

## Committee Hearing on Gun Control

Mr. Chairman and Honorable Representatives:

Today we're gathered to address events such as the tragic loss of life at Sandy Hook and Century 21 Theater and how they can be avoided in the future. This is a worthy goal, and it should be pursued intelligently and with much wisdom.

There are those who would say the Constitution, and therefore the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment are antiquated and for a different time in history. My question to you is what has changed? When the document was written, people murdered, lied, cheated, stole, raped and oppressed their fellow man. I submit to you that all of this continues to go on today; therefore, nothing has changed, and certainly not human nature. We have thousands of years of history to see that's true.

A careful reading of the Constitution will reveal that it restrains the government, and not "We the people". The authors of the Constitution recognized that man's nature is such that if under the guise of government, he is not restrained, then evil will be the result. The same is true for the state of Colorado as well as nationally.

We are then confronted with two evils; the evil of free choice by free individuals, as opposed to the evil of no freedom for people with no choice. History is replete with dictators of every stripe disarming their people in order to rule them with a heavy hand, and we can be eyewitnesses to these types of events through the marvelous technology of television and wireless transmission. We can watch people of other nations in real time as they are oppressed by their governments, and all they have with which to fight back is rocks and sticks. Of course, those weapons are very short range and ineffective. It is very dangerous and a slippery slope when governments have a monopoly on gun ownership – just look around the world and throughout history.

Of course, criminals come in the form of rogue elements such as robbers, thieves and murderers, but they also occupy the seats of power in government. The founders of America witnessed this first hand as the British oppressed and murdered many of them. One founder, Alexander Hamilton, co-authored the Federalist Papers, which were a series of newspapers published for the purpose of explaining the Constitution to the citizenry. In Federalist Paper #28 Hamilton said the purpose for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment was that "We the people" have the right to defend ourselves against a government that would betray us. In fact, the Declaration of Independence says we have the duty to do so.

{See Back}

The only way to do that is with the individual citizen having parity of weapons with the individual foot soldier – rifle for rifle.

If you representatives see your way clear to institute laws that severely limit, or even eliminate, that right to defend ourselves against criminals in or out of government, then who will defend us and our rights? The New York State Supreme Court has ruled that the government has no obligation or liability to protect the individual. This ruling arose from a case where a woman suffered a criminal attack in her home, and she called 911. The police didn't arrive in time to stop the attack, and she sued the police for failing to protect her. It went to the Supreme Court which decision I just quoted. The same applies true for attacks in crowded theaters, schools or any other public or private place where people are defenseless.

Certainly everyone here has seen the shadowy videos of police beating people senseless for no justifiable reasons, and what prevents the government pursuing this as a policy? Absolutely nothing but the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment prevents that.

As you deliberate, please keep these two thoughts in mind as well; when seconds count, the police are just minutes away, and also, freedom wasn't won with a registered gun.

Universal background checks are de facto registration which violates privacy, and when it comes to "certain" very controversial issues in our society, some people cry out very loudly for privacy and declare it as sacrosanct.

Whatever arguments are used to take away someone's rights today, the same arguments will be used to take away someone else's rights tomorrow. Ten rights are guaranteed for all time in the Constitution as inalienable – what is it about "inalienable" that people don't understand, and what is it about "no infringement" that people don't understand? The 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment is the only one that gives "We the people" the ability as a last resort to defend the other nine. Government is power, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment is a balancing power. We are a nation of checks and balances.

The hope and prayers of many people rest upon your wisdom and integrity that upholding and defending the Constitution – a basis for your oath of office – will be the decision you make, and that you will not be swayed by emotions and faulty arguments.

{See Front}