

# Second amendment essay



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

One of the most highly debated amendments of the United States Constitution is the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment has been disputed for hundreds of years on exactly of its exact true meaning. The United States Constitution wrote the Second Amendment as " 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. " The argument that has lasted for centuries begins with the first part " A well regulated militia".

Over the years, many of the nation's supreme courts have ruled in a lot of different ways. The definition of a well regulated militia means to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions. The United States code described that militias are always subject to federal, state or local government control. It also described a " private" militia or army not under government control could be considered illegal and in rebellion, and as a result is subject to harsh punishment.

Many have argued that since the militias are " owned," or under the command of the states, that the states are free to disarm their militia if they so choose, and therefore of course no individual right to keep arms exists. The militia is not " owned," rather it is controlled and organized by the government. The federal governments as well as the states have no legitimate power to disarm the people from which militias are organized.

At the time it was ratified in 1791, the Second Amendment was intended to have at least two security purposes other than a well regulated militia. The

first purpose which was a position taken by Thomas Jefferson was the “ a practical purpose”. The practical purpose was to protect people from thieves, bandits, Native Americans and slave uprisings. The second purpose was a position that was taken by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison which was known as the “ political purpose”.

The political purpose was to remind the rest of the world that the United States is well-armed. James Madison wrote the original proposal of the Second Amendment which was later changed by Congress which stated “ The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; a well-armed and well-regulated militia being the best security of a free country; but no person religiously scrupulous of baring arms shall be compelled to render military service in person. I can understand how the meaning of a well regulated militia has been argued over the centuries. I feel that James Madison’s original version of the Second Amendment proved that the intent was for the people to have the right to keep and bear arms under the United States Constitution. I feel that when the version was changed it opened the door for misinterpretation. The next argument disputed for centuries is “ the right of the people to keep and bear arms. ” Individual rights advocates interpret the word “ people” to mean citizens as individuals.

Individual rights advocates have also argued the meaning “ to keep and bear arms” as the retention of personal firearms in the home, the free carrying of them elsewhere, and learning how to handle them. Collective rights advocates interpret the word “ people” as the collective body meaning the American people. They also argue the meaning “ to keep and bear arms” as in the military sense that soldiers “ bear” arms, civilians “ carry” them, and <https://assignbuster.com/second-amendment-essay/>

society doesn't need citizen-soldiers since we have arsenals and public barracks in the form of police.

I would classify myself as an individual rights advocate. I believe that when the United States Constitution was written that the sole purpose was for the rights of the American people to protect themselves in the event that it was necessary to protect their lives or property. I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment. I am also a strong supporter of stronger gun laws. Having worked in law enforcement for several years, I have encountered hundreds of people in possession of firearms that shouldn't have them in their possession.

The Second Amendment allows for guns to be purchased by a law-abiding citizen for purposes of recreation, hunting and personal protection. I think that when the law-abiding citizens feel the need to sell firearms, they eventually end up in the hands of criminals. I think that if the government takes on stronger gun laws, the citizens will not have any means of protecting themselves or their families and will fall prey to criminals.

Studies have shown that they crime rate will increase if criminals know that homeowners are unable to protect their own property. I hope that the United States continues to support the Second Amendment for the rights of its citizens. My hopes in the future is that the government will strengthen the laws on purchasing firearms, and make tougher penalties for the people that are found in possession of them illegally.