

has ever adopted the policy of reducing to a minimum the number of cars in private hands. Automobile registration is not advocated or feared as a first step toward confiscation of all automobiles. However, registration lists did facilitate gun confiscation in Greece, Ireland, Jamaica, and Bermuda.[138] The Washington, D.C., city council considered (but did not enact) a proposal to use registration lists to confiscate all shotguns and handguns in the city. When reminded that the registration plan had been enacted with the explicit promise to gun owners that it would not be used for confiscation, the confiscation's sponsor retorted, "Well, I never promised them anything!"[139] The Evanston, Illinois, police department also attempted to use state registration lists to enforce a gun ban.[140]

Unlike automobiles, guns are specifically protected by the Constitution, and it is improper to require that people possessing constitutionally protected objects register themselves with the government, especially when the benefits of registration are so trivial. The Supreme Court has ruled that the First Amendment prohibits the government from registering purchasers of newspapers and magazines, even of foreign Communist propaganda.[141] The same principle should apply to the Second Amendment: the tools of political dissent should be privately owned and unregistered.

Gun Licensing

Although opinions on some form of gun licensing (auto licensing), 69 police power to deny That is exactly what not to those who a police get along. routinely been denied lack their husband have denied permit affiliation, or by is not an adequate

Class discrimination taxi drivers, who the city, are denied \$2,000 in cash. (anyway, and only r so.) As the court in the city may not have no greater ne city.[144] Carry

As Kopel wrote in, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa109.html>, "Trust the People: The Case Against Gun Control," Cato Institute Policy Analysis No. 109, July 11, 1988, p. 25.

The context here is explicitly gun ownership. The Second Amendment had an entirely different purpose from the First Amendment. Otherwise, why list them separately? There is a difference between the right of the people "peaceably to assemble" and the right of the people to "keep and bear arms"—that is, a right of the people to assemble under arms.

Armed political dissent satisfies the constitutional definition of treason.

Ronald Reagan said, Trust but verify. It is not even a question of verification. It is to fulfill the civic obligation to suppress insurrections not make them.

The greatest danger is a government that does not understand what it means to be a government.

The first business of Senator Leahy and the Senate Judiciary Committee (Jan. 30, 2013) is to clarify the difference between Civil Society and the State of Nature which is the state of anarchy. The rule of law, the state's monopoly on violence, and state's internal sovereignty all mean the same thing. Members of Congress are under oath of public office. That oath marks the difference. Anyone who does not know the difference is in the words of John Locke, very familiar to the Founding Generation, a "Patron of Anarchy" (...2ndtreatise.html#94).

Anything else is pandering to a malignant constituency. The courts have settled the issue for policy making purposes (.../park2007.pdf).