What Authority do Courts Have Over the Second Amendment?



by Lex Greene

In a July 5th article in Epoch Times titled <u>Texas Joins 21</u> <u>Other States Asking Supreme Court to Protect Second Amendment</u>, writer Jack Phillips celebrates twenty-two states joining a law suit headed to the US Supreme Court asking the court to "uphold the Second Amendment" following a typically "unconstitutional" ruling in Hawaii and the 9th Circuit Court in California.

Millions of American "conservatives" seem elated by this news, as if they trust the US Supreme Court to uphold anything in the Constitution or Bill of Rights. But this story begs an even bigger question… Why do people ask a *mother-may-I* question to courts who are NOT their mom?

What "legal standing" (legal authority) does any court in the USA have over the Bill of Rights and the Second Amendment?

Why are twenty-two states asking any court to "uphold the Second Amendment" as if the court has any legal jurisdiction over the Bill of Rights? Everything in the Bill of Rights stands just as it was adopted on December 15, 1791. It means exactly what it says, nothing more and nothing less. It was written and adopted in plain English, so that no one needed an expert in legalese to explain it to them.

Without these <u>Ten Original Amendments</u>, the original colonies would have never ratified the U.S. Constitution in 1787. The colonies demanded additional protections from future Federal

tyranny in the form of the Bill of Rights before they would agree to adopt the Constitution itself. The Founders working to pass the Constitution had to agree to the following Bill of Rights to gain support for their Constitution, which followed four years later in 1791.

The Second Amendment at the center of yet another frivolous suit reads as follows;

"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."

These 26-words couldn't possibly be any clearer...

- 1. being necessary to the security of a free State (the sole purpose of the amendment)
- 2. the right of the people (every single legal US Citizen)
- 3. to keep (own and-or possess)
- 4. and bear arms (to bear means, to carry)
- 5. shall not be infringed (shall not be regulated in any way by any Federal authority)

Now, the US Constitution governs the Federal Government, not the people. The Bill of Rights is NOT an enumeration of Citizen's Rights. It's an additional enumeration of items which the Federal Government is strictly prohibited from ever infringing upon, regulating, limiting, eliminating, amending or in any way touching, the inalienable Natural Rights of the People.

The States and Local governments are prohibited from enacting laws, statutes, or ordinances which themselves, violate the protections of the people as they exist in the Bill of Rights. So, no one has "legal standing" (legal authority) to prevent or limit the Rights of the People to "keep" (own) or "bear" (carry) arms, free from any restrictions whatsoever.

The modern assault on these Natural Rights hinges upon this

section of the Second Amendment — "A well-regulated militia;"

As has been the case for more than two-hundred years now, the "legal authorities" are once again trying to use their <u>British Common Law Courts</u> to amend the US Constitution and Bill of Rights via judicial fiat (case law) — by simply issuing a new definition to old words. Typical legal-beagle word-smithing is used to undermine the Supreme Law of the Land and the Natural Rights of the People.

In 1787 and 1791, there was no "standing army." According to the historical writings of our Founders, there was never supposed to be. Therefore, at the time, "a well-regulated militia" meant the Citizens at large. That's still what it means today.

Further, the reason there is — and can be no — limits or restrictions on Citizen's Right to keep and bear arms is because it's essential to "the security of a free State," it's downright necessary. The second amendment exists to protect ALL Natural Rights of the People. Without it, the People have no way to protect any of their Rights or liberties.

Mere days before the July 4th weekend to celebrate our Independence as a "free sovereign people," fake white house resident Joe Biden took to the press and openly threatened all American Citizens with this statement, putting a fine point on the subject… "Biden says future patriots face lost cause against tyranny; U.S. has F-15's and nuclear weapons' — as if Posse Comitatus doesn't exist at all.

This my dear friends, is exactly why the Second Amendment exists, why it has no restrictions on what type of weapons Citizens have a Natural Right to keep and bear, and why our Founders put everything in place for the People to protect themselves from government tyranny, that they all knew would one day come.

Once adopted, no one in government has any authority whatsoever to infringe upon these Rights by any means or methods, certainly not the "legal opinion" of nine unelected and totally unaccountable political appointees on the US Supreme Court or any other court.

Which leaves us with this one question...

Why are twenty-two so-called "conservative states" asking any court to uphold anything in the Bill of Rights? No court in the country has any jurisdiction over the Bill of Rights, nor does the legislative or executive branches of government, federal, state, or local.

By asking the court this question, they are pretending as though the courts have authority on the matter, and placing the People in harm's way, awaiting a decision from nine politically appointed oligarchs, all but two of whom couldn't care less about the People's Rights, Justices Thomas, and Alito.

What if the court issues the wrong answer? Are these twentytwo states going to abide by an unconstitutional answer from the high court? Are these twenty-two states going to ignore an unconstitutional ruling from the court? If so, why bother to even ask the court a question they have no legal purview over?

The road to hell is often paved with good intentions! Or...is it that these twenty-two states are simply playing the British Common Law game of "legal precedence" to hide behind a Supreme Court opinion in order to participate in disarming all Citizens?

As for the Epoch Times writer, does he not know any of these facts, or is he too, participating in the current affront to all Natural Rights of the People? Do you really think the twenty-two states don't know what I just explained?

Time will expose all of them! But it may be too late to stop

them if the People don't pay attention and ignore the works of the so-called "experts." Everything wrong in the USA today was done by "experts" in many fields, the legal profession above all others.

Americans need to study and learn their real Rights, or they will have no means of protecting any of those Rights! STOP asking courts to answer questions that they have no constitutional authority over...unless, you want to be ruled by nine unelected lifetime politically appointed oligarchs, whom we have little or no power over.

The people who do know these facts intimately, are the "experts" who use British Common Law courts in the USA today, to undermine everything the Founders created 245-years ago. They rely entirely upon the sad reality that more than 80% of Americans have no clue about any of this. Most don't know what their Rights are or where they come from, much less how to properly protect those Rights.

If that doesn't change fast, it's all over for the Great Experiment called The United States.

© 2021 Lex Greene - All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Lex Greene: NWVLexGreene@gmail.com