

Mr. Chair and Committee

The Constitution of the United States is not a hard document to read through the lens of an historically relevant 6th grade grammar acuity and does not require one to be a constitutional attorney for understanding or application {1}. I am in opposition to this bill concerning firearms relating to the possession thereof including cross-references because I proclaim and believe that, according to the Constitution the language in Section 1(a)2 is unconstitutional. {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13}

Historic tradition of federal firearm regulation does not appear to exist prior to 1934, which equals no historic tradition at all. There is no need for strict scrutiny if we utilize the plain, historic, and traditional textual language of the Constitution, which was the intent of our founders so that we could defend ourselves from a tyrannical federal government. {6, 7, 11, 12} There is no Gordian knot to untie pertaining to partisan case law, a college professor's "woke" or failed interpretation, or the snag of a congress that has gone outside its authority of the United States, according to the Constitution. Article VI Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States simply reads:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Enumerated powers of the federal government (which was created by the states) are limited and expressed. Any law not in pursuance of the Constitution (whether made by an administrative state or Congress) is null and void. The states are not bound to comply with such "laws" as these "laws" do not fall under the authority of the United States according to the Constitution. This includes any international treaties that are not made in the pursuance of the supreme Law of the Land, which is the Constitution including Article VI clause 2. Legislatures are not bound, judges are to reject, and executives are not to enforce any such "laws", but on the contrary, should faithfully execute their duty to defend this clause in all matters in pursuit of liberty according to the Constitution of the United States. This is important because if laws made by Congress are superior to the Constitution, when not in pursuance to the Constitution then we are no longer a constitutional Republic, but a Marxist culture in pursuance to the arbitrary and capricious will of what would essentially be a democracy of Congressmen. {8, 9, 10, 11}

I would support this bill if it eliminated all language pertaining to federal firearms regulations and the elimination of cannabis as a controlled substance in the State Controlled Substances Act. I also further support the passage of a Second Amendment Preservation Act like that of Missouri. {6}

1. https://www.senate.gov/civics/resources/pdf/US_Constitution-Senate_Publication_103-21.pdf
2. -timeline <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>
3. <gov.uscourts.ca5.210916.197.1.pdf>
4. [LSB11104](#)
5. [infringe | Etymology of infringe by etymonline](#)
6. [Missouri Revisor of Statutes - Revised Statutes of Missouri, RSMo Section 1.410](#)
7. <https://www.atf.gov/our-history/atf-history>
8. [communist_goals_1963_cong_record.pdf](#)
9. [Controlled Substance Prohibition Examples](#)
10. <https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/mh%26r%20-%20prescription%20drug%20use.pdf>
11. <https://thehill.com/opinion/civil-rights/545847-according-to-the-founders-all-federal-gun-restrictions-are/>
12. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/ending-the-weaponization-of-the-federal-government/>