Better information about the

SECOND AMENDMENT

to raise the Public's understanding of the Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Much of the Public believes the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is the source of their right to keep and bear arms, that it stands alone in the path of those who wish to impose gun control in the United States and there is a plan to rewrite or repeal this amendment to bring about this control. These beliefs are a result of the mere parroting of previous false statements about the Second Amendment and a failure to study the broader concepts of the Constitution for the united States of America, the Constitution of your State and life in general. This pamphlet is offered to help make more informed discussion with government administrators and decisions about the course of your nation [Hosea 4:6].

We, the People, as assembled in conventions in their respective states, not the States nor the then-nonexistent national government, ratified the Constitution for the united States of America. The Preamble to its Bill of Rights declared, "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 ..." It was the same People, assembled in these conventions, who authorized the Bill of Rights as an additional layer of protection for their States and themselves. The 2nd Amendment therefore only applied to the national government and the People had possessed the right to keep and bear arms prior to the Second Amendment. By this Preamble, before the 2nd Amendment is argued, one must first study the Constitution for any power granted to the national government to regulate State Citizens' use of firearms; none exists. Yet, Congress has infringed this right. How is this accomplished?

Some administrators of the general government tried various schemes to expand their power over the States and over the People, without lasting success, but by the 1850's had come upon the most perplexing and controversial subject ever presented to the Public. Well, it wasn't exactly presented; instead, general misunderstanding of it was used against the States and later against the People.

At that time, cases were before the supreme Court, touching upon the identity of the We, the People and culminating in Dred Scott v. Sandford [60 U.S. 393]. It was only necessary to review and restate the founding and subsequent documents of the States and the united States to show only the White race was comprehended as the People and none other were Citizens. Chief Justice Taney cited a fundamental reason for one race to govern by adding "there is no *law of nations* standing between the People of the United States and their government, [page 451]." Congress reads court cases, too, and saw an opportunity to use an emotionally charged issue as a vehicle to make social change.

For example, the 2nd Amendment mentions three subjects: militia, State and the People. Congress figured it would be impossible to convince the People to rewrite or repeal the 2nd Amendment, and other interrelated parts of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, so they chose to alter the understanding of these three subjects; in effect, there would be no subject matter for the 2nd Amendment to act upon because there would be no true militias, no true States nor no true People of the united States. If Congress could change who is described as *the People*, then they could change every other concept of law without any informative debate.

To discover the original legal capacity of the People named in the 2nd Amendment, and the source of power which these administrators were trying to circumvent, one must examine the same "We, the People ... and our Posterity" named in the Preamble to the Constitution. By mentioning "our Posterity," the authors left the benefits of their labors to the descendants of the body of People of whom they were a part; this was no arbitrary transfer but depended on the actual physical blood relationship among this body of People which is otherwise known as a race or a nation of People. The rights of this People are inherent in their natural born offspring because there is no unrelated or intervening thing or person in their continuity. Through today's posterity you see the same Jefferson, Madison, John Locke, Moses, Abraham, Noah and Adam as well as all of the covenants with the God of Israel, His Son Jesus the Christ and the Holy Ghost.

Long before any public servant was elected, the People had wisely acted in this *family capacity* when they created their form of government and thereby dictated the purpose and scope of any public office. This principle affects many issues, among them: the right to life (continues the Posterity), the right to untaxed inheritance (continues the Posterity) and the futility of the NRA (an artificial person having no inherent rights). Not understanding this reduces an inarguable RIGHT and RESPONSIBILITY to defend one's self, family and nation to the level of statutory debate among the various Peoples, faiths and histories of the earth.

This is not to disparage any other People from preserving their own nation. The Declaration of Independence (1776) recognized, "one people (race) ... (may find it necessary) to assume among the Powers of the earth, the SEPARATE and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, ... (and) to secure these rights, Governments (plural, for each People their own Government) are instituted among men." The Constitution of Liberia (1847), wherein the Negro race composed the sovereign body, is another example of one People creating one Government for their protection alone.

The Courts of the States and the united States, meanwhile, saw the creation of the united States as a culmination of 6,000 years of history (re-gathering of Israel). Never was a more perfect union ordained and established since Israel under the Judges. Moreover, this nation was ushering in

the Kingdom of God wherein the law was written on the hearts of its Citizens [Hebrews 8:8-13].

Now observe how Congress seeks to *reduce* the qualifications of citizenship so the responsibilities of their office are *likewise reduced*.

Congress did not argue against the sovereignty of the People nor presume to add anyone to it [38th Congressional Record]; instead, they desired to create their own subservient body politic by arrogating private property, the slaves, to themselves as public property [starting at Amendment 13, Sect. 1]. Congress had no such authority so they proposed this power [Section 2] within the same amendment and submitted these contrivances to the State legislatures, not the People, for ratification.

Under Article 1:8:18, Congress has "necessary and proper" powers to carry out the Constitution but under Amendment 13:2, "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation," words carefully chosen to keep this amendment outside the scope of the original Constitution. This is a new well of unlimited power, it reserves to Congress the fate of this new class of persons, exclusive of the Judicial Power [U.S. v. Rhodes, 27 Fed. Cas. 785], and is found in the rest of the post-civil war amendments as well.

When a Citizen complains that an official is violating his oath of office or is failing to "uphold the constitution" as the Citizen understands it, he must realize the official is, in fact, upholding the new constitution, for a subject class of persons, consisting of the 13th and later amendments.

The administrators of the Courts used a non-judicial venue, conveyed by Congress, to shelter this fiction with a growing body of case law [SlaughterHouse Cases, 83 U.S. 36; U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649]. This statutory venue provides for adjudication of many issues, except this: whether Congress and the State legislatures can create a new body politic and its own legal system to displace We, the People – that would be a *judicial* question.

Nonetheless, the Courts revealed the quality of citizenship this new class suffered: " ... no right of trial by jury in civil cases; no indictment by grand jury necessary for prosecution; no right to confront witnesses; NO RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS [Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, page 98 and supporting cases]" (Emphasis added). This was the same due process given to slaves prior to the Civil War.

The Courts also maintained the distinction and inferiority of that jurisdiction to the original Citizenship of the People. "No White person ... owes (their) citizenship to the (13th and 14th) amendments [Van Valkenburg v. Brown, 43 California 43]." Congress had no penal power against state citizens to enforce 14th amendment civil rights [Civil Rights Cases, 109 U.S. 3].

Administrators continued their efforts, under the separate but equal doctrine, but were limited in their actions until White people unknowingly, yet voluntarily, changed their status (their legal representation to society) by subscribing to the Social Security Act [49 Stat. 620] and thereby assuming a statutory identity which would interfere with their legal ability to contest this system [Ashwander v. T.V.A., 297 U.S. 288]. Their rights (privileges) would then rise no higher than this Act of Congress, leaving them in the same legal position as the subjects of the 13th and later Amendments; the States have a similar scheme through their licenses to prevent judicial review of any rights issue.

Administrators, conniving or unwitting, have been working since the Civil War to impose *martial law rule* which sanctions abortion, perpetual debt, social strife (leading to yet more legislation) and our deliverance, UNARMED, into the hands of world government. This was supposedly done in the name of equality; yet, this equality has only been accomplished by bringing the common law rights of the original Citizens down to the subjection of slavery, making liberty equally impossible for all.

The Public hasn't a clue as to what has allowed this social change and for good reason: those administrators who desired to change the fundamental law of this nation were shrewd in picking the race issue because they could change public policy without public debate, expecting violence to erupt among men rather than calm discussion of their scheme. Let's talk!

The most immediate form of gun control is carried out by State "peace officers," defined as such by the State legislatures. Even the Sheriff is not recognized as having any powers of that office without the legislature's consent [RSMO 57.010, 590.020].

If your State is to be held to its rights and responsibilities as originally intended, it is useless to claim the 2nd Amendment because it is inapplicable to the State and only invokes the 14th Amendment with its limited form of due process; however, Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution for the united States prohibits the State from passing any bill of attainder [Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U.S. 277]. Your state, however, keeps your legal status spoiled so you may not seek remedy at the federal level. Likewise, membership in Social Security prevents the state government from granting your relief from the national government.

Of course, you must show that you are one of "We, the People" by inheritance; that you are a Citizen of your State and not a subject of the 13th and later amendments; that you are not licensed by the State, nor enfranchised to Congress, in any way; and that you uphold the Christian faith; otherwise, gun control makes a lot of sense, doesn't it?

Please take an interest and confirm this material for yourself. Every sentence is a talking point. This pamphlet may be copied and distributed freely only in its entirety; reference must be given to talkradiomore.com so the reader may obtain more information. Comments may be made through info@talkradiomore.com ©3-2024