

**Candidate's Name :** Powell Gammill

**Political Party:** Libertarian

**Office you are running for:** U.S. Congressional

**State:** Arizona

**County:**

**District:** 2

**1) Do you believe that the Second Amendment confirms the individual right of every American citizen to possess and use (update of keep and bear) militia/military weapons for individual self-defense, as well as for the defense of the State / National defense?**

The Second Amendment acknowledges the Right of every independent human being to carry and own arms without restriction, especially those arms useful for service in the militia.

**2) If elected would you support legislation for the removal of firearm laws and regulations? If your answer is yes, and if you are elected, what specific legislation would you propose/support to ensure that this individual right is protected? Which current laws which infringe upon this individual right would you seek to repeal?**

Yes, Congress is forbidden by the Constitution from passing legislation that infringes on the Rights of individuals from possessing or owning arms. ALL such legislation on the books should be immediately repealed.

I would support a resolution, or a sense of Congress, declaring that every independent individual should arm themselves and be familiar with the appropriate use of their choice of weapons, in the defense of themselves, their families and residences. While the Constitution does not forbid Congress specifically from compelling arms ownership, I do not believe anyone should be compelled to own a weapon. If only 10% heeded the call of Congress to arm themselves the community violence rates would drop, as it has in [Kennesaw, Georgia](#). If 25% of individuals armed themselves Congress and the rest of government would be very afraid ... and that is a good thing.

**3) What do you consider are "legitimate" reasons to own a firearm?**

Check as many as apply:

- Personal Defense
- Home Defense
- Defense of your country (Unorganized Militia)
- Hunting
- Farm Use
- Competitive Shooting
- Informal Sport Shooting
- Informal Target Practice and/or Plinking
- Collecting
- Constitutional Rights
- Just because. No reason is necessary.
- Other \_\_\_\_\_
- All of the above
- None of the above

**4) Would you support the banning of some firearms or ammunition? (IE: Saturday night specials, "assault weapons", Hollow points, and "Safety Slugs") Why and to what extent?**

No. Without ammunition, firearms (a type of arm) would not work. Ammunition is a functional part of the arm. Therefore, Congress lacks the legal authority to transgress upon an individual owning OR bearing any firearm, and thusly ANY ammunition. But especially, ammunition that would be useful to service in the militia.

**5) Do you believe that firearm owners should be required to have licenses or permits to own or carry firearms? Do you believe training for such licenses should be mandatory? Why?**

No. And no. While training is a very good idea to bear arms, a Right cannot come with conditions. And since the ability of government to issue licenses or conditions for ownership or possession clearly transgresses upon the Right to keep and bear arms, government is not permitted to so transgress. Individuals bearing arms are responsible for their own actions, both criminally and civilly if they harm another individual or another's property without just cause.

**6) Do you believe that firearms and/or firearm owners should be registered?  
Which ones and why?**

No. Neither firearms registration, nor firearms owner registration is Constitutionally permitted. Why? Because it still says you must register BEFORE exercising a Right to keep and bear arms. Even if it said the registration could occur after keeping and bearing arms it would still be unconstitutional because if a person refused, they would still have the Right to keep and bear arms unincfringed.

Historically, time and time, as recently as a decade ago in England and Australia firearms owners were assured such registration would never be used to confiscate weapons. Always government lied. 12 million humans were crated away to concentration camps, half of whom were Jews who gave up their weapons to a demanding government who used their gun registration, who later snuffed their lives out.

**7) Do you support equal rights for all citizens of the United States regardless of the person's sexuality / orientation and / or gender identity/expression?**

Absolutely.

**8) Which of the following would you be willing to support in regards to same-gender and/or polyamorous marriages and/or civil unions?**

Check as many as apply:

- Domestic partnerships for same-sex couples
- Domestic partnerships for opposite-sex couples
- Domestic partnerships for polyamorous (more than two consenting adults)
- Same-sex marriages
- Opposite sex marriages (What we have now)
- Polyamarous marriages (between more than two consenting adults)
- All of the above. Everyone should have equal rights under the law.

None of the above. Government has no role in defining a marriage. Leave it to the church, or private contracts.

Other: A marriage license is nothing more than a tax, and the mechanism for the government to say "NO." Since when does the government have the prerogative to transgress on your Right to seek Happiness for yourself?

**9) Do you support the right for people to act as they wish in a private setting, with other consenting adults?**

Absolutely.

**10) On March 15, 2004, two gay men in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, were denied a marriage license. On March 19, twelve state legislators filed suit against the two gay men, with the intent to establish the constitutionality of the law so that the register of wills would not be required to issue a marriage license to a same-sex couple. Do you agree that legislators should engage in preemptive judicial action as social engineering? Why?**

Actually, I am confused as to why a court would accept jurisdiction over this? Who amongst the legislators is the party being harmed? It seems to me the two men in this example are the ones who must file suit on some grounds expressing harm done to them. Then the legislators would be free to act as a friend of the court. Also, the legislators are still free to attempt to pass legislation clarifying the law, and the wishes of the legislature.

Still, what do the two gay men care? They should file a countersuit, and take advantage of the fact that these 12 legislators started the suit, and they presumably represent some aspect of government. Discovery is a bitch. I say, pour it on!

**Do you have an additional statement to make that is not covered by this questionnaire? Use as much space as you wish.**

Do you want your Rights? Go armed. Do you want to be free from crime? Go armed. An armed society is a polite society. The government is not your friend. Gun control is hitting your target.

It is immoral to permit someone to initiate force or fraud upon you or your dependents without negative consequences. Unmolested and rewarded, they will feel encouraged and move onto the next person. Made to pay a price, they will at worst move onto the next person more wary, and at best change their philosophy.

For further information on my positions, please visit: [www.GammillForCongress.com](http://www.GammillForCongress.com)