"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." (Second amendment "the bill of rights")

The second amendment is very short but highly misunderstood. There some very controversial interpretations of this amendment. One is the argument of what is considered an "arm". Another argument is considered "A well regulated militia". Different issues are how far the atf can regulate when and why it would be lawful to use or sell "arms".

Back when the second amendment was written an "arm" was considered a weapon of the era some examples are muskets and canons. Some say the 2nd amendment only protects weapons that can be used directly against an attacker without jeopardizing innocents. A few examples would be swords, knifes, shotguns, rifles, and maces. The 2nd amendment would not protect weapons that cause destruction and capable of harming innocents. A few examples would include machine gun, automatic weapons, antitank rockets, nuclear devices, small or large explosives, and booby traps. The amendment also does not protect modified weapons example being saw-off shotgun due to not being able to contribute to the maintenance at a militia, and has no use in common defense.(Dc v miller, Freerepublic.com). Who has to say that the forefathers didn't predict modern weapons and did not discriminate when granting the people the "right to bear arms"? In the end its how the morals and ethics of the peoples interpretations to say how much is to much.

What is considered a well organized militia? A militia constitutes as anyone who is a law abiding citizen and is properly trained and can be armed to defend their country

and themselves against crime and as a last resort against their government if it should turn to tyranny. A citizen militia is a group of citizens who are able and expected to defend their homeland in times of need. State organized militias should also be considered citizen militia because of its volunteered one example would be the National Guard. The 2nd amendment should not cover private militias that are anti-government and causes terrorism towards the nation. Self defense is the core of the 2nd amendment the right to individuals to resist tyrannical officials and if necessary band together with other law abiding citizens to over throw tyranny. The 2nd amendment should protect a person fighting or using arms against a public enemy, a political crime or an invader/plunderer to protect innocents from harm, death, rape, or other grave bodily harm. Not only is the 2nd interpreted in many ways it also has varying degrees of stipulations on how to handle an "arm" when allowed to carry it.

Imagine America the lawless gun slinging and mob controlled nation. Thanks to the ATF(alcohol tobacco and firearms) we can have a sense of security knowing there is a organization that is keeping illegal trade and use of "arms", or can we? When is controlling gun trade going overboard? Many reports have placed the ATF in situations that break the 2nd amendment. Jerry Michal a law abiding gun dealer in mesa Arizona allegedly was unrightfully abused and his goods taken is one example.(Keepandbeararms.com ATF Rips Off Another Gun Dealer in Arizona) There needs to be a enforcer to protect local and state laws from people in ATF otherwise what is the point of the 2nd amendment if there are government organizations out there that don't abide by it.

"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." (Second amendment "the bill of rights") The

Timothy johns Government The 2nd amendment

Pols 1101 – Introduction to American

2nd amendment, there to protect rights or just a nuisance for government officials to "interpret" to fit their needs, only time will tell. Would our forefathers be ashamed when they see their decedents misusing their words to infringe on the rights that were written to do the exact opposite?