

The Bill of Rights Sentinel

The Voice of Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership

Why Firearm Ownership Matters

by Dean Weingarten,
Guest Columnist



In these difficult times, the Constitution hangs by a frayed thread. The President is openly disdain-

ful of the powers of Congress and the Judiciary, yet remains in office. Executive orders are praised as more powerful than acts of Congress. Opposition to presidential power mysteriously fades away at every created crisis. The old media cheers the centralization of power, instead of lambasting it as you would think watchdogs of freedom should.

The thread that holds the Constitution from destruction is the Second Amendment and the army of Second Amendment supporters exercising the rights protected by it—especially those who fight for it. The reason is Machiavellian.

There is no comparison whatever between an armed and disarmed man; it is not reasonable to suppose that one who is armed will obey willingly one who is unarmed; or that any unarmed man will remain safe...

– Niccoló Machiavelli, *The Prince* (1537)

A person who owns a firearm as a right, who has participated in forcing legislatures and courts to recognize that right, *always in defiance of the desires of elite power brokers*, is a direct challenge to those elites' power and authority.

JPFO supports this reality of gun ownership 100%. In very real ways, *your* armed existence limits what they can do, and supports greater resistance to tyranny, greater support for freedom. Nothing else accomplishes this with equal strength.



**America's Most Aggressive
Civil Rights Organization**

The existence of an armed citizen shouts out to would-be dictators: *Your power is limited! The Constitution means something! I have power that you can not take without risking your life! The rule of law is more than the whim of ruling elites!*

They dislike that. It creates the very balance of power the Second Amendment was designed to achieve. *It keeps us free.* Being armed changes a person's attitude. It fosters a healthy sense of independence that nothing else can in quite the same way.

Picking up your first gun, you feel and instinctively understand the empowerment it gives you.

Tyrants fear an armed population as much for the mental habits it encourages as the physical threat it provides.

Second Amendment supporters have become the absolute core of resistance to the centralization of all power in the federal government.

Newspaper writers certainly aren't—they have failed miserably in this task. The old media have actually sided with the enemies of independence, gun ownership and The American Way. Astonishing.

All across the country, smart politicians are learning to respect Second Amendment rights... or risk losing the power they currently enjoy.

JPFO is determined to be a rallying point to stop the growing tyranny, because, as Jews and people faithfully allied with us for all the right reasons, we understand what the loss of gun ownership will mean for America and the free world.

If a constitutionally limited government is to be restored, it will be built around the core of the Second Amendment. Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership will be there. **Armed Jews are free Jews.**

Dean Weingarten, certified to teach firearms safety in 1973, has been a competitive shooter, peace officer, military officer, and retired from the Dept. of Defense after more than 30 years in research, development, testing, and evaluation.

Weingarten holds degrees in Meteorology, Mining Engineering and writes for numerous publications.

Have the Jewish People Lost Their Way? A Call to Arms

by Rabbi Dovid Bendory, Rabbinic Director, JPFO

There was a time when Jews understood the need for armed self-defense. In the very beginning of Jewish history, Abraham—the first Jew—established himself as a fierce warrior, not to be trifled with. During the War of the Nine Kings (*Genesis 14*), Abraham's nephew Lot was taken captive.

Abraham's response? He armed 400 men, chased down the enemy, and not only freed Lot but also took back all that the army had plundered in war. Having established his military prowess, Abraham never again needed to defend himself.

Fast forward a few generations to the leadership of Abraham's grandson Jacob (*Genesis 34*). Apparently, the deterrence of Abraham's fierce defense had faded into memory among the locals, so the Prince of Schechem kidnaps and rapes Jacob's daughter Dinah. Jacob's sons Simeon and Levi slaughter not only Schechem and his father, but all the males of the city—all of whom knew of and were complacent in the crime.

On his deathbed, Jacob curses Simeon and Levi for their anger—though he never criticizes them for their master swordship. The tools of war were a necessary evil in a harsh world. Without them, the world would be overrun by tyranny.

Hundreds of years later, after generations of enslavement in Egypt, the Jewish People emerged as twelve tribes of a nation. Despite generations of victim disarmament, "the Jewish People emerged armed from the Land of Egypt" (*Exodus 13:18*). They would soon use their arms to defend against an unprovoked attack by Amalek (*Exodus 17*), and a generation later, to recapture the Land of Israel from the pagan nations that had taken over the land during their absence.

Biblical history continues with tens of war heroes who defend the Jewish Nation against the Philistines and

other enemies; the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings record extensive accounts of both battles and wars in defense of the Jewish way of life in the Promised Land.

Unfortunately, human nature does not change, and Jews in post-Biblical time continued to need defensive arms. Hanukkah celebrates the military triumph of the Maccabees during Greek times, and later during Roman times Josephus entitles his history of Jews under the Roman Empire, *The Wars of the Jews*. Clearly the Jewish people had no aversion to arms.

So why are there so many Jews today at the forefront of the disarmament movement? Feinstein, Boxer, Schumer, Bloomberg, Gross, Sugarman and Jewish democrats everywhere will tell you that Judaism favors their views. They could not be more wrong.

Fortunately, not all Jews are as misguided as these fools who have lost their way. They may be Jews, but the positions they espouse are not Jewish. We at JPFO believe in the right of free people to arm themselves. And we believe that all Jews should learn to use firearms.

Jewish history has taught us time and again that a disarmed Jew is a victim waiting for anti-Semitism to strike. "Nothing says 'Never Again' like an armed Jew," to quote L.A.-based Children of Jewish Holocaust Survivors (<http://cjhsa.org>).

The bullies and tyrants of the world love the victim-disarmament movement as it empowers their hate-filled, criminal agenda. The first simple step in resistance is knowing how to use the tools of self-defense. JPFO encourages you to learn to shoot, to acquire the means of self defense—both physically and mentally—and to educate your family and your community in these vital life-saving skills. You'll be hearing more about our Call to Arms in the coming months.

JPFO LOOKOUT SCOUTS WANTED

Would you like to follow the armed-teacher movement for us?

Cities, states and schools across the nation are moving toward arming our teachers, and we need eyes and ears on this for our upcoming special projects.

Can you do it? Will you do it? We need volunteers to track the steps being taken. Where are the enemies and resistance to this fine effort? Be part of our volunteer effort and make a difference.

Send news and links you track: info@jpfo.org or (800) 869-1884



Bill of Rights Sentinel

Editor: Ray Carter
Publisher: Alan Gottlieb
Consultant: Alan Korwin
Contributors: Rabbi Dovid Bendory
Charles Heller
Dean Weingarten
Rabbi Judah Freeman

The *Bill of Rights Sentinel* is published by Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, 12500 N.E. Tenth Place, Bellevue, WA 98005 (800) 869-1884

©2015 JPFO

Address Change: Include new address, city, state and zip code and send to the *Bill of Rights Sentinel* at 12500 N.E. Tenth Place, Bellevue, WA 98005 or e-mail to info@jpfo.org. Please allow up to four weeks for changes.

BOOT THE BATFE



In its ongoing unconstitutional effort to disarm the American public, BATFE, a rogue federal agency operating numerous illegal and borderline legal projects, is still attempting to ban the most popular and effective rounds of ammunition for the American public.

The agency has only agreed to withdraw its proposed ban of AR-15 ammo "at this time," with no word on what it plans for the future. Efforts to have it drop its plan permanently *have failed*.

When these unelected petty bureaucrats decide to act, and do, no power on Earth short of real power will stop their bans and edicts. Other law enforcement agencies are guaranteed to cooperate in implementing any bans or edicts this agency *invents*. If they say green tip is against the law, it will become a *crime* for your local Officer Friendly (if you have one) to see it and allow the contraband to remain in your hands. Besides, (he will have been instructed), it could be used to harm his fellow boys in blue. He will have been instructed. Repeatedly. *History does not provide us with many examples of police disobeying such orders.*

Rebuffed by Congress and the majority of the U.S. public in its first effort to ban a select group of this ammo, so-called "green tip" variety, by *suddenly declaring* it to be armor piercing, this lawless agency is now threatening to ban any ammunition that can be fired from America's most

popular long gun, the Armalite Rifle 15, now known as the AR-15, since many firms manufacture a variety of this fine gun.

JPFO stands with law-abiding authorities who honor and respect the rights of the people, and stands firmly against all those who would trample the rights of the public. *No ammo of any kind should be fired at decent authorities.* Suggesting a greater risk, or difference in penalties for using one type of round over another is a red herring, a false flag, a deception meant to confuse the issue, so typical of BATFE's imperial tactics. JPFO stands for no ammo of any kind shot at lawful anybody. Period.

The effort to deny access to any round of ammunition, ammunition-feeding device, availability of ammunition, or any other element of ammunition parity with authorities is intolerable infringement and serves no non-tyrannical purpose. Acting on the pretext that ammo is dangerous is so transparently deceptive it merits punishment and dismissal of all those in Washington who perpetrate it. Members of the media who propagate such balderdash should be

reprimanded and belong in reeducation camps for unethical behavior. *Criminal acts are already outlawed.*

All ammunition is dangerous. It's supposed to be dangerous. It wouldn't be any good if it wasn't dangerous. The idea that BATFE is more concerned that a shot can injure an officer, more than any other innocent human being, is an outrage, and the people behind this line of thinking are emblematic of why this entire agency needs to be closed. It has been an elitist affront to our principles of freedom since its inception. The Constitution, by its plain wording, forbids the creation of such an agency with powers over firearms.

Boot the BATFE now. How many outrages do they have to perpetrate before we close them down and save the money? C'mon, you know half the staff will end up in other agencies anyway (a big savings), at least it's a start. No other agency has a culture as bad as this one. Blending their few essential administrative functions in elsewhere will dull the sting of this viper. They started as tax collectors. Swap badges for accounting pads.

Boot the BATFE now!

Wall Street Journal 2/14-15, 2015 New Front in Gun-Ban Fight

The latest effort to deny Americans the right to keep and bear arms follows a long line of usurpations and abuses, this time, the denial of rights simply based on charges being filed—without due process, court hearings, opportunity to contest or even be informed of the charges, and without convictions of wrongdoing.

Using the ominous and poorly defined rubric of "domestic violence," authorities in at least 12 states, according to *The Wall Street Journal*, have or will soon institute policies where the mere charge of domestic violence will be sufficient to confiscate a person's firearms—without a conviction or proof of anything.

This comes on top of the growing practice of allowing a disgruntled spouse to file court papers, without the other spouse's knowledge or consent, and have firearms summarily removed with no notice and no effective recourse.

Domestic violence is a serious problem in America, without any doubt. JPFO unreservedly condemns domestic violence.

Government operatives, elected or otherwise, who contemplate disarming the public based on the mere filing of paperwork, without notice or due process is a far worse problem and cannot be tolerated.

Perpetrators must be punished.

A Pox On Jewish Group for Bogus Gun Criticism

by Rabbi Judah Freeman

“The National Jewish Democratic Council Slams Ohio House Candidate ‘Joe the Plumber’ for Blaming Holocaust on Gun Control.”

So blares the NJDC website and numerous Jewish news sources in the U.S. and Israel, and my email inbox. Apparently, the NJDC thinks that Joe the Plumber pitched a “campaign video that inappropriately and offensively blamed the Holocaust on gun control.”

In response, NJDC President and CEO David A. Harris said: “Using the memories of the *six million Jews* killed in the Holocaust to make a political point is never appropriate, under any circumstances. For Ohio Republican House candidate Samuel Wurzelbacher to imply that these innocent lives were taken because of *gun control* laws is simply beyond the pale.”

How upright! How morally proper to condemn the demeaning behavior of misusing and misappropriating the Holocaust to score political points!

And how absurd for the NJDC to make such a statement. Liberals love “fact check” news stories—so let’s look at the facts.

FACT: Joe NEVER implied that Jewish or other “innocent lives were taken because of *gun control* laws.” Rather, if you watch the video you’ll see that Joe simply states several facts:

- The Turks used gun control to systematically disarm Armenians prior to the Armenian Genocide.
- The Nazis used gun control to systematically disarm Jews (and other “undesirables”) prior to the Holocaust. (<http://tinyurl.com/7wxakts>)

FACT CHECK: Joe is right on both counts; see JPFO’s widely acclaimed Genocide Chart which has pointed out that throughout the 20th Century so-called “gun control” was used as a step in the process of controlling and murdering innocent civilians.

FACT: Joe makes no statement whatsoever about the “cause” of either genocide. One could argue that he implies that these disarmed populations had no means of self-defense against a government-run extermination program—but that would just be stating the obvious, no?


FACT CHECK: Indeed, disarmed populations have no means of self-defense against a government-run extermination program. It seems that Joe got this one right too. Does the NJDC disagree?

FACT: In the video, Joe then shoots several targets and states simply: “I love America.”


FACT CHECK: We see no reason to doubt that Joe loves America. As demonstrated in the video, he exercises his rights under the Second Amendment, one of the uniquely American aspects of our Constitution. Joe posted his video on YouTube, an exercise of his First Amendment rights—another American particularism. What is it about Joe’s love of American exceptionalism that

the NJDC doesn’t like?

We at Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership understand that the First Amendment is our first defense against government gone awry. We further understand that the Founders intended the Second Amendment as our defense of last resort against such a government. Just which of these aspects of our independence, liberty and freedom does the NJDC disagree with?



“If a thief is caught breaking in and is struck so that he dies, the defender is not guilty of bloodshed”
- Exodus 22:2



Background Check Baloney

The media wants you to believe the Brady bill background check has somehow succeeded in disarming criminals, because (they say) two million firearms transactions have been prevented. Right.

What that really means is that, without due process, formal charges, a trial, representation by an attorney, right to confront witnesses—even an explanation for the denial of your specific enumerated constitutional right—an unelected low-pay bureaucratic clerk sitting in front of an FBI government computer in Clarksburg, West Virginia prevented an American from exercising the right to obtain a firearm.

Was the person denied actually guilty of anything? Was the denial legal and proper? Was anyone punished for wrongfully denying a person their civil rights? We don’t know, we don’t know, and absolutely not.

Was an actual criminal denied and arrested by this so-called background check process? Nope. Sorry, that’s not how this works. Some John Smith, Tyrone Jackson or Jose Rodriguez whose name got into a computer just had their rights denied, case closed. Rights denied.

So we must ask: “Are there any criminals in America who want to arm themselves and who cannot because of the Brady law?”

No one in government asks this. None of your representatives asks this. No republicans, no democrats, no bureaucrats, no candidates, no reporters, nobody asks this.

Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership asks this. We demand this. Join us, so we have the numbers to make our demands felt.

Send a memo to JPFO at info@jpfo.org now!

The Moyel's Tips

Police Bill of Rights?

Police and police unions are embarking on an extremely dangerous course of action, developing a “police bill of rights” with conditions far beyond anything the public can expect when they are involved in a shooting. This would make police immune from uniform inquiries, due process, and leave the public exposed to worse abuse than we are already seeing on the nation stage.

Police, as is widely known, already pose a serious threat to the right to keep and bear arms and the preservation of firearms ownership, since they are the ones charged with disarming the public, when push comes to shove.

This is the uniform experience in nations worldwide throughout history, from ancient times through modern dictatorships and U.S. experience: includes classic slavery, unconstitutional takings under *in rel* pleadings, arbitrary confiscations, gun bans, civil forfeiture, RICO statutes, dubious, supra-legal rabid no-knock raids and SWAT activities, rapid militarizations that have been increasing and even Katrina-style disaster responses. Even police participation in deceptive gun buy-ups with or without taxpayer funds is questionable behavior.

JPFO's position here is simple and unequivocal: ***Any legal protections police have in shooting or related incidents cannot exceed the protections afforded to the public.***

If police have real need for more protections, then so do we. They cannot get it without the public getting identical equal treatment. To do otherwise is criminal and deserves punishment.

Training: Genius or Dreck?

When required by law as a prerequisite to exercising Second Amendment rights—no matter how well

meaning—training often grows in scope and expense as it becomes a tool to keep the “wrong kind of people” from their basic rights.

Voluntary training develops skills and responsibility. It doesn't create a facade behind which to hide bigotry and discrimination via economics.

Undelegated Powers

FLASH—Sen. Ed Markey (Mass.) and Rep. Carolyn Maloney (N.Y.), both democrats, introduced the “Handgun Trigger Safety Act of 2015.” It requires all handguns made domestically, within five years, to have “smart gun” technology allowing only “authorized” users to fire them.

As usual—run-of-the-mill gun-rights groups are objecting to smart-gun proposals as if they were fighting smart phones (“this technology doesn't even work!”), and they miss the whole point. *Government has no legitimate power to be regulating or demanding any design feature of firearms, this is a power forbidden to them.*

The Second Amendment prohibits such actions by its strict wording, history, and its penumbras and emanations. If the free market develops features that people want, they will be free to buy them. Officials requiring any such things are in violation of their oath of office and this is grounds for at least removal, if not trial on charges of conspiring to undermine the national security.

JPFO condemns such outrageous affronts to our liberties and blatant attacks on the right to keep and bear arms. We currently lack sufficient power to effect the needed change, but know that as people hear our clear message and join with us, our voice, our size and our strength will grow. Become a member today and support this work. Don't be a schlemiel!

The Moyel's Lesson

“Don't teach girls, PARTICULARLY good Jewish girls, how to shoot! They're precious fragile creatures far too delicate to defend themselves! That's our job, as men—particularly their men!”

How many times have we heard that same tired refrain, or “*Women should be protected, raise babies and make nice homes - they don't need guns or education!*” usually followed with “*if someone must have guns, it should be men—since men are more emotionally stable.*”

The list of myths goes on, complete with, “*Think of all the trouble women would get into if we gave them guns (or shoes)!*”

“If there's a problem, you're probably in the wrong place and brought it on yourself—you don't deserve to defend yourself.”

“That's what the police are for—call 911 and wait for help!”

JPFO fundamentally disagrees with all of the myths above.

We know better. We've seen time and again how these myths cripple women, the disabled, the able-bodied and minorities—making them defenseless against assailants again and again.

These myths are absolutely in opposition to any modern code of ethics—the principles that separate us from the barbarians.

Yet we hear those and more from peers and elders at Temple and range implying women are too foolish and flighty to do more than tend babies and kitchens with bare competence.

Each of us has a moral responsibility to stand up for the idea that women have the wit and wisdom to defend themselves, their family and—heavens forbid the need—their men. Women should learn to shoot.

Now, how do we teach the men?

Send answers to info@jpfo.org

HELLER HIGHWATER

By Charles Heller

Rules for Anti-Freedom Radicals

Do you dream of the day when the anti-freedom bigots will be vanquished, and our right to keep and bear arms will finally be secure?

Stop dreaming! That day will never arrive. Bloomberg happens. Schumer happens. Feinstein happens. In the old days, Metzenbaum happened. Brady happened.

The Jews know that in every age we faced an existential threat. So does the Right To Keep And Bear Arms.

Some want to ask why, or why so many Jews are anti-rights about the tools of self-defense. Respectfully, that's the wrong question. We must first ask, "What is the threat?" Once we know that, the thing to ask is "what we are going to do about it?"

The threat is that there will always be people, including some in power, who fear our rights.

Whether it's because they would not trust themselves with a gun, or because they want to control you, or have had negative experiences with guns... does not matter.

What matters is that they are willing to believe and act as if their end justifies any means against your rights.

Lie about statistics on gun violence? Yup.

Lie about the excessive use of force by law enforcement and call it a "race issue?" Sure.

Spend millions on phony "research" supporting the anti-rights agenda? Why not?

People on the pro-rights side of this debate need to get it through their skulls, that the other side will use every and all means to win. Incremental theft, lying, deception, and perversion of the democratic process,

are all "tools" to deprive you of the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, and that's OK. To them. Trying to reason with fellow travelers of the victim-disarmament clan makes as much sense as trying to talk Klansmen into electing a black guy as their leader.

Speaking of which, does the anti-rights clan not have something in common with the KKK? The Klan burned crosses. Isn't this the modern day self-defense crucifix?

So now what? I'll tell you what—be willing to call the victim disarmament people what they are—bigots! Until you are willing to expose the harshest truths about them, you give them a tremendous advantage!

Has everyone reading this read Saul Alinsky's "Rules For Radicals" yet? If not, why don't you stop reading this article right now, and download a free copy? Instead of decrying the "unfairness" of what the enemies of freedom do, why not figure out how to bend their tailpipe back down their carburetor with their own techniques?

Here's a sample:

Go to www.jpfo.org, and order a dozen stickers. Send them to your legislators. Give them to your friends to wake them up to the lies of the anti-freedom bigots.

Until you are willing to use shame, guilt, and humiliation, you disarm yourself. Once you wound them, you can look at loving ways to educate the teachable.

We say in The Passover Seder, "He who knows not, and knows not that he knows not, is a fool, shun him; He who knows not, and knows that he knows not, is a child, teach him."

Our rights will be safer when we shun fools and teach children.

Charles Heller is the host of internet radio shows *Swap Shop*, *Liberty Watch* and *Armed America and Free* (all at www.libertywatchradio.com). He is also an Arizona CCW Instructor and the Media Coordinator for JPFO.

JPFO Reader Survey

1) A well-known and active gun-rights advocate said:

"Cops are a group of the population that is exponentially more pro-gun than the general population. Cops want to arm teachers."

Agree / Disagree

Tell us why and we'll publish the results as space allows.

2) If a type of legal firearm were declared illegal, police would:

(A) Refuse to confiscate those guns from the public if ordered to do so.

(B) Obey orders and confiscate those guns if they were told to do so.

3) If Jews started shooting German officials when the round-ups began at the start of WWII:

(A) The entire German effort would have collapsed.

(B) It would have made matters worse.

(C) More Jews would have survived.

(D) Other (explain).

Follow-up question:

In pre-war Germany when would armed resistance have been justified?

(A) When Jews were being disarmed.

(B) When due process was abandoned.

(C) When property was being summarily confiscated.

(D) When government propaganda campaigns began vilifying "undesirables"

(E) When Jews and other "undesirables" were rounded up

(F) Resisting Authority is always wrong.

Explain...

Mail or email to JPFO at
12500 N.E. Tenth Place
Bellevue, WA 98005
survey@jpfo.org

Reader Responses: “How Close Are We to Midnight” and the JPFO Reader Survey



Your Thoughts?

How Close Are We To Midnight?

I believe about 11:30. Here in New Mexico we beat back a scheme that would register all transfers of firearms via the State Police.

Both Republicans and Democrats supported this nonsense and our Republican Governor told the legislature to hurry and pass it so she could sign it because she had to catch a plane to see the Pope.

Our Police came from the military in large part and these people are brainwashed into following orders even if it means firing on their countrymen.

Look at how close Manchin-Toomey came to passing.

– **Mr. James Deck**

Unfortunately, we are at about 8:00 pm. Too many bad legislators and judges, not to mention a dumbed down public.

– **Gary (via e-mail)**

Join JPFO Now!
www.jpfo.org (800) 869-1884



**America's Aggressive
Civil Rights Organization**

Would police seize guns?

Some would and some wouldn't. Many police and military members don't know that they are not required to obey illegal orders.

Police probably don't face as immediate and severe response as do the military personnel.

Those who are mature enough to have studied the consequences of such action would be slower to respond than would less mature individuals and there are surely individuals in both who would blindly follow any order issued.

There was a young lieutenant in Vietnam, I believe his name was Calley, who ordered a village of civilians murdered with grave consequences for many.

I don't remember all the details but I'm sure you have that information at hand. Wholesale disarming of civilians by police or military would surely fall into that category and would probably result in very nasty confrontations nationwide.

No need to send Bloomberg the video “No Guns for Negroes” as he has surely heard of it and wouldn't view it anyway.

People with his views cannot be convinced otherwise. He doesn't want to be confused with facts. He obviously has other agendas.

– **John Cox (via e-mail)**

Yes, too many young (and older) cops have no idea what the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution say - or - why the Founders wrote them. And, they don't care about liberty.

Just look at how militarized they've become, and how often they do “no-knock” and “no-warrant” raids.

Now, a federal judge has decided that the Third Amendment does not apply to police. I have a friend who recently retired after 32 years with the Pima County (Ariz.) Sheriff's Department.

His comments are: “Don't trust any cop who doesn't have gray hair,” and “Never trust any federal cop.”

2) Send Bloomberg the video “No Guns for Negroes” (not that he'd watch it, or care anyway).

– **Gary (via e-mail)**

Should we send Bloomberg the JPFO videos?

Send Bloomberg the video “No Guns For Negroes.”

Stop preaching to the choir and put the word out to the public.

Bloomberg should be ashamed of himself. He walks around with armed bodyguards but wants everybody else disarmed. Keep up the good fight.

– **Ben Moskowitz**

Send Bloomberg all the “no guns” videos, especially “No Guns for Jews.”

Send them in separate mailings, not all at once.

– **Ken Obenski (via e-mail)**

Send him the video. Reason why, these idiots are going to try back angle after back angle.

– **“The Great Zod” (via e-mail)**

“A .45acp jacketed hollow-point—placed center of mass—will distract the most determined attacker.”

Rumblings from the Blogosphere

by Ray Carter

Some of the best writing today on firearms rights is found in blog-posts, Facebook posts and even “Twitter tweets” - often authored by writers with day jobs they would like to keep, using pen names.

In simple and direct language the “Cake Analogy” by one such, Law-Dog, accurately dissects federal gun laws passed as “compromises” over the last 80 years. The original article can be found at <http://thelawdogfiles.blogspot.com/2013/01/a-repost.html> in all its glory.

“We cannot negotiate with those who say, ‘What’s mine is mine, and what’s yours is negotiable.’”

– John F. Kennedy, Address to the American People, 25 JUL 1961

Opening with a quote from John F. Kennedy, he then explores his famed “Cake Analogy.”

“Let’s say I have this cake. It is a very nice cake, with “GUN RIGHTS” written across the top in lovely floral icing. Along you come and say, “Give me that cake.”

I say, “No, it’s my cake.”

You say, “Let’s compromise. Give me half.” I respond by asking what I get out of this compromise, and you reply that I get to keep half of my cake.

Okay, we compromise. Let us call this compromise The National Firearms Act of 1934.

This leaves me with half of my cake and there I am, enjoying my cake when you walk back up and say, “Give me that cake.”

I say—again: “No, it’s my cake.”

You say, “Let’s compromise.” What do I get out of this compromise? Why, I get to keep half of what’s left of the cake I already own.

So, we compromise—let us call this one the Gun Control Act of 1968—and this time I’m left holding what is now just a quarter of my cake.

And I’m sitting in the corner with my quarter piece of cake, and here

you come again. You want my cake. Again.

This time you take several bites—we’ll call this compromise the Clinton Executive Orders -- and I’m left with about a tenth of what has always been MY DAMN CAKE and you’ve got nine-tenths of it.

Let me restate that: I started out with MY CAKE and you have already ‘compromised’ me out of ninety percent of MY CAKE ...

... and here you come again. Compromise! ... Lautenberg Act (nibble, nibble). Compromise! ... The HUD/Smith and Wesson agreement (nibble, nibble). Compromise! ... The Brady Law (NOM NOM NOM). Compromise! ... The School Safety and Law Enforcement Improvement Act (sweet tap-dancing Freyja, my finger!)

After every one of these “compromises”—in which I lose rights and you lose NOTHING -- I’m left holding crumbs of what was once a large and satisfying cake, and you’re standing there with most of MY CAKE, making anime eyes and whining about being “reasonable”, and wondering “why we won’t compromise” as you try for the rest of my cake.”

In a damning review of the National Firearms Act, Lawdog writes:

“In 1933 I—or any other American—could buy a fully-automatic Thompson sub-machine gun, a 20mm anti-tank gun, or shorten the barrel of any gun I owned to any length I thought fit, silence any gun I owned, and a host of other things.

Come your “compromise” in 1934, and suddenly I can’t buy a sub-machine gun, a silencer, or a Short-Barreled Firearm without .Gov permission and paying a hefty tax. What the hell did y’all lose in this “compromise”?”

and then continues with comments on the regrettable Gun Control Act of 1968 - a classic example of “collective punishment” of the law abiding majority for the sins of the few - writing..

“In 1967 I, or any other American, could buy or sell firearms anywhere we felt like it, in any State we felt like, with no restrictions. We “compromised” in 1968, and suddenly I’ve got to have a Federal Firearms License to have a business involving firearms, and there’s whole bunch of rules limiting what, where and how I buy or sell guns.

In 1968, “sporting purpose”—a term found NOT ANY DAMNED WHERE IN THE CONSTITUTION, TO SAY NOTHING OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT—event the importation of guns that had been freely imported in 1967.

Tell me, do—exactly what the hell did you lose in this 1968 “compromise”?”

The straight forward and earthy analysis, not unlike Gran’pa Jack on a very cranky day, is not only accurate but reaches an audience more formal writing styles drive away.

Another example of this phenomena is an article, “Why the gun is civiization...” by another blogger (and now famed science fiction author) Marko Kloos - published on the JPFO website (<http://jpfo.org/articles-assd02/marko.htm>).

More and more, as time goes on, we’ll see many of our best and brightest writers and thinkers emerging on the internet - and only later (if ever) going to print.

Social media (Facebook, Twitter, blogs and all the rest) offer us, as firearms owners and Second Amendment advocates, the best chance to get our message out in front of the broadest audience of all—the unconvinced—without the deadly filter of a mainstream media editor or reporter already opposed to our message.

Lawdog and Kloos are two examples of the best representatives we have in Social media - each of them logical and fact-based while presenting their views.

It might be an approach worth considering.

By permission of “Lawdog,” June 6, 2015.