

"Criminals are well armed. Restrictive gun laws do not deter them. Since only decent citizens are disarmed by restrictive gun laws, society has aided and abetted the criminal by making his work less dangerous and difficult. Decent citizens must have the right of the Second Amendment protection, a recourse to legal means of self defence."

And the National Sheriffs' Association said:

"There is no valid evidence whatsoever to indicate that depriving law-abiding American citizens of the right to own firearms would in any way lessen crime or criminal activity. The National Sheriffs' Association unequivocally opposes any legislation that has as its intent the confiscation of firearms or the taking away from law-abiding American citizens their right to purchase, own, and keep arms."

I'm going to give you some references that you must obtain, or at least attempt to obtain, or copy the pertinent pages.

The United States Code, Service, Lawyer's Edition, Title X, Section 1 to Section 835; and the United States Code, Service, Lawyer's Edition, Title X, Section 836 to Section 950.

It's two volumes, ladies and gentlemen. Two volumes. If you cannot find it in your local library, or if you do not have a local university library, or law library, available to you in your area, you may be able to purchase these two volumes by calling this number: 1-800-527-0430.

In these two volumes is everything you need to know about the militia and, in order to have a well regulated militia, the Universal Code of Military Justice which you must apply.

If you live in the State of Arizona, it's the Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated, Volume IX, Title 26, Military Affairs and Emergency Services.

Again, that's the Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated, Volume IX, Title 26, Military Affairs and Emergency Services. You may be able to purchase that volume if you cannot find it in your local library, university library, or wherever you're going to go by calling 1-800-328-9352.

Now, we're going to get into the meat of the matter, folks. Pay attention. Pay attention, for this is important.

This is from the United States Code, Service, Lawyer's Edition, Title X, Armed Forces, Section 1 through 835. This is Chapter 13, "The Militia", Section 311: Militia Composition and Classes:

"The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least seventeen years of age and, except as provided in Section 313 of Title 32, USCS Section 313, under forty-five years of age, who are, or who have made a declaration of intention to become, citizens of the United States, and of female citizens of the United States who are commissioned officers of the National Guard. The classes of the Militia

are: (1) the organized militia which consists of the National Guard and the Naval Militia; and (2) the unorganized Militia which consists of the members of the militia who are not members of the National Guard or the Naval Militia."

Also, Title X, Armed Forces, Chapter 13, "The Militia", Section 311, Militia Composition and Classes:

"The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least seventeen years of age and, except as provided in Section 313 of Title 32, under forty-five years of age, who are, or who have made a declaration of intention to become, citizens of the United States, and of female citizens of the United States who are commissioned officers of the National Guard. The classes of the Militia are: (1) the organized militia which consists of the National Guard and the Naval Militia; and (2) the unorganized Militia which consists of the members of the militia who are not members of the National Guard or the Naval Militia."

"Appointments and Enlistments: Age Limitations. To be eligible for original enlistment in the National Guard, a person must be at least seventeen years of age and under forty-five, or under sixty-four years of age and a former member of the regular Army, regular Navy, regular Air Force, or regular Marine Corps. To be eligible for re-enlistment, a person must be under sixty-four years of age, must be a citizen of the United States and be at least eighteen years of age and under sixty-four."

Now remember, ladies and gentlemen, that extends the age of the unorganized militia to age sixty-four IF you are a former member of the regular Army, regular Navy, regular Air Force, or regular Marine Corps.

And this, ladies and gentlemen, is the Militia, National Guard, and State Militia for the State of Arizona, and--let me make sure I have the right one here. Oh, no. No. I'm sorry. This is the list of U.S. Supreme Court Digest, Lawyer's Edition, 10(a), Mandamus to Passport which Covers the Militia. And we may get to that if we have time. If we don't, you can always look that up.

The Constitution of the State of Arizona, ladies and gentlemen, Article

II, Section 26, Bearing Arms. And you need to go to your own state constitution and your own state laws in order to find out what your limitations or what your laws require for the militia in your particular state.

The Constitution of the State of Arizona, Article II, Section 26, Bearing Arms:

"Section 26. The right of the individual citizen to bear arms in defence of himself or the State shall not be impaired. But nothing in this Section shall be construed as authorizing individuals or corporations to organize, maintain, or employ an armed body of men."

And I might add, folks, it doesn't restrict you from doing that either. But it's talking about individuals or corporations to organize, maintain, or employ an armed body of men. This comes from the old days of the range wars, when ranchers would hire gangs of gunmen. It does not apply to the militia.

Arizona Constitution, Article XVI, Section 1: Composition of Militia:

"Section 1. The militia of the State of Arizona shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens of the State between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years, and of those between said ages who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, residing therein, subject to such exemptions as now exist or as may hereafter be created by the laws of the United States of this State.

Composition and Designation of Organized Militia, Section 2--and remember, this just pertains to the organized militia:

"The organized militia shall be designated the National Guard of Arizona and shall consist of such organized military bodies as now exist under the laws of the Territory of Arizona or as may hereafter be authorized by law."

Conformity to Federal Regulations, Section 3:

"The organization, equipment, and discipline of the National Guard shall

conform as nearly as shall be practicable to the regulations for the government of the armies of the United States."

And remember, there is also the unorganized militia which is all others who are not members of the organized militia, and includes all those up to age sixty-four who have served in the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marines.

In the Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated, Volume IX, Title 26, Military Affairs and Emergency Services, it states under Article 2, Militia, Section 26 through 121. Composition of Militia. It talks about persons exempt.

"The militia of the State of Arizona consists of all able-bodied citizens of the State between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years, and all residents of the State between such ages who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States except (1) persons exempted by the laws of the State of the United States; (2) idiots, lunatics, totally blind persons, and persons convicted of infamous crimes;...."

Which are felonies, ladies and gentlemen.

"...(3) judges and clerks of courts of record; (4) state and county civil officers holding office by election and members of the legislature; and (5) ministers of the Gospel.

Now, why do you think they say that judges and clerks of courts of record, state and county civil officers holding office by election and members of the legislature cannot serve in the militia?

It's simply because, ladies and gentlemen, the purpose of the militia is to enforce the laws of the State. If the State becomes oppressive or tyrannical, if the judges and the clerks of courts of record, state and county civil officers holding office by election and members of the legislature could hold positions of officers of the militia, their tyranny would be complete and the militia would not be able to serve its purpose, which would be to overthrow the tyranny and reinstate the law of the land.



Do you understand, dear sheeple? I hope that you do.

And, Title 26, under subheading (e):

"The unorganized militia consists of members of the militia not members of the National Guard or State Guard when organized."

And it provides for the organization of a State Guard. It provides for how and when and by whom the militia can be called up, and what they are to do. Under Section 26, it also states:

"No person, partnership, or corporation shall maintain troops under arms. But this section shall not be deemed to prohibit a business, plant, or firm from maintaining armed guards for protection of their property from damage or loss, or formation of a state police or highway patrol, or the existence of county and municipal police forces and sheriff's posse."

And of course, it does not exclude the militia which exists always, always, as every able-bodied male between the ages of eighteen and forty-five.

Now, you may say, this is all well and good. But what, what does it all mean?

Well, let me read you some more references that may clarify this for you. 18 USCS, Section 1385: Use of Army and Air Force as Posse Comitatus:

"Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or Act of Congress, wilfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the law, shall be fined not more than ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

I think that's very plain.

The Constitution of the United States of America, Article I, Section 8,

Clause 15, states:

"The Congress shall have Power...to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;...."

What does it mean, "execute the Laws of the Union"? It means, ladies and gentlemen, just that. To support the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the legal and lawful laws of the Union. No one in the militia, or any armed forces for that matter, is authorized--and, in fact, is strictly forbidden--to obey any illegal or unlawful order.

Now, some out there have argued and will continue to argue that the National Guard is the militia, and that is just not so. According to federal law, they are distinctly separate entities.

Distinctly separate entities, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, before I've talked about this. I never read it to you and I never cited the exact study that I'm going to cite to you now, simply because everything was packed away and I couldn't find it. But now I have it and I'm going to read it to you exactly and cite exactly where you can find it, because this is the clincher. This is the clincher, folks.

In 1982--and I believe I said somewhere between '81 and '83 when I talked about this previously--that's 1982--in 1982, the United States Senate published their report which, among other things, specifically addressed this subject. This subject, ladies and gentlemen. And I'm going to clarify it for you right now.

This is from the Report of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session, February 1982, page 11.

One more time: Report of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session, February 1982, page 11. And I quote:

"The militia refers to a concept of a universally armed people, not to

any specifically organized unit. When the framers referred to the equivalent of our National Guard, they uniformly used the term 'select militia' and distinguished this from 'militia'.

So, the National Guard was termed the "select militia" and is completely different and distinguished from "militia".

"Debates over the Constitution constantly referred to organized militia units as a threat to freedom comparable to that of a standing army, and stressed that such organized units did not constitute, and indeed were philosophically opposed to, the concept of a militia. That the National Guard is not the militia referred to in the Second Amendment is even clearer today. Congress has organized the National Guard under its power to raise and support armies and not its power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia. (House Resolution Report No. 141, Seventy-Third Congress, First Session, February 5th, 1933.) This Congress chose to do, in the interest of organizing reserve military units which were not limited in deployment by the strictures of our power over the constitutional militia, which can be called forth only 'to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions'. The modern National Guard was specifically intended to avoid status as the constitutional militia, a distinction recognized by 10 United States Code, Section 311, Subsection (a)."

I'm going to read this whole thing over again. Pay close attention.

Report of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session, February 1982, page 11. And I quote:

"The militia refers to a concept of a universally armed people, not to any specifically organized unit. When the framers referred to the equivalent of our National Guard, they uniformly used the term 'select militia' and distinguished this from 'militia'. Debates over the Constitution constantly referred to organized militia units as a threat to freedom comparable to that of a standing army and stressed that such organized units did not constitute, and indeed were philosophically opposed to, the concept of a militia. That the National Guard is not the militia referred to in the Second Amendment is even clearer today.

Congress has organized the National Guard under its power to raise and support armies and not its power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia. (House Resolution Report No. 141, Seventy-Third Congress, First Session, February 5th, 1933.) This Congress chose to do, in the interest of organizing reserve military units which were not limited in deployment by the strictures of our power over the constitutional militia, which can be called forth only 'to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions'. The modern National Guard was specifically intended to avoid status as the constitutional militia, a distinction recognized by 10 United States Code, Section 311, Subsection (a)."

Now, how could a National Guard which was sent to the Middle East to fight in Desert Storm fulfil the strictures of the Constitution on the militia?

If you can figure that out, ladies and gentlemen, please let me know.

Until then, form your militias. Arm yourselves. No gun control laws, no requirements of registration, no waiting periods, no restrictions as to type of weapons or armament applies to any, ANY, element of the constitutional, legal and lawful militia of your state or of the United States of America.

Good night. And God bless you all.