



The Bill of Rights Sentinel

The Voice of Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership

Vol. I, No. 4



Campus Carry—Basic Civil Rights

Denial Is an Intolerable Constitutional Infringement

by Dean Weingarten



Citizens of the United States have the same rights to keep and bear arms on school campuses as off campus. Enforcement of our Constitution does not stop at some magical invisible line separating a campus from other public space.

This is such an obvious truth that anti rights advocates on campus resort to special pleading that they should have more power than other government officials—absurd on its face. They claim students are too stupid, emotional, and/or drunk to be trusted with firearms on campus, even though students (and instructors and these elites themselves!) are trusted with arms everywhere else.

In short, they see their institutions as ivory-tower models for society, where a wise overseer treats everyone as stupid children, who are compelled, by an elite ruler, on what to think and do. Facts do not matter to these close-minded ideologues.

Students for Concealed Carry on Campus has pointed out the irrationality of arguments used by those who oppose campus carry, on its website for all to see. The arguments are based on emotion instead of facts. John Lott recently gave testimony to the Michigan legislature. He eviscerated the anti-rights arguments, by pointing out among other things: 1) College-age permit holders are as law abiding as other age groups, and 2) Permit holders are six times as law abiding as police officers.

Colleges have historically offered theoretical thinkers and speculators

protection from the rigors of reality, but they had to answer to some authority, especially those who provided the funding.

Unfortunately, in the last hundred years, government has become a primary piggy bank for funding colleges and universities. They have become hotbeds of anti-rights ideology, power centers used to influence and indoctrinate teachers and journalists away from traditional American values. Radicals of the 1960's are now in charge of nearly all institutions of higher education in the United States. And as Jefferson warned us, "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." Those institutions are now serving as focal points in the takeover of cultural institutions, education, the media—and our sacred right to arms.

The anti-rights ideologues have come to think of public universities and colleges as their private fiefdoms, where they can do what they want without opposition, check or balance. They argue these public spaces should be treated as their private property. Ardent support by allies in the media cartel, insulating them from most pressure to stop their assault on constitutional rights, is a given.

If these elites can't stop students and faculty from exercising their right to keep and bear arms, they lose. If they can, America loses. Armed students peacefully carrying weapons undercuts their carefully crafted false narrative of "guns bad," "more guns equal more crime" and "guns are only manufactured to kill people."

In truth, guns are good, are made to protect people (which is why we arm police, and ourselves), and evidence

clearly shows arms and safety are directly linked. America is #1 for arms per capita (frequently cited by anti-rights control freaks), but #111 for murders per capita (never cited by the controllers, statistics from the U.N., available at Wikipedia).

Utah enacted Campus Carry in 2004, affirmed by its state Supreme Court in 2006. "We haven't had much problem with it," according to Steven Mecham, head of the Utah State University Dept. of Public Safety. "It's just not been an issue." University of Utah spokeswoman Maria Mara agreed, telling IdahoReporter.com, "We have had no incidents on campus regarding this law." Compare that to "gun-control" utopia Chicago. Nah.

College and university administrators act as if they are dictatorial overlords, immune to the civil-rights laws society obeys. This reflects their hoplophobic fears and desperate grabs for power they do not deserve, at the expense of human rights.

There is no exception in the Constitution or in reason to make college campuses dangerous, reckless and negligent make-believe gun-free zones at the whim of petty tyrants.

Those who advocate for so-called "gun free" campuses should be removed, and our rights restored.

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.

BIGOTRY ON CAMPUS!

Endangering Students Near YOU!

by Marcus Cole

One of the first “gun control” laws in the New World called for colonists to stop anyone with darker skintones who might be carrying “any potential weapon,” and even “shoot to kill” if the colonist thought it was necessary (*The Racist Roots of Gun Control* by Clayton E. Cramer, University of Kansas School of Law 1995). This unquestionably racist law actually predated the founding of the United States by 25 years.

American “gun control” is built on the despicable notion that killing an elderly black person carrying a walking stick is acceptable. It is built on a history of racial and economic class warfare, perpetrated by a wealthy and largely pallid elite using the force of the state upon persons of color, immigrants, religious minorities, and the poor to deny arms to the “lesser” classes while keeping the hands of the upper class clean.

“Gun control” in America is consistently designed to keep the unwashed masses, the not-quite-human, in their place, so the “good folk” are not menaced by uppity untermenschen.

Whether attacking the rights of Native Americans in California or black freemen (and later, emancipated slaves and poor whites) in the Old South, or as part-and-parcel of the pre-Civil-Rights era Jim Crow package, “gun control” has been a bludgeon to keep the poor from rising, persons of color from resisting those that would oppress them and the assorted rich and powerful elites safe and comfortable in the knowledge they have a monopoly on the use of force.

Given the well-documented history of racist “gun control” laws, it is particularly disturbing that—as reported in the Daily Caller—two allegedly liberal University of Texas professors would use a race-based argument (since disappeared from the web at their request) for the preservation of existing “gun control” legislation.

Professors Jorge Canizares-Esguerra and Patrick Timmons aim their special hatred at white males in a bizarre argument that campus carry

would somehow only be permitted to persons of that demographic (both untrue and constitutionally impermissible).

If racism is wrong at all, it is wrong across the board—whether the target is African-American, Asian, Latino, Caucasian or of other ethnic origin. Just as murder is wrong, regardless of the gender, hue, or orientation of its target, so it is with racism.

Canizares-Esguerra and Timmons immediately default to the idea that white male students are inherently untrustworthy colonialist aggressors that should not be trusted with spoons, let alone firearms (every bit as odious as the bigoted meme “black men are after the white women”).

The reality is, campus carry in Texas will be open to all CHL holders regardless of race, creed, color, gender or orientation. But somehow, white male students are especially evil in the professors eyes.

The blind spot exhibited by these two educators regarding the racist roots and past application of “gun control” is nothing less than amazing.

Consider the world around us. If black lives matter, as the ongoing political movement claims, then what rational reason exists for limiting persons-of-color ability to defend themselves? Or do their lives really only matter when it is politically expedient? Is it not racist to use persons of color to push a specific political cause and then hang them out to dry?

Once we examine the notion that Black Lives Matter then if we are at all consistent in our thinking, we must admit that all lives matter. Bigotry and racism, such as the professors promote, is fundamentally and inherently wrong at every level.

For Heaven’s sake, the two professors actually note that whites have subjugated and oppressed specific minorities throughout America’s history... and then turn around and pimp the very laws used for that very subjugation. How does that blatant hypocrisy even begin to make sense?

The inconvenient truth is that anti-rights cultists inject race into every

situation when they realize they might not get their way, and “gun control” is no different. Those who embrace the demolition of Americans’ basic rights to self-defense have somehow convinced themselves that they are the white knights coming to the minorities’ rescue while blinding themselves to the inherently racist nature of the policies they support... and the racist notion that those minorities need, or want, their “protection.” Or, as the inimitable Mr. Colion Noir recently put it, “I’m so tired of these anti-gun mainstream media publications, personalities and politicians exploiting the racial sensitivities of black people in this country. Every two seconds the media is pressing their thumb into the open wound of our racial past in order to manipulate our emotions so they can maintain their perceived political plantation on the black opinion on every issue in this country.”

Racism is slowly becoming a thing of the past. How about we sweep the tools employed by racists—including the unjust deprivation of arms—into the same dustbin of history?



Bill of Rights Sentinel

Editor:	Ray Carter
Publisher:	Alan Gottlieb
Consultant:	Alan Korwin
Contributors:	Rabbi Dovid Bendory
	Charles Heller
	Dean Weingarten
	Marcus Cole
	Jessie Gaunt
	Maxwell Dolor

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

©2016 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.

Don't Just Do Something, Think!

by Rabbi Dovid Bendory, Rabbinic Director, JPFO



It's become a predictable pattern. In the wake of a tragic shooting, political elites insist there is a way to stop such events from occurring. Supported by a fawning liberal media, they propose "common-sense" reforms to our already restrictive firearms laws. No one explains how these changes will stop the next killing, and no one considers the impact on law-abiding citizens, let alone the legality of infringing on Second Amendment rights. And when these "common-sense" ideas fail to gain traction, we—you, me and every gun owner in America—are viciously demonized by the pundits and elites.

Since when did owning firearms make a person criminally guilty until you are proven innocent?

The rhetoric of anti-rights groups has changed dramatically since the heady days of "gun control" in the last decades of the 20th century. When founded in 1974, the Brady Campaign quite honestly called itself National Council to Ban Handguns; from 1980-2000, it was simply called "Handgun Control, Inc." and partnered with the "National Coalition to Ban Handguns."

While they may have hated the Second Amendment and the freedom it represents, gun grabbers were at least honest about their goals of confiscation.

Today we have the fraudulently named "Committee to Stop Gun Violence", the misleading Bloomberg front group "Moms Demand Action," the "Brady Campaign to Stop Gun Violence" and the "Brady Center for Gun Violence." All gun control groups, all supporting draconian restrictions on private firearms ownership and possession—and all hiding behind spin control and fancy phrases with the same old anti-rights goals of bans, seizures and entrapment.

Hillary Clinton, when asked how to prevent a mass killing, cited "the Australian example" as a successful "buyback" program. She artfully suggested "I think it would be worth considering it on the national level if that could be arranged." These are exemplary statements explaining why no one trusts Hillary.

Unless the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer is the one purchasing the firearm, there is no such thing as a "buyback" program.

The government cannot "buy back" firearms that the government never owned. We could possibly excuse such phraseology as ignorant use of an imprecise expression, except that we all know how carefully politicians choose their words and phrases, most especially when they seek to deceive.

Australia never had a "buyback program." They had a confiscation program. Australia seized guns from citizens under threat of legal action; the rightful owners then received "compensation" for their property from the government that stole it.

Does anyone who knows the truth of Australia's confiscatory citizen disarmament actually believe Hillary thinks it was voluntary?

Everything that Hillary proposes is unconstitutional. The Fourth Amendment states clearly: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause."

In addition, the Second Amendment protects our G-d-given right to keep and bear arms.

For Clinton, the Constitution is not a problem. She proudly claims that "the Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment."

Even worse, we hear such rhetoric coming from the White House, from the Commander of the Armed Forces who is sworn to protect and uphold the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Obama was clear: "We know that other countries, in response to one mass shooting, have been able to craft laws that almost eliminate mass shootings. Friends of ours, allies of ours—Great Britain, Australia, countries like ours."

Obama and Hillary know they are floating the idea of gun confiscation in an attempt to see how it polls with the American people – it is far from an accident.

As a member of JPFO or a reader who agrees with our goal of destroying "gun control", you must educate your friends and family. Support JPFO and the other defenders of freedom and truth.

Finally—preferably this weekend—take a friend to the range and introduce someone new to the enjoyment of the shooting sports. Make it your habit to take someone new out at least once a month and don't hesitate to break bread with them after to "seal the deal."

Respond to your media's lies and deceptions. Call them out publically in social media. Send letters to the editor. Get together with friends and send a barrage of such letters.

It is not just our right to keep and bear arms, but our very freedom that hangs in the balance.

Join JPFO Now!

www.jpfo.org (800) 869-1884



America's Most Aggressive
Civil Rights Organization

JPFO: A Future

JPFO must be eternally vigilant in its mission to not only loudly proclaim “Never Again” but also take concrete action as part of that mission to destroy “gun control” and the arguments of its vile proponents utterly. Never again must a nation, state or band of terrorists succeed in rolling cattle cars of helpless victims to oven-filled death camps. JPFO exists to ensure proposed victims have the tools to fight back effectively.

“An armed populace capable of effective revolution is far more resistant to tyranny and bad acts than an unarmed mob...”

We must always teach of the horrors of the Holocaust and of other genocides, lest the world forget. We must teach people to recognize the warning signs of murderous evil. These teachings—added to a lesson on how armed and aware citizens can stave off or delay yet another genocidal rampage—are key to “Never Again.”

Armed citizens not only protect themselves and their loved ones from the evil and the mad, but also from governments gone astray. That protection against government sponsored tyranny and terror is not simply expressing defiance at gun point—the unspoken threat of that last step is one element in preventing governments from going rogue in the first place.

An armed populace is far more capable of effective revolution and is a far more effective deterrent to tyranny and bad acts than an unarmed mob.

Totalitarians and nanny-state supporters of all stripes, not unlike other criminally oriented sorts, seek to disarm the populace before abusing said populace. To them, return fire is undesirable.

Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership defends the constitutionally protected right to keep and bear arms possessed by every good and decent person, the fundamental right of such people to effectively defend themselves and others from the unlawful use of force and utterly opposes the evils of so-called “gun control.”

Whether through the publication of accessible, direct and thought-provoking materials like the Gran’pa Jack series (#9 is coming soon), JPFO web and social media sites, via email or through the *Bill of Rights Sentinel* JPFO works to inform members and the general public of the latest news and cutting-edge thought regarding the right to keep and bear arms.

Unlike some groups, JPFO has never abandoned principle and con-

tinues as the thought leader at the edge the right to keep and bear arms movement—for if not JPFO, who will? Will the NRA suddenly leap to the cutting edge of defending the right to keep and bear arms?

Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership—America’s most aggressive defender of firearms ownership—must continue to grow as it continues the fight for moral and logical right.

KARNO ADMITS GUN CONTROLLERS ARE RIGHT!

DO YOU IDIOT GUN NUTS SERIOUSLY BELIEVE YOUR PUNY LITTLE PERSONAL ARMS ARE GOING TO DEFEND YOU FROM A TYRANNICAL GOVERNMENT?

SNORT! SNEER!

KJARTAN
© 2015

THE SITUATION’S FAR WORSE THAN ANYTHING THE FOUNDERS HAD TO FACE, BUT YOU’VE DONE **NOTHING!** WHEN ARE YOU ARMCHAIR RAMBOS GONNA START WITH THE ALTERING OR ABOLISHING, HUH? HUH?

MAYBE YOU HAVEN’T NOTICED, BUT THE GOVERNMENT IS **ALREADY** TYRANNICAL! THE NSA’S SPYING ON EVERYONE, MAKING A JOKE OF THE 4TH AMENDMENT. “ASSET FORFEITURE” LETS COPS ACT LIKE A ROBBERY GANG, WHEN THEY’RE NOT BUSY KILLING UNARMED BLACK MEN. ETCETERA, ETCETERA, ET-BLOODY-CETERA!

YOU’RE RIGHT! THE GOVERNMENT IS A PACK OF ARROGANT CRIMINALS WHO HOLD OUR FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN CONTEMPT. THE NAKED, SHAMELESS CORRUPTION IS BREATHTAKING!

SO HANDING OUR GUNS IN TO THIS PACK OF LYING, THIEVING, MURDEROUS CRIMINAL VERMIN WOULD BE INSANE, YES? THE LAST THING A VIOLENT CRIMINAL NEEDS IS MORE FIREPOWER! THANK YOU FOR POINTING OUT THAT “GUN CONTROL” IS PURE CRAZY!

UH, THAT’S NOT WHAT I WAS TRYING TO...I MEAN... I MEAN, IT’S NOT LIKE THE GOVERNMENT **NEEDS** YOUR GUNS!



High Velocity Empowerment

by Jessie Gaunt, Guest Writer

Most women are accustomed to a constant state of low-level threat assessment. Given that most women are at a distinct physical disadvantage to most men, and that they are likelier targets for a predatory assault than their male counterparts, most of us who have not either been extremely sheltered or made an active choice not to think about it are constantly alert to potential threats.

“How closely is that person following me? Is my path from the store to the parking lot well-lit the whole way? This person keeps creeping just into my personal space and it’s ringing all my internal alarms. I’m meeting someone new for dinner—does someone know where I am, and that I should be checking in with them? I’m really enjoying this party and meeting the people here, but I’d better not take my eyes off my drink, and I need to be very conscious of how much I have...”

Given this, women and firearms seem an obvious match. A gun levels the playing field, and barring injury or disability, it does not depend on upper-body strength, muscle mass or reach. Superior numbers improve one’s odds significantly less against a person carrying a gun than a person without one. A man has no physical advantage over a woman in firearms training. Gun rights should be a critical feminist issue as well as a general human-rights issue. Yet, women are still a minority among shooters and especially as voices in the self-defense community.

Women are socialized from birth to be soft and gentle where boys are rough and tumble, to be conscious of their disadvantage in strength and even to exaggerate it as a sign of femininity. Even when being pushed or outright bullied by another child, women are not encouraged to fight back, but rather to seek help from an authority figure—and may be told that if it’s a boy pushing them around, that he’s doing it because he likes her and she should keep that mind, even be flattered. All children are taught not to hit and bite and that starting fights is bad, but a boy is

much likelier than a girl to be taught to stand his ground, hold his own, and that defending himself physically is a thing that he may have to do someday. Ironically, though there is no greater physical hurdle for a woman to use firearms to defend herself than a man, the psychological hurdle can be imposing.

Given this, learning to shoot and to come to terms with the idea of trusting and relying on herself to defend herself and her family from others’ violence can be a deeply powerful and transformative journey for a woman. A gun does not remove fear, but it does temper it and replace helplessness with the seed of control, the possibility of turning danger aside through your own actions.

The process of learning to shoot can be—should be—inherently pleasurable and rewarding, simply because mastering a new skill is. Especially if guns were an object of fear in themselves beforehand, grasping the basics of the skill and getting to the point where improvement is tangible and mastery is imaginable is a tremendously profound experience.

If you are already living the majority of your life on alert—constantly in condition yellow or orange whenever out of an entirely safe place—then you’re already halfway to a self-defense mindset. Taking the other half of the journey and developing the skill and the will to react to danger that comes to you rather than solely hoping to flee, find a defender or “hope and endure” is the next step—the step to self-reliance, self-confidence and a wider world.

Good Reads

Thoughts on Paris by Larry Correia
<http://tinyurl.com/thoughtsonparis>

Paris & The Pain of Being Human
by Peter Grant
<http://tinyurl.com/painofbeinghuman>



JPFO Reader Survey

Many “gun control” surveys use artfully constructed questions to solicit the answers they seek - a clever, if unethical, approach to creating statistics and survey results that support one’s own view.

Take this survey and see if you’d fall into this dishonest trap!

1. If you received a phone call asking you to take a survey, and one of the questions asked if you own a gun, would you answer truthfully?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Would you be more truthful if the person calling claimed they were from the NRA?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Would you be more truthful if the person claimed they were from Handgun Control?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. How much information would you provide if they wanted to know specifics about guns you own?

☐ Everything Asked

☐ Some

☐ None

5. If a person went into a so-called “gun-free zone” and murdered innocent people before committing suicide or being shot to death by police or a bystander, would you think the murderer was responsible, gun-control laws, or the gun?

☐ The Murderer

☐ Gun Control Laws

☐ The Gun

Mail or email to:
Jews for the Preservation of
Firearms Ownership
12500 N.E. Tenth Place
Bellevue, WA 98005
survey@jpfo.org

HELLER HIGHWATER

Who Owns The Holocaust?

By Charles Heller

Recently I addressed a group of ten Holocaust survivors in Tucson for JPFO. There was disagreement amongst them on the value of guns in society—a robust discussion of recent remarks by Dr. Ben Carson, “The likelihood of Hitler being able to accomplish his goals would have been greatly diminished if the people had been armed... there is a reason that these dictatorial people take the guns first...”

It is not wholly surprising that some of the survivors who came to the U.S. in the aftermath of WWII have a deep faith in the government, which gave them refuge after their previous one tried to exterminate them. What is surprising is the contradictory ideas they expressed over the use of arms in lawful self defense.

Each survivor acknowledged the acts of Mordechai Anielewicz (1919–1943), the hero of the Warsaw uprising, but few expressed support for the efficacy of the armed struggle against tyranny.

One participant, I’ll call her Lilly, probably summed up the use of arms best, when she said, “So what if armed Jews wouldn’t have stopped the Holocaust—it would have slowed it some and resulted in the death of a few more Nazis—what could be wrong with that?” What, indeed?

The question is, do the anti-free-domin bigots (the ones who want to disarm you) so own the memory of the Holocaust that you cannot point out that Lilly is right?

Carson’s remarks have reignited the smoldering ember of media lies claiming that Nazis did not significantly use victim disarmament as a predicate to genocide.

Salon dismisses Carson, saying, “The law did prohibit Jews and other persecuted classes from owning guns, but this should not be an indictment

of gun control...”

In 2014, JPFO awarded Stephen Halbrook the David And Goliath Award for destroying that myth in his book *Gun Control in the Third Reich: Disarming the Jews and Enemies of the State*.

After the Holocaust many Jews adopted the slogan, “Never Again,” with a book of that title *Never Again* by Meir Kahane published in 1972 driving the phrase into popular memory.

How do you enforce “Never Again” without the force of arms?

It seems the “Never Again” Jews moved to Israel, and the take-my-guns-away Jews moved to New York and elected Michael Bloomberg - before retiring to Florida or Arizona.

Has the only modern equivalent of “Never Again” degenerated into a Jewish “declaration of war,” otherwise known as a lawsuit.

Nobody thinks we are on the verge of a genocide here, but by the same token why do these survivors not understand they are responsible for their own security? Why do they not see or refuse to look at armed volunteers in schools in Israel or soldiers slinging their weapons and going about their business? Why are guns there not “bad,” but guns here, are?

Is it the same willful blindness today about the RKBA as it was for the Jews of 1938? Certainly, no one thinks the stakes are as high now as then, but is the “background check” not the same “soft pathway” to registration as the German weapons registration law of 1928 that allowed the Nazis to later confiscate the guns of all Jews?

JPFO broke new ground when it did the research on the 1968 Gun Control Act and published the fact that some of the language in it was a direct translation of the 1938 Nazi Weapons Law (on the JPFO website).

The whole sporting purpose test is a phony addition to our 1968 U.S. law which is wholly lifted from a Nazi statute. It was brought to the U.S. by Thomas Dodd, a prosecutor at Nuremburg and translated for him by our State Department.

Why is it so hard for some people here to see the connection between a culture of self-reliance and the possession of arms? Can some of those survivors not realize that part of the culture that saved them is the culture of arms?

Is there a magic wand that will finally open human minds to the idea that we protect what is precious with lawful deadly force when necessary? A vaccination?

Does any one set of people own the memory of the Holocaust? Must we endure the lies of the “news” media, or the revisions and fears of Jews afraid to confront the realities of what “Never Again!” really means?

Heaven forbid!

Action Items

You go out on date night, ready to visit your favorite restaurant or go to a movie—and there on the door, as you and your special other are ready to enter, is a sign reading “No guns, knives or other weapons allowed under penalty of law.”

Uncomfortable leaving a weapon unattended in a vehicle or visiting an “enhanced victimhood zone”, you and your partner go elsewhere.

But what about the smug and bigoted business owner you leave behind? That anti-gun sign is just as bigoted as the old “No Colored Allowed” in the days of segregation and open bigotry.

Fortunately, you can take action. Gather a small group of friends and stand on the public sidewalk outside the business entrance—and hand each potential customer a card—“Don’t Shop With Bigots.”

Charles Heller is the host of radio shows *Swap Shop*, *Liberty Watch* and *Armed America and Free* heard on KVOI in Tucson, AZ (archived at www.libertywatchradio.com/recent_shows_). He is also an Arizona CCW Instructor and the JPFO Media Coordinator.



15 MINUTES TO MIDNIGHT

The hands of JPFO's Confiscation Alarm Clock crept a bit closer to midnight with the frank admission, during the Democrat's presidential debate on Oct. 13, that the party openly admires and now seeks government-run gun confiscation. All five candidates on stage joined Mr. Obama's recent entreaties in calling for what they termed 'common-sense gun-safety laws like Australia'—to raucous cheers and applause from the liberal-progressive audience.

Australia enacted laws forcing confiscation and public destruction of a significant portion of privately owned guns nationwide from all of its otherwise innocent citizens.

Preventing the symbolic clock's hands from inching further forward was the election in America on Nov. 3 of a number of pro-rights candidates, and the fact, voiced by several observers, that now the democrat's liberal-progressive gun-confiscation agenda was fully out in the open for all to see, exposing a deception they have kept for years with media help.

Is America Like Australia?

The enemies of freedom would have you think so, to convince you to give up guns as they have, but it isn't so.

The United States is 14 times larger (23 million to 320 million population) and Australia lacks the glorious multiculturalism we enjoy (none of our ghetto problems—with 92% white and 7% Asians in the public at large).

The Aussies have only five major cities. When you get down to our

50th you're around Cleveland and New Orleans. They started out as a penal colony for the British Empire, a band of tyrants who we threw out, to start the linchpin of freedom on planet Earth, a position we still hold, along with our guns which the Aussies have lost, much to their chagrin (and rising crime rates now). We may both speak English (though Brits might argue that point), but America cannot truly be compared to other nations in the history of humanity, and efforts to do so are deceptions of the first order.

As we go to press, we are well aware that, in addition to threats Jews face just like any other decent individuals, the world harbors villains who pose a particularly dangerous threat to Jewish people, and in fact all "infidels" everywhere. This makes it especially important to hold back the hands of this clock.

We must eliminate the dangerous make-believe gun-free zones where preservation of possession meets a reckless blockade.

Possession bans are tantamount to confiscation.

Doctors for Responsible Gun Ownership

Doctors for Responsible Gun Ownership (DRGO.us)—a project of the Second Amendment Foundation—under the leadership of Dr. Timothy Wheeler, is a team of pro-gun-rights doctors formulating plans to bring the self-defense and the Second Amendment message to doctors nationwide.

Largely unchallenged, medical leftists have repeatedly introduced whacky plans to treat guns like germs, create unethical boundary-violation models where doctors act as untrained firearm counselors for their patients, and lobby against the fundamental rights of Americans and promote the use of tax dollars and their patients' trust against unsuspecting individuals.

DRGO is a credible and nationwide voice to resist these immoral and irrational incursions on the practice of medicine and on human and civil rights.

In the last year DRGO has added four new members to its leadership team:

Dr. Robert Young is a clinical pro-

fessor of psychiatry at the University of Rochester and practices psychiatry in upstate New York.

Young has rapidly become a prolific writer on Second Amendment topics bearing on mental health, and he has been published in National Review, the Washington Times, and other outlets in addition to DRGO's blog.

Dr. Arthur Przebinda is an imaging specialist in Los Angeles who serves as DRGO's social media editor. Przebinda has created and managed blogs, web pages, and social media profiles and has transformed DRGO's website into a dynamic online resource.

Dr. John Edeen is a pediatric orthopedic surgeon from San Antonio, Texas.

Edeen has a special interest in working for the elimination of so-called "gun-free zones" in medical facilities and is DRGO's membership director.

Dr. Sean Brodale, an osteopath, is a family physician from Bloomfield, Iowa. Brodale has worked toward changing his community hospital's

policy to allow discreet carry of firearms by hospital personnel. He is active with social media and will coordinate outreach to younger physicians and other health professionals.

All of us have doctors! Many of us know medical professionals in our circle of friends. Every time you have can, tell medical friends and doctors about **DRGO.us**.

Encourage them to join now!



Doctors for
Responsible
Gun
Ownership

*Doctors for Responsible
Gun Ownership (DRGO)*

P.O. BOX 1931

Upland, CA 91785-1931

<http://drgo.us>

E-mail: info@drgo.us

Denial of Access

Gun Control By Other Means

by Maxwell Dolor

We have all grown accustomed to certain sorts of blatant gun control pushed by anti-rights activists. The gun bans (either general or trying to ban some gun the fanatics claim is “icky”), attempts to ban magazines with normal capacities or efforts implement draconian requirements for constitutionally questionable “permits” are—though certainly still dangerous—nothing really new. They are the same old stuff from the same old evil hacks and fanatics.

Unfortunately those old and obvious attacks aren’t the only ones the anti-rights loons pursue.

New infringements include:

- Attempts to impose a \$25 or more tax (locally, nationally or both) on the sale of each gun.
- Creation of stealth gun registries through mandatory background checks where a permanent record is kept of each check.
- Forcing gun owners to pay for expensive “gun liability insurance” on each gun.
- Ramming through new taxes on ammunition to discourage purchases.
- Mandatory storage schemes that require gun owners to lock up their guns even in their own homes.

These new attacks brazenly attempt to deter decent gun owners and citizens that want to become gun owners from purchasing or keeping firearms or ammunition.

Often based in conscious or unconscious economic elitism (the idea that poor and moderate income folks should not own guns) these attacks focus on keeping the so-called lower classes in their “place.”

A new gun tax is a newly opened door. Nothing exists to keep such taxes from being raised, dramatically pricing out the average citizen out of their Second Amendment rights.

Taxes though are still relatively obvious and direct attacks on gun owners and those who would like to become gun owners.

How can a beginner learn even

basic skills with a gun without instructors or a place to shoot?

When laws are passed that make opening or continuing to operate a private range a near-impossibility—and then the public is barred from any government ranges—how can gun owners develop any sort of marksmanship or safety skills? How can newcomers interested in firearms explore their interests?

“We didn’t ban guns! We just banned ranges!”

In states without range protection statutes, ranges built in once-rural areas are being driven out of existence as urban sprawl surrounds them—and the new neighbors campaign to get rid of them through elaborate licensing or sound-management schemes.

When a range has existed for decades and other development builds up around it, it is rightfully the problem of the developer and the buyer/tenant to accommodate the range—not the problem of the range to accommodate some johnny-come-lately.

Anti-rights activists are attacking actual firearms-safety instruction in the name of “gun safety.”

These attacks include both opposing instructor-liability protection and making instruction nearly impossible by enacting conveniently ill-written background-check laws that would entrap those who allow a student to hand off or receive a firearm without a background check each time during instruction.

Each anti-rights attack undermines firearms-safety instruction, but the last is by far the most deadly.

While the others can be dealt with, the new crop of mandatory background-check ballot initiatives typically forces instructors to perform a separate background check on each student every time a firearm changes hands during a class—can you imagine trying to teach the NRA Home Firearms Safety course, which uses six or more guns in a class of twenty students under such conditions?

We can’t imagine teaching that way.

Don’t be Left Out!

- Don’t be left out! Every week the JPFO team sends out email blasts that make important information available to you on what is going on in the world of the right to keep and bear arms and how you can best help advance our rights.

If JPFO lacks your email address, then you miss these critical updates and opportunities for action.

If you are not already receiving your JPFO updates, please send us an email at

membership@jpfo.org

and we’ll get you on the list as soon as possible.

- Bring in 15 new members and earn a free life membership! If you sign up 15 new members of JPFO, receive a certificate good for one free life membership—that you can either redeem for yourself or the lucky recipient of your choice.

Help JPFO to grow, prosper and reach for new achievements! You can do it!

JPFO members need to be on the look-out for both obvious and underhanded attacks on our fundamental rights—not just the old and obvious gun bans and gun grabs.

The new strategy of the anti-rights cultists is that gun owners rights “be nibbled to death by a thousand ducks.” It is time to go duck hunting.

Every time your legislature or Congress meets, your Second Amendment rights are at risk. Call and write your representatives.

In every single election, anti-rights traitors can slither into the halls of power and bad ballot initiatives can erupt. Make your voice heard!

Wake up and smell the brimstone. We must watch elected officials and contact them often or they are likely to go horribly astray and anti-2A.