I've rec'd 3-4 copies already of an email claiming that the Dick Act of 1902 ... well, let me post it:

"DICK ACT of 1902 - CAN'T BE REPEALED (GUN CONTROL FORBIDDEN) - Protection Against Tyrannical Government This criminal Cabal is counting on the fact that the American Citizens don't know this, their rights and the constitution. Don't prove them right.

The Dick Act of 1902 also known as the Efficiency of Militia Bill H.R. 11654, of June 28, 1902 invalidates all so-called gun-control laws."

No, the Dick Act repealed the Militia Act of 1792, and created the National Guard system. It says nothing about gun control. And it was extensively re-written in a couple of post-WWI Army Acts.

"It also divides the militia into three distinct and separate entities. ** SPREAD THIS TO EVERYONE ** The three classes H.R. 11654 provides for are the organized militia, henceforth known as the National Guard of the State, Territory and District of Columbia, the unorganized militia and the regular army."

I believe 10 USC 311 survives (and is almost the only section that has survived) from the original Act. That breaks the militia into two classes, organized (Guard) and unorganized. Why would the regular army have been part of the militia?

"The militia encompasses every able-bodied male between the ages of 18 and 45. All members of the unorganized militia have the absolute personal right and 2nd Amendment right to keep and bear arms of any type, and as many as they can afford to buy."

No authority cited for this, I notice. In any event, such a right would vanish once a person hits 45.

"The Dick Act of 1902 cannot be repealed; to do so would violate bills of attainder and ex post facto laws which would be yet another gross violation of the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights."

There is no such thing as a statute that cannot be repealed. The bill of attainder clause prevents Congress from convicting people without a trial. The ex post facto ban prevents punishment, or increased punishment, of actions taken before the law in question was passed. As noted above,
most of the Dick Act was rewritten by the Army Acts (I think of 1916 and 1920), so it HAS been repealed.

"The President of the United States has zero authority without violating the Constitution to call the National Guard to serve outside of their State borders.

The National Guard Militia can only be required by the National Government for limited purposes specified in the Constitution (to uphold the laws of the Union; to suppress insurrection and repel invasion). These are only purposes for which the General Government can call upon the National Guard."

Those are the only purposes for which the government can call out the militia. They got around this in the post WWI Army Acts by organizing the Guard as part of the reserve forces of the regular army, etc., and by requiring dual enlistment: any Guardsman also takes an oath to the U.S..

A bit of history: in 1912 the Attorney General indeed ruled that the militia could not be used outside the US. Then came WWI. The government dealt with that ruling by simply drafting National Guardsmen en masse. The Guard didn't care for this: its units were broken up, officers became enlisted men, etc.. So after the War, they were supporters of the system of dual enlistment, so that their units could be called up as units.

[Update: if your comment is blocked, try omitting your email. I had to block gmail, yahoo and some others due to unbelievable waves of spam comments linking to them, but set it so you can comment while giving no email address at all].
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counsel dew | January 25, 2013 10:53 PM | Reply

Gov. Perdue signed NCGS127A into law. In part, it states:

§ 127A-7. Composition of unorganized militia. The unorganized militia shall consist of all other able-bodied citizens of the State and of the United States and all other able-bodied persons who have or shall declare their intention to become citizens of the United States, who shall be at least 17 years of age, except those who have been convicted of a felony or discharged from any component of the military under other than honorable conditions.

Skyler | January 26, 2013 10:14 AM | Reply

If I recall, a bill of attainder is a law which singles out individuals as having broken the law. They would still get a trial, but the trial would simply confirm that the person is the one named in the law. It's a gotcha law that the Brits used and the colonies despised.

James N. Gibson | January 26, 2013 1:13 PM | Reply

It still surprises me as to the number of people who believe false history. First, the 1903 has not been repealed as you suggested by the 1916 National defense Act or legislation in 1920. The Federal definition of militia
as being of two types, organized and unorganized- is still active. The 1916 Act, section 79, invoked this description in the creation of reserve battalions from which men would be drawn to replace regular Army troops lost in combat. Section 79 requires the National Guard to be federalized as a first step. As for where these men come from, Section 79 states they come from the unorganized militia as defined by Act in 1903. It was section 79 that was repealed in 1920 as part of the effort at shutting down selective service following World War 1.

James Gibson | January 26, 2013 1:33 PM | Reply

Also, there is a third militia allowed under Federal Law: State Defense Forces. Created after WW1, it allows States to maintain a cadre strength militia separate from the NG. If war is declared this cadre force can then be easily expanded into a true militia allowing the State's NG units to be federalized. The size of the expanded force is not officially limited, but the Federal government has only promised to supply enough arms an equipment for a force one half the size of the regular NG force of the State. Of course the arms and uniforms have to be distinctly different to those of the active Army: if nothing meeting that criteria exist in Federal store nothing will be provided. In the Korean War the California SDF armed themselves, and during WW2 the Federal government sent the State Guard Shotguns (Biden Approved)

CDR D | January 26, 2013 5:54 PM | Reply

*Perpich v. DOD* goes into much detail on this subject of the Dick Act:

http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/496/334/case.html

CDR D | January 27, 2013 5:59 PM | Reply

I have to laugh, please excuse...

But this post begins with "Dick Act."

And the one preceding begins with "Holder Prepares.."

sorry...

Mike Gardner | January 27, 2013 9:57 PM | Reply

"Congress of the United States begun and held at the City of New-York, on Wednesday the fourth of March, one thousand seven hundred and eighty nine.

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."

The US Constitution
FRINGE:
noun:
something resembling a fringe : edge, periphery

Synonyms: borderline, bound, boundary, brim, circumference, compass, confines, edge, edging, end, frame, border, hem, margin, perimeter, periphery, rim, skirt, skirting, verge

INFRINGE:
Transitive verb: to encroach upon in a way that violates law or the rights of another

Intransitive verb: encroach — used with on or upon

synonyms see trespass

en·croach\in-ˈkrōch, en-\ intransitive verb
1 : to enter by gradual steps or by stealth into the possessions or rights of another

Synonym discussion: trespass encroach infringe invade mean to make inroads upon the property, territory, or rights of another. trespass implies an unwarranted or unlawful intrusion . encroach suggests gradual or stealthy entrance upon another's territory or usurpation of another's rights or possessions . infringe implies an encroachment clearly violating a right or prerogative . invade implies a hostile and injurious entry into the territory or sphere of another .

From Webster's Dictionary

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.

From the U. S. Constitution.

The writers of the Constitution chose their words carefully. Any law which in any way hinders the RIGHT to keep and bear arms is illegal. ALL gun control laws are illegal. A law creating multiple definitions and divisions of "militia" does not override the 2nd amendment.

George Ramos | January 27, 2013 10:05 PM | Reply

Just follow our 2nd Amendment as required by law

DrVino | January 27, 2013 11:23 PM | Reply

"suppress insurrection" - one man's insurrection is another's.....

I thing those two words worry some people - rightfully or not.

Anonymous | January 30, 2013 12:38 PM | Reply

My question is how do can a militia be "well regulated" as our 2nd amendment states, but not infringe upon our rights (however those rights are interpreted) and who regulates it?
tom | February 3, 2013 5:46 AM | Reply

The phrase "well-regulated" was in common use long before 1789, and remained so for a century thereafter. It referred to the property of something being in proper working order. Something that was well-regulated was calibrated correctly, functioning as expected. Establishing government oversight of the people's arms was not only not the intent in using the phrase in the 2nd amendment, it was precisely to render the government powerless to do so that the founders wrote it.

tom carney | February 4, 2013 2:55 PM | Reply

My understanding of a bill of attainder is the situation when the government convicts someone, that particular someone's property, the person of his heirs and the property of the heirs could be forfeit. Kinda like the RICO statutes. There are so many losses to our personal freedoms that I just cannot understand why those who claim to liberals push this stuff (gun control, creation of hate crimes, the loss of freedom from being tried again and again once having been acquitted, the use of imminent domain to seize property for non-government use, the RICO statutes created so that alleged racketeers didn't have the money to pay for their defense, and on and on). Remember, our founders were the best examples of liberals their era boasted.

Anonymous replied to comment from Mike Gardner | January 29, 2014 6:03 AM | Reply

Outstanding comment and right on you are Sir!

Isaiah | February 28, 2014 2:46 PM | Reply

10 U.S. Code § 311 (a) The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age...

anonymous | March 3, 2014 5:56 PM | Reply

I can't understand and do not agree with the part that says someone with a felony can't own a gun, I have a felony that was non violent, no weapon or gun involved and I think it is wrong to take my gun rights away, and my voting rights etc.,I can see taking gun rights away from someone who uses a gun to rob a bank or store or person or a gun to kill someone, then yes they should lose that right, but not someone who got a felony for any other reason should, the law needs to be amended to correct this flaw.

Riderguy | March 21, 2014 5:47 PM | Reply

I think one rationale is that someone who has committed a felony has shown either extraordinarily poor judgement, or a lack of respect for the rights of another, or both. As such they are not to be trusted with easily available lethal force.

Your situation may be different (marijuana laws could be a case in point) but that is probably what most people would say.
It is gratifying that a pro gun person such as yourself can still see though the Dick Act = anti gun control argument.

I disagree with the writer's comment that once a person reaches the age of 45 his "right" would "vanish." That would be tantamount to say that a RIGHT can be given and taken away. A RIGHT is unalienable PERIOD. I hold fast to the belief that the 18 to 45 issue was directly addressing state militia/National Guard and the DC divisions. Remember there was more than one type established. Each with its own set of regulations.

AAHAHAHAHAH, while it CAN BE REPEALED, IT HAS NOT, EVER, YET BEEN REPEALED.

Be Clear and thorough...militia acts cover the organized militia - the naval guard aka coast guard, and the national guard, the provision in the constitution to raise and support armies is that of foreign invasions, or off us soil warfare. Militia's cannot leave us soil by directive of congress OR the president. They can by volunteer though. And no act or revision of the militia act, aka the dick act 1902, has ever occurred. Only army acts - clearly, not affecting the militia.

Gov. Perdue signed NCGS127A into law. In part, it states:

§ 127A-7. Composition of unorganized militia. The unorganized militia shall consist of all other able-bodied citizens of the State and of the United States and all other able-bodied persons who have or shall declare their intention to become citizens of the United States, who shall be at least 17 years of age, except those who have been convicted of a felony or discharged from any component of the military under other than honorable conditions.

§311. Militia: composition and classes
(a) The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age and, except as provided in section 313 of title 32, under 45 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 members of the National Guard.
(b) 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.


Historical and Revision Notes
1956 Act
Revised section Source (U.S. Code) Source (Statutes at Large)
311(a)
311(b)
32:1 (less last 19 words).
32:1 (last 19 words).
In subsection (a), the words “who have made a declaration of intention” are substituted for the words “who have or shall have declared their intention”. The words “at least 17 years of age and * * * under 45 years of age” are substituted for the words “who shall be more than seventeen years of age and * * * not more than forty-five years of age”. The words “except as provided in section 313 of title 32” are substituted for the words “except as hereinafter provided”, to make explicit the exception as to maximum age.
In subsection (b), the words “The organized militia, which consists of the National Guard and the Naval Militia” are substituted for the words “the National Guard, the Naval Militia”, since the National Guard and the Naval Militia constitute the organized militia.

1958 Act
Revised section Source (U.S. Code) Source (Statutes at Large)
The words “appointed as . . . under section 4 of this title” are omitted as surplusage.
Amendments

PS....governer twat of any state cannot overrule congress....and that's the law :) government printing office, junior.

Robert | October 15, 2014 8:14 AM | Reply

A slight tangent but... Can anyone cite the authority or prohibition on the National Guard serving outside the United States in a State Active Duty status (that is, under the authority of the Governor, not the Federal Government)? Scenario: The Governor's family and staff are on vacation in Cancun when a massive hurricane strikes. Mexico declares a national emergency and all commercial flights are suspended. May the Governor order the National Guard C-130's assigned to his state to fly down to Mexico and "evacuate" the citizens of his state?

Timothy Roberts replied to comment from Josh Harn | January 8, 2015 8:21 AM | Reply

There was/is a Naval Militia that is distinct from the Coast Guard. Most states still have the term in their constitutions and Alaska and New York still maintain naval militias. Until recently Missouri still appointed officers to that militia, although the appointments were strictly honorary. I know of no evidence that the Coast Guard was ever part of the militia system, but would be grateful to you if you have information on the CG's origins out of the militia system.
Anonymous | March 12, 2015 1:03 AM | Reply

Have kids, guns are a heirloom to their once their reach a legal age to own the firearms

capa760 | April 20, 2015 10:34 AM | Reply

There are several defined important items:
ALL MEMBERS of the UNORGANIZED MILITIA have the ABSOLUTE PERSONAL RIGHT and 2nd AMENDMENT RIGHT to KEEP and BEAR ARMS of ANY TYPE, and AS MANY as they CAN AFFORD.
The Dick Act of 1902 cannot be repealed; to do so would violate bills of attainder and ex post facto laws which would be yet another gross violation of the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The government is the CORPORATE of the Corporation U.S.C. Section 3002(15, the states are subdivisions of the corporation, 28 U.S.C. Section 3002(10), cannot ban arms or stop people from defending themselves against a tyrannical government. IF the government TRIES TO BAN ALL GUNS through backdoor measures like domestic violence laws or through an unconstitutional U.N. declaration adopted by our current Marxist unconstitutional Congress, NO TREATY CAN SUPERSEDE THE CONSTITUTION. No one can change this. No executive order, Presidential directive, etc. **Communist Rules for Revolution #C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view toward confiscating them (ALL) and leaving the population helpless.

Brandon O replied to comment from anonymous | May 29, 2015 4:16 PM | Reply

By all rights, NO ONE should be barred from bearing arms as long as they're a citizen. Considering the ease and speed with which background checks can be conducted, it should be left up to the sellers' discretion. You could argue, but no matter the situation illegality of felon ownership doesn't stop felon ownership. It only increases difficulty of acquisition. If I were so inclined, I could steal a firearm. I could purchase a stolen firearm. I could even MAKE a firearm.

Brandon O replied to comment from Riderguy | May 29, 2015 4:49 PM | Reply

Consider this: Someone convicted of a crime must pay in one way or another. This is prison time, time on supervision/under restriction (such as probation/house arrest), and fines. In cases of violent crimes, especially shootings, the convict will do decades behind bars if not life. You do ALL your time behind bars, you pay your debt, your crime is public record FOREVER and anyone can look you up and judge for themselves, yet you STILL get saddled with a lifetime stripping of your 2nd amendment rights?
The moment we allowed this to happen and justified it with "yeah, but those are BAD people" opened the door for it to happen to anyone. Look up the law, it's not just felons. One Misdemeanor domestic violence
conviction will strip your 2nd amendment rights FOR LIFE. USC Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 44, ss 922. "Yeah, but those are WIFE BEATERS." Keep telling yourself that as your rights slowly erode away under the auspices of increased safety and security.

And really, after decades behind bars, with no hope of finding a job better than McDonald's toilet-scrubber, his best years behind him, filled with regret deeper than the Grand Canyon, maybe the guy just wants to buy a gun so he can put it on his mouth.

Reasoned Thought replied to comment from anonymous | May 30, 2015 11:36 AM | Reply

I think that to take away any rights of a former criminal who has served his time as prescribed by a judge and/or jury is wrong. Whether felon or not, after anyone has served their punishment as required by law they should have their full rights as citizens. Otherwise why let them out at all if they are going to be punished the rest of their life. That is not justice. With today's laws if you are prosecuted for having an copy of a music CD that you did not pay for, that is a felony. A vast majority of our laws this day and time are more often felonies than not, even for things that used to be misdemeanors. Our government has enough felony laws on the books that ANYONE can become a felon if they want you to be. Do the research and prove me wrong if you can, but so far I have not found a way out if you live in these Blessed United States.

GuitarMan | June 8, 2015 12:10 PM | Reply

Who knows better what the Second Amendment means than OUR Founding Fathers? Here are some powerful gun quotations from the Founding Fathers themselves.

The writers of the Constitution chose their words carefully. Any law which in any way hinders the RIGHT to keep and bear arms is illegal. ALL gun control laws are illegal. A law creating multiple definitions and divisions of "milita" does not override the 2nd amendment.

"A free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined..." - George Washington, First Annual Address, to both House of Congress, January 8, 1790

"No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms." - Thomas Jefferson, Virginia Constitution, Draft 1, 1776

"I prefer dangerous freedom over peaceful slavery." - Thomas Jefferson, letter to James Madison, January 30, 1787

"What country can preserve its liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance. Let them take arms." - Thomas Jefferson, letter to James Madison, December 20, 1787

"The laws that forbid the carrying of arms are laws of such a nature. They disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes.... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an
armed man.” - Thomas Jefferson, Commonplace Book (quoting 18th century criminologist Cesare Beccaria), 1774-1776

“A strong body makes the mind strong. As to the species of exercises, I advise the gun. While this gives moderate exercise to the body, it gives boldness, enterprise and independence to the mind. Games played with the ball, and others of that nature, are too violent for the body and stamp no character on the mind. Let your gun therefore be your constant companion of your walks.” - Thomas Jefferson, letter to Peter Carr, August 19, 1785

“The Constitution of most of our states (and of the United States) assert that all power is inherent in the people; that they may exercise it by themselves; that it is their right and duty to be at all times armed.” - Thomas Jefferson, letter to John Cartwright, 5 June 1824

"On every occasion [of Constitutional interpretation] let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying [to force] what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, [instead let us] conform to the probable one in which it was passed.” - Thomas Jefferson, letter to William Johnson, 12 June 1823

"I enclose you a list of the killed, wounded, and captives of the enemy from the commencement of hostilities at Lexington in April, 1775, until November, 1777, since which there has been no event of any consequence ... I think that upon the whole it has been about one half the number lost by them, in some instances more, but in others less. This difference is ascribed to our superiority in taking aim when we fire; every soldier in our army having been intimate with his gun from his infancy.” - Thomas Jefferson, letter to Giovanni Fabbroni, June 8, 1778

“The thoughtful reader may wonder, why wasn't Jefferson's proposal of 'No freeman shall ever be debarred the use of arms' adopted by the Virginia legislature? They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.” - Benjamin Franklin, "Pennsylvania Assembly: Reply to the Governor", November 11, 1755

"To disarm the people...[i]s the most effectual way to enslave them." - George Mason, referencing advice given to the British Parliament by Pennsylvania governor Sir William Keith, The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, June 14, 1788

"I ask who are the militia? They consist now of the whole people, except a few public officers." - George Mason, Address to the Virginia Ratifying Convention, June 4, 1788

"Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed, as they are in almost every country 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." - Noah Webster, An Examination of the Leading Principles of the Federal Constitution, October 10, 1787

"Besides the advantage of being armed, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation, the existence of subordinate governments, to which the people are attached, and by which the militia officers are appointed, forms a barrier against the enterprises of ambition,
more insurmountable than any which a simple government of any form can admit of." - James Madison, Federalist No. 46, January 29, 1788

"The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. A well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms, is the best and most natural defense of a free country." - James Madison, 1 Annals of Congress 434, June 8, 1789

"...the ultimate authority, wherever the derivative may be found, resides in the people alone..." - James Madison, Federalist No. 46, January 29, 1788

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves." - William Pitt (the Younger), Speech in the House of Commons, November 18, 1783

"A militia when properly formed are in fact the people themselves...and include, according to the past and general usage of the states, all men capable of bearing arms... "To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms, and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them." - Richard Henry Lee, Federal Farmer No. 18, January 25, 1788

"Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force. Whenever you give up that force, you are ruined.... The great object is that every man be armed. Everyone who is able should have a gun." - Patrick Henry, Speech to the Virginia Ratifying Convention, June 5, 1778

"This may be considered as the true palladium of liberty.... The right of self defense is the first law of nature: in most governments it has been the study of rulers to confine this right within the narrowest limits possible. Wherever standing armies are kept up, and the right of the people to keep and bear arms is, under any color or pretext whatsoever, prohibited, liberty, if not already annihilated, is on the brink of destruction." - St. George Tucker, Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England, 1803

"The supposed quietude of a good man allures the ruffian; while on the other hand, arms, like law, discourage and keep the invader and the plunderer in awe, and preserve order in the world as well as property. The balance of power is the scale of peace. The same balance would be preserved were all the world destitute of arms, for all would be alike; but since some will not, others dare not lay them aside. And while a single nation refuses to lay them down, it is proper that all should keep them up. Horrid mischief would ensue were one-half the world deprived of the use of them; for while avarice and ambition have a place in the heart of man, the weak will become a prey to the strong. The history of every age and nation establishes these truths, and facts need but little arguments when they prove themselves." - Thomas Paine, "Thoughts on Defensive War" in Pennsylvania Magazine, July 1775

"The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms." - Samuel Adams, Massachusetts Ratifying Convention, 1788

"The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been
considered, as the palladium of the liberties of a republic; since it offers a strong moral check against the usurpation and arbitrary power of rulers; and will generally, even if these are successful in the first instance, enable the people to resist and triumph over them." - Joseph Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 1833

"What, Sir, is the use of a militia? It is to prevent the establishment of a standing army, the bane of liberty .... Whenever Governments mean to invade the rights and liberties of the people, they always attempt to destroy the militia, in order to raise an army upon their ruins." - Rep. Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, I Annals of Congress 750, August 17, 1789

"For it is a truth, which the experience of ages has attested, that the people are always most in danger when the means of injuring their rights are in the possession of those of whom they entertain the least suspicion." - Alexander Hamilton, Federalist No. 25, December 21, 1787

"If the representatives of the people betray their constituents, there is then no resource left but in the exertion of that original right of self-defense which is paramount to all positive forms of government, and which against the usurpations of the national rulers, may be exerted with infinitely better prospect of success than against those of the rulers of an individual state. In a single state, if the persons intrusted with supreme power become usurpers, the different parcels, subdivisions, or districts of which it consists, having no distinct government in each, can take no regular measures for defense. The citizens must rush tumultuously to arms, without concert, without system, without resource; except in their courage and despair." - Alexander Hamilton, Federalist No. 28

"[[If circumstances should at any time oblige the government to form an army of any magnitude that army can never be formidable to the liberties of the people while there is a large body of citizens, little, if at all, inferior to them in discipline and the use of arms, who stand ready to defend their own rights and those of their fellow-citizens. This appears to me the only substitute that can be devised for a standing army, and the best possible security against it, if it should exist." - Alexander Hamilton, Federalist No. 28, January 10, 1788

"As civil rulers, not having their duty to the people before them, may attempt to tyrannize, and as the military forces which must be occasionally raised to defend our country, might pervert their power to the injury of their fellow citizens, the people are confirmed by the article in their right to keep and bear their private arms." - Tench Coxe, Philadelphia Federal Gazette, June 18, 1789

Mr Bigg replied to [comment from anonymous] | June 15, 2015 12:19 AM | Reply

Sir it say's in the 2nd amendment "NO FREE MAN". I interpret this as being. "no free man shall be denied the God given right to protect himself and his family. So you're either for felons having guns or not. You can't say because mine was "non violent" I shouldn't have that right stripped away FOREVER!! Personally my beliefs are if the crime was bad enough to send someone to prison and you don't want them to have a gun when they're "FREE" Than don't release them, if they're that much of a menace to society than keep them locked up. Besides criminals can get guns off the street easy as hell, or you can even make them in your garage.
control will never work in my opinion for the reasons stated before. I myself have no problems with anyone having a gun, criminals or not. If everyone carried most people wouldn't try to rob you or beat you because you have a gun to. I'm sure they don't wanna die over 20 bucks in a wallet or maybe zero since most people don't carry cash anymore! I hope they overturn all the laws that violate the United States Constitution and or the bill of right's! GOD BLESS AMERICA!! ]][][% 

Anonymous | December 16, 2015 9:32 AM | Reply

All members have a personal AND 2nd Amendment right, the age grouping is for clarification of members, AND 2nd Amendment right shows that ALL have a right to keep AND bear arms AND that right shall not be infringed upon. Not to worry this act still protects the 2nd Amendment for all ages. Member=18-45 have a personal AND 2nd Amendment right. Apparently the writer of this act knew that eventually someone would come along and question what is is, thus the And in the phrase.

**Leave a comment**

Sign in to comment, or comment anonymously.

Name 
Email Address 
URL

☐ Remember personal info?

Comments (You may use HTML tags for style) 

Preview Submit