

## Though Still a Bit Confused....Doing a Fine Job!

By Anna Von Reitz



Many otherwise perfectly good and serious patriot organizations remain confused about the Constitutions and the fact that we, Americans, don't live under them.

One of the groups that seems closest to getting that straight is The Tenth Amendment Center, which clearly knows that the Tenth Amendment preserved undelegated "Powers" to the people and the States-- an important exclusionary limit on the presumed powers of the Federal Government.

They often come up with very worthy articles and actions that sometimes seem providential.

Here we are grappling with setting up the State Assembly Militias, a task and a subject that many people fear and misunderstand --- and here is The Tenth Amendment Center with an excellent article explaining the history, context and importance of our State Assembly Militias within the American Government.

I am reposting it here in its entirety for educational purposes:

### **Strong Militia Over Standing Armies**

Important lessons from the Founders on the right to keep and bear arms

One of the primary reasons the founders wanted a strong militia system with a well-armed general public was to minimize or even eliminate the need for a large, permanent standing army, even in times of peace.

Most people in the founding generation were extremely wary of standing armies. They were often referred to as "the bane of liberty."

They knew this from experience. From the standing armies that led to the massacre in Boston, to [the gun control scheme that kicked off the war for independence](#) – they lived it firsthand. As colonial resistance to taxes and other policies grew in 1774, the British responded by attempting to disarm the colonists.

Noah Webster understood this danger well, saying, “Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed.”

George Mason also minced no words.

“I abominate and detest the idea of a government, where there is a standing army.”

St George Tucker warned what would happen if there was a standing army and the people were disarmed:

“This may be considered the true palladium of liberty. ... The right of self defense is the first law of nature: in most governments it has been the study of rulers to confine this right within the narrowest limits possible. Wherever standing armies are kept up, and the right of the people to keep and bear arms is, under any color or pretext whatsoever, prohibited, liberty, if not already annihilated, is on the brink of destruction.”

This is why so many in the founding generation favored a strong militia system.

Patrick Henry summed it up during the Virginia ratifying convention.

“The militia, sir, is our ultimate safety. We can have no security without it.”

Why did the founders trust the militia and not a standing army? Because as George Mason said, the militia consists of “the whole people, except a few public officers.”

In other words, the people ultimately maintain control over the militia. In fact, they are the militia. But the government controls a standing army. It effectively serves as an extension of the government.

Henry Knox served as the first secretary of war in the U.S., and he recognized this distinction. In a letter to George Washington sharing his plan for organizing the militia dated [18 Jan. 1790](#), he emphasized that the militia should provide the primary defense and a standing army was distinct from the people at large.

“An energetic national militia is to be regarded as the Capital security of a free republic; and not a standing army, forming a distinct class in the community.”

He went on to say that “whatever may be the efficacy of a standing army in war, it cannot in peace be considered as friendly to the rights of human nature.” [Emphasis added]

Knox reflected a broadly-held view in the founding generation. People generally acknowledged the need for a standing army during times of war. Some even recognized the utility of a small standing army in times of peace. But virtually everybody understood standing armies posed a danger in peacetime. The militia served as an alternative – a first line of defense.

This view shaped the drafting of the militia clause at the Philadelphia Convention.

George Mason brought up the subject of federal regulation of the militia, saying he “hoped there would be no standing army in time of peace unless it might be for a few garrisons.”

“The militia ought therefore to be the more effectually prepared for public defence.”

Mason conceded that “an absolute prohibition of standing armies in times of peace might be unsafe.” So, desiring to point out and guard against their danger, he moved to preface the militia clause by adding the words “And that the liberties of the people may be better secured against the danger of standing armies in times of peace.”

This language wasn’t ultimately included in the Constitution, but it shows the thinking of the framers as they were drafting the Constitution, and underscores their widely-held worries about a standing army.

Even Alexander Hamilton acknowledged this point in Federalist #29, writing, “If standing armies are dangerous to liberty, an efficacious power over the militia, in the body to whose care the protection of the state is committed, ought, as far as possible, to take away the inducement and the pretext to such an unfriendly situation.”

“To render an army unnecessary, will be a more certain method of preventing its existence than a thousand prohibitions upon paper.”

During the Philadelphia Convention, James Madison also argued that a good militia would minimize or even prevent the need for standing armies.

“As the greatest danger to liberty is from large standing armies, it is best to prevent them by an effectual provision for a good militia.”

This drives home the point that the reason for having a well-armed populace isn’t just for shooting deer, or for personal defense, or even for defending against foreign enemies. The founding generation believed it was necessary to reduce the need for a standing army.

When Thomas Jefferson first read a copy of the proposed Constitution, he urged James Madison to provide for “the substitution of militia for a standing army.”

## **PODCAST: Militia vs Standing Army: The Founders' View**

To a vast majority of the founding generation, standing armies were extremely dangerous, “the bane of liberty.” The best way to prevent them? Render them unnecessary.

### [AUDIO AND VIDEO PODCAST HERE](#)

During the Virginia ratifying convention, the question came up as to why the general government was given the power to call forth the militia. Madison emphasized that “if insurrections should arise, or invasions should take place, the people ought to unquestioningly be employed, to suppress and repel them, rather than a standing army.”

This reiterated the point he made during the Philadelphia Convention.

“The best way to do these things is to put the militia on a good and sure footing, and enable the government to make use of their services when necessary.”

He went on to argue that “the most effectual way to guard against a standing army is to render it unnecessary.”

How do you do that?

“Give the general government full power to call forth the militia, and exert the whole natural strength of the Union, when necessary.”

Tench Coxe also argued for a strong militia in order to mitigate the need for a standing army. He said, "The militia, who are in fact the effective part of the people at large, will render many troops quite unnecessary."

During the Virginia Ratifying Convention, James Monroe gave perhaps the best summary of the importance of the well-armed militia.

"All countries are more or less exposed to danger, either from insurrection or invasion and the greater the authority of Congress over this respectable body of men, in whose hands everything would be safe, the less necessity there would be, to have recourse to the bane of all societies, the destroyer of the rights of men, a standing army."

This is the kind of essential, foundational information we work to advance every single day of the year. Nothing - absolutely nothing - helps us roll up our sleeves and get the job done more than the financial faith and support of our members.

Please consider joining us [today](https://tenthamendmentcenter.com/members/) - for as little as \$2/month here:  
<https://tenthamendmentcenter.com/members/>

Help us take a stand for the Constitution and liberty - whether the government wants us to, or not.

(they don't)

If you prefer a one-time donation, you can pitch in online at this link:  
<https://tenthamendmentcenter.com/donate/>

You can also mail a check to:

Tenth Amendment Center  
16755 Von Karman Avenue Suite 200  
PMB 705  
Irvine, CA 92606

THANK YOU for reading - and for your support!

--Michael Boldin, TAC."

--Unquote.

I couldn't have said it better or provided a better overall historical explanation of the issues involved.

As noted in this article, the people are the militia; in fact, the Hebrew word "people" means "militia".

We have no reason to be shy or fearful about standing up our own well-regulated State Militias, nor do we have to argue with our Federal

Employees about our right to keep and bear arms --- which means a lot more than pistols and deer rifles.

To this day, the experience of our veterans, our ingenuity, our heavily armed population, and our determination remain the single biggest obstacle to the Deep State and the Deep Fakes alike.

Anna Maria

-----

See this article and over 4800 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website. How do we use your donations? **Find out here.**