

The right of the people to keep and bear arms is a cornerstone of this experiment in Democracy, this United States of America. Those of you saying that we cannot handle, or should not have the right to bear arms as defined by the Second Amendment of our constitution, are saying that this experiment in Democracy has failed. And do you know what,... maybe it has. But, let us admit, as a whole nation, before we fool ourselves into thinking that we will be more secure by voluntarily throwing away more of our rights, that we have failed. We have failed and therefore we need more laws because we the people can't handle our constitutional rights. Personally, I am not quite ready to say that. I don't believe it.

I have heard it said that the founding fathers did not invade a day when weapons were as potent as they are today. The founders were talking about muskets, the argument goes, not "assault weapons."

In the late 1700's the arms that the citizen could own were equal to the arms that a national standing army would possess i.e. "Muskets." The citizen militia did not have its right to bear arms infringed to the point that we do today. The citizen today cannot bear the arms of the standing army or National Guard. We cannot have grenade launchers or RPG's or attack helicopters and guess what? We are not asking for them. We don't want them. We are reasonable. We are happy with the way things are. We are fine with not owning machine guns. We are content with the current infringements on the inalienable rights recognized by the Second Amendment. What we are doing is stating that we do not buy the premise that the imagined security gained by banning a variety of guns outweighs what is lost, that thing being the spirit of the second amendment. That thing being, some very dark day that we all hope never comes, a fighting chance.

We have all heard the argument that the second amendment refers to the National Guard, not the private citizen. The problem there is, that pesky little word, "free." As in: A well regulated militia being necessary for the security of a FREE state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Well, if the militia is the National Guard or standing army, then I guess North Korea is very Free State. If you take the word "free" out of the second amendment you can make some interesting arguments. But the word is there.

The second amendment is not about hunting. It is about citizens being able to fight if they have to.

One more thing. And I can't speak for all here, but I think it is safe to say that we would be willing to give up some freedom to keep our children safer. But there isn't proof that such is the case.

I cannot imagine one of my children not coming home because a sociopath went crazy. My heart aches for those families.

But I don't believe that putting further restrictions on sane, law abiding citizens is an answer.

Thank you,

Eric Sodergren.