An Unlikely Conversion
From Gun Terror to Certified Instructor

by Robyn Sandoval

No way was I going to allow a firearm in our home with our three children. I didn’t let my kids play with toy guns. I felt our society was too violent. I didn’t understand the purpose of anyone having a firearm. I didn’t hunt or live in a bad area of town. The idea of having a gun—any gun—in our home seemed like an invitation to Death itself. My paradigm shattered on Aug. 31, 2005. Sitting on our couch watching televised devastation of Hurricane Katrina on the news, I saw a mother hand her young children to a complete stranger, who was getting on a bus out of New Orleans. She said, “Please take them. I’ll try to find you in Houston in a few days.” Oh, how my heart shattered for her! I cried. I couldn’t imagine her despair.

A modern American city was depleted overnight by a storm and the situation quickly became severe and desperate. There was increasing violence and death, with limited food and water. This was a wake-up call of how quickly a community can fall apart. First responders were unable—and in some cases, unwilling—to respond, and families were left on their own. Mothers had to make choices they probably thought they would never make.

I resolved that would never be me.

I started storing peanut butter and tuna fish in case our city ever suffered an outrage of any kind. My plan was to have supplies, so we could shelter in place until things calmed down. My husband asked, “How are we going to stop someone with a gun from kicking down our door and taking the food and water you’ve stored for our kids?”

In all my years arguing for gun control, I suddenly had no argument.

I agreed to the purchase of one firearm to be locked away and never touched, unless there was a disaster in our area. We don’t live in a coastal city, but I realized any city’s infrastructure is vulnerable. I had no intention to ever touch that firearm, but was open for the first time to having one in our home—for my husband to use to protect us.

Natural disasters quickly turn civility to chaos. The increase in violent crime and looting when a disaster strikes serves as a wake-up call to every American family. In all my years arguing for gun control, I suddenly had no argument.

I agreed to the purchase of one firearm to be locked away and never touched, unless there was a disaster in our area. We don’t live in a coastal city, but I realized any city’s infrastructure is vulnerable. I had no intention to ever touch that firearm, but was open for the first time to having one in our home—for my husband to use to protect us.

Natural disasters quickly turn civility to chaos.

Semitic peoples are a broad swath of humanity, evolved and living in what we roughly call the Middle East. They include Arabs, a group we define primarily by geo-political and ethnic parameters, and Jews, classified entirely by religion, not their ethnicity or locale. Isn’t that odd when you think about it.

To cast them together as one batch to hate is, first, wrong. Arabic, and Jewish, is not a single category, it is a mismatch. Many Arabs are Jewish. Many Jews are not Semitic. This awkward twist and misapplication of language is actually typical of leftist Marxist distortion aimed at confusing complex social and cultural issues. An anlyskeysque technique for winning debates, it replaces reasoned argument with politicized drama and moves rationale into the sewer. Anti-Semitism—as used in modern discourse—explodes Arabs (Semites), arguably the largest group at 1.3 billion! That hothead of religious fervor, many of whom want to murder infidels and take over the world, are semitic anti-Semites, can that be correct? But not too many, though, The Pew Center informs us it’s only about 15% of them (a couple hundred million).

If you call a spade a spade, then Jew haters are simply that, Jew haters, not anti-Semites. Watering down the problem Jews face by giving it a deceptive name like anti-Semite dissolves the issue to a point where it can never get resolved. It perpetuates itself.

Hatred is ugly, believe it, everyone has it, including you. It is normal. Always has been. You hate it when your shoes don’t fit, when the TV has fits, when your laptop is on the fritz. You hate the gun haters and the gun haters hate you. You—and everyone close to you—hate each other a little, or a lot, at different times of day and points in your life. This is standard. Need we tell spouse jokes? What is not standard—and not acceptable in civil society—is acting out on it (more than a little).

The now common and oft-praised hate-crime laws are an abomination to what we like to call “the rule of law.”
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They call it swatting, and think it’s funny! Left-wing radical activists, frustrated at their inability to ban civilian guns outright, have called in phony police reports against people peacefully going about their business while armed, as if those people posed some sort of danger. Police arrive tense and prepared for a lethal confrontation, when the person with a gun at McDonald’s is just having lunch. It is the swatters who put everyone falsely at risk. That form of “swatting” has been made specifically illegal in many places. Filing false police reports has always been a crime.

But now—in the interest of political correctness (marxism under a nice name)—so-called “red-flag laws” encourage the public to inform on each other, under the rubric of blanket fear. Once you are red flagged, “swatting” is legal, your rights evaporate, due process is over, and police can pretty much do with you as they please. Whether you’re a danger or not is not an issue, and is not demonstrated much less proven. Merely someone’s fear of you manifests, and this gains the weight of law.

Your guns are taken by force, without notice to you or a chance to appeal or protest, and later, you get a day in court. People have died at the hands of authorities, who are immune from liability, under this system of institutionalized paranoia. Resist red-flag laws without compromise. They protect nothing.
Did you ever imagine you’d see every candidate from one political party run on a platform of banning guns?
☐ What are you talking about that’s impossible.
☐ I knew that was on their wish list all along.
☐ Our Founding Fathers knew that was possible.
☐ Those people should be tried for treason.
☐ Half the country would vote for them.
☐ It’s the education system’s doing, long-term plan.

What does the first question say about their understanding or adherence to the Constitution?
☐ They haven’t got any.
☐ They are morality free.
☐ Their values are unhinged.
☐ The rule of law no longer matters.
☐ They are not fit to serve—or run.

If candidates can campaign to ban guns, overlook 4th Amendment property guarantees, due process protections and more, what else in the Constitution do you think they might respect?
☐ Nothing.
☐ G-d help us.

Isn’t it illegal (“infringement”) to ban and confiscate guns people already legally own?
☐ Yes.

Haven’t tyrants been shot for less, even in our own history?
☐ Yes.

Where is party leadership, allowing their candidates to run on banning parts of the Constitution?
☐ Leadership is complicit.
☐ Leadership are co-conspirators.
☐ Leadership is as bad or worse than the candidates.
☐ They’re all in collusion with the Russians.

☐ Their leaders put them up to it.
☐ Leftist leadership won’t allow candidates who won’t promise gun bans.

How did America get to this point?
☐ I don’t know but it’s so severe it must be obvious.
☐ I don’t know but it’s so bad it must have been devastating.
☐ I think I know but I’m afraid to say and get red flagged.
☐ I know but no one believes me, it was those rat bastards red commies.

It was Saul Alinsky and his 5th column marxist infiltrators.
☐ The teachers union and their woke monolithic thought control played a part.

What does it say for gun ownership and the balance of power that keeps America free if one party wants to ban the very thing that provides a block to tyranny?
☐ We’re doomed.
☐ We’re screwed.
☐ Civil war is bubbling under.
☐ Tyranny is less than a generation away.
☐ They know not what they do.
☐ Massive resistance is already starting to form.

Hasn’t anyone told this to the candidates?
☐ Yes.

Why doesn’t news media question them about the tyrannical socialist confiscatory storm brewing?
☐ Why indeed. Check out the new seminar, “Enforcing News Media Ethics,” staged this summer at the International Mensa (High IQ) Conference, and possibly a location near you, inquire at jpfo.org.

I’ve watched these Town Halls—why don’t “reporters” question them about anything meaningful, instead of the same redundant talking points, without followups, for which they have prepared spiels?
☐ If they did viewers would see the whole thing is a farce.
☐ It would be embarrassing to be seen as so stupid (for candidates and reporters).
☐ You can’t do that on public TV.
☐ It’s all a set-up, not really a Town Hall, and certainly not debate.
☐ They never pick any real people from the audience to grill them.

If they had me on there the cameras would melt.
☐ If they had me on there the cameras would melt.

Real interviews would give the public apoplexy, when they see the levels of ignorance, duplicity, intolerance, and lack of fundamental comprehension of what America is and why citizens keep and bear arms, so obviously, they (who is they?) can’t let that happen. “They” is the question...

Are You Worried About Lobbying Chaos?
Who hasn’t heard about turmoil in the gun-rights lobbying industry, some of it well deserved. If this concerns you, donate to and volunteer with JPFO. We have things you can do to advance your rights that side-step political shenanigans How? Phone, Facebook or Click today. jpfo.org • 800-869-1884

Webmaster assistant sought
Do you have web skills? Volunteer to help JPFO advance its website into the 22nd century. 1-800-869-1884 or—click to us. That’s a test.

Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, www.jpfo.org will be well represented at the upcoming Gun Rights Policy Conference, scheduled for Sep 20-22, 2019, in Phoenix, Arizona. The Sheraton Crescent Hotel will be the site of our annual Roundtable event, where you can express your ideas for the coming year, review our activities for the past year, and help us strategize for the preservation of rights. Meet JPFO’s movers and shakers face-to-face.

2620 W. Dunlap Ave., Phoenix, AZ 85021, NE cor. of I-17. Register for the special room rate of $119 per night, go to tinyurl.com/yxz4k4j0 to book online. Reserve your room by phone, 1-800-325-3535. Mention GRPC to receive the special rate.

The Moyel’s Tips

“The seeds of the Holocaust exist in all societies at all times it is never defeated or gone. It requires constant monitoring and resistance.”
—Prof. Alvarez, U of Ariz.

Missouri criminal defense attorney Kevin L. Jami-
son tells us a recent Missouri case holds that 911 calls can be used as evidence without the corrobor-
oration of the caller. This reiterates what we al-
ready know: You do not have the rights you think you have, like the right to have an attorney present before or during any questioning. Along the same lines, so-called “excited utterances” made in the immediate aftermath of an incident, sometimes considered by courts to be less reliable, are sometimes considered to be more reliable. “That’s the law everywhere,” says one criminal defense attorney, as if to clarify. A 911 call is a hearsay exception to “excited utterance.” There are so many exceptions to hearsay, warrants, right to counsel, etc. that you basically don’t have those rights anymore. That’s not an exaggeration. You haven’t had certain basic rights in a long time. According to practicing attorneys. Is that clear?

England won’t support a woman threatened by muslims because then muslims might stage reprisals against England. In U.S., papers won’t identify muslim jihadis, or delay identifying at-
tackers as muslims, in deference to muslims, and they don’t fear us doing them harm when they insult and enrage us. Have we become feck-
less wimps? The muslims are woofing. We’re not. What will turn us around? What will make “officials” and enemies of freedom fear messing with the Constitution?

Listen up, Starbucks global coffee plantation. The next time a customer complains of fright at the sight of armed police officers (or any armed citi-
zens for that matter), as one did in Tempe, Ar-
izona recently, you invite the customer to leave. You do not ask the armed Americans to leave. That’s vile and disgraceful. People can account for their own actions, they are in no way empow-
ered to manipulate someone else’s. You’re un-
comfortable where you are? Go away.

They fear the muslims might cause them harm. But we’re the ones harmed, and with the guns—and they don’t fear us doing them harm when they insult and enrage us. Have we become feck-
less wimps? The muslims are woofing. We’re not. What will turn us around? What will make “officials” and enemies of freedom fear messing with the Constitution?

“Crime Doesn’t Pay” is no longer a movie stan-
dard. If ever it was. The public’s fascination with crime means it will always be glorified, and quite likely always be used by one element of society to rat against the right to keep and bear arms by the innocent.

The next time a customer complains of fright at the sight of armed police officers (or any armed citizens for that matter)... invite the customer to leave.

Having Faith in JPFO

by Paul Darling, Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army (Ret’d.)

For Jews, the need to preserve our G-d given right of self defense is self-evident truth. JPFO is and must remain a foundation for uncompromising self-de-

fense—and not just for Jews, but for all Americans. Like the motto advises, “You don’t have to be Jewish to join JPFO, you just have to love liberty.”

The election in 2020 brings us a Democrat party unified not only in hostility to firearm ownership in general, but a growing and disconcerting antipathy to Israel—itself the ultimate manifestation of Jewish self defense. And at this critical time, we witness chaos in traditional Second Amendment advocacy groups. All Second Amendment supporters need a strong JPFO and I believe that a three-pronged ass-

ualt by a rejuvenated JPFO can provide this.

1. Research. JPFO and its members have pro-

vided countless articles, white papers, DVDs and books giving 2A advocates a deep magazine of ammunition against those who seek to disarm us. This research, and more like it in the future, is essential to preserving and expanding our Sec-

ond Amendment rights. JPFO provides a platform for your work.

2. Advocacy. We must take the message of armed self defense to the grass roots level. Specifically, we must dive into the synagogues and town halls and patiently explain the unquestioned logic that an armed populace is peaceful and safe against all violence. Help bring out the obvious that so-called “gun control” seeks only to disarm those least likely to commit crime and leave them defenseless against those who seek to do evil.

3. Training and consulting. Jewish organiza-
tions and individuals are threatened by violence across all spectrums of extremism; political, ide-
ological and religious. JPFO must become a bigger resource and offer assistance to our fellow Jews. To raise a cadre of shomrim (watchers, or guards) prepared to defend their communities. This training will go far beyond mere firearm proficiency and be a full-spectrum defense based upon expert knowledge gleaned from reli-
able overseas and domestic sources. These efforts will require, at no small expense, a modern website that can do battle decisively on the political battlefield of the 21st century—which is the internet. A better website that will provide the center of gravity for all our efforts is desperately needed.

To these ends I ask for your continued financial and volunteer support, and outreach to new mem-

bers for this fine organization. Know that your ef-

forts and contributions go directly to advancing gun rights for all Americans. I personally ask that you gently remind those you know who rightfully and

Gun control seeks only to disarm those least likely to commit crime and leave them defenseless against those who seek to do evil.

Yavapai County Attorney Sheila Polk recently de-
scribed to the JCC how police went from protec-
tors to enforcers to persecutors, in WWII Germany, after a visit to Yad Vashem, the Holo-
caust Museum in Israel, and it changed her for-
ever. She now trains her forces and forces nationwide in what to watch out for in “How cops can personally avoid the slippery slope”—Remember your oath. Remember why you became a cop. Little things matter. Watch out for creep. Question illegal orders. Silence is complicity.

The “N” Word

Anti-rights activists are becoming so strident in their call to deny your civil rights, they are refer-
ning to anyone who owns a gun as a “gun nut.” This term drips with hate, and comes from a heart filled with hate, from people who, surpris-
ingly, believe they are anti hate. It is directed not at criminals but at honest and decent people. You should express the same outrage at this “N” word, and similar epithets, as ethnic groups would feel about racial slurs.

The other N word

Because followers of WWII’s most notorious Ger-
man villain shout and salute when they hear the name of their party, going forward JPFO will be referring to it as the nozy party, because those notties earn no notoriety at all. ’Snot our fault.

Moyel, n. the person who performs a circumcision.

Guns and ammo make good gifts.
911 system is overburdened is predictable. Even with good weather, political divisiveness and religious or cultural tensions can get very scary very fast. Mental-health resources are lacking. Some people are isolated and unstable.

I had suddenly accepted that I needed to focus less on what was happening “out there” with other people’s children and a bit more on what was best for mine. I could not control what others do in good times or bad—I could control my home and prepare to weather any storm or crisis.

This was a major mental shift for me. Honestly, I felt I had sold out. I grew up watching utopian cartoons and sitcoms, where everyone contributes to the greater community. Society needs to be better for all children, not just mine. We must all give up a little freedom so that we can all be safer.

My new reality was acknowledgment that I can give up all my rights for a better society, but others won’t. There are simply people out there who are never going to play by the rules, even good folks, and especially under extreme duress. Criminals cause chaos or use it to take what they can. I was no longer ignorant to the reality that danger could kick in my door. I won’t go seeking a fight, but if someone came for our kids’ peanut butter and tuna, or worse, I would protect my children.

The Moment of Truth Arrived

My husband encouraged me to attend “A Girl & A Gun” event at our local range. I was terrified! I don’t know if I was more scared of shooting a firearm, meeting other women, or just looking stupid and out of place at a gun range. The experience, however, changed my life.

I found women who could answer my questions, offer encouragement and provide endless training tips that helped me feel more empowered and confident. It was transformative. I started attending regularly, began competing in IDPA (International Defensive Pistol Assn.) and took additional training. Eventually I started mentoring other women, expanded my knowledge and even accumulated credentials. I began working full-time in the firearm industry as an executive, instructor and advocate—did I say transformative? Over the years I have welcomed thousands of women and families to learn more about the safe use and storage of firearms.

Often I encounter a woman who was like me: not comfortable operating—or even being near—a firearm. I enjoy helping her identify the tools available that can empower her to be her own first responder during a crisis. I help her make a family emergency plan and find ways she is comfortable responding to different threats, from hurricanes to robberies. Usually these women slowly come to appreciate how important it is to be able to respond to lethal force in seconds, rather than depending on police who are at least minutes away—if they are called, if they respond.

My journey had four steps:
1. Acknowledging my family’s vulnerability in our modern society.
2. Accepting that not everyone plays by the rules.
3. Wanting my family to have immediate protection.
4. Being willing to take that personal responsibility by learning about firearms.

Step #3 was the huge leap—to the mindset of being my own first responder. Luck, a passerby, some good Samaritan, that would not do. I wanted my family to have a fighting chance in any desperate situation. Going forward, I know we will be able to weather any storm, together.

Anti-Semitism—Or Jew Hatred? • Continued from Page 1

(a useful invented legal artifice but not something that actually exists). Crime and punishment to be fair must be based on harm done, not some person’s perception on why the harm was done. That requires Orwellian assessment of thought crime—great substance for a novel but not an enterprise to be dared in a court of justice.

If you hit someone over the head with a two-by-four, the penalty cannot and must not increase because you hated that Jew or that color or whatever word you think of to describe your victim. It must be based on the harm you did, the damage you caused the victim, however measured—physical, psychological, pecuniary or otherwise. And if directed at a Jew because a person’s a Jew, that’s why JPFO demands the right to be armed.

Which Is Worse? ... and which is true?

Gun registration plans suffer from a difficulty in tying each firearm to its owner in a way that can be tracked without any wiggle room. Because you can change your ID, systems until now are flawed. So:

(A) NOTICE: Chicago police will now require all residents to place their DNA on file with the department, beginning January 1, 2020. Failure to comply may include fines and jail time up to six months for the first missed deadline. Pick up your DNA sample kit at any major area cooperating drug store and follow the included instructions.

(B) GOOD NEWS: You can now get your DNA tested, including ancestry, latent genetic abnormalities, missing relatives, intellectual strengths and social compatibility profiles, free of charge, if you are one of the first 5,000 people to apply to the U. of Chicago Psych and Criminal Justice Dept. Evaluation Center, thanks to a new federal research grant. The funding, in cooperation with the National Fairness in Education Institute, won’t last long, so be sure to apply today!

(C) BREAKING NEWS: As defense attorneys and prosecutors sift through cases potentially tainted by problems uncovered at the Austin Police Department’s now-shuttered DNA lab, they are sending cases to outside experts to review DNA results when it was critical to case outcomes. Of the first 39 cases reviewed, at least a quarter needed more study and could see a new day in court, a top lawyer researching the cases told the American-Statesman newspaper on Tuesday. (9/26/18)

The last story is true. The first story is a nightmare dream authorities are floating plans to achieve, because it would make law enforcement so much easier and more airtight. The degree of control over the populace would be better even than tattoos. The “good news” story is just a send up of highly successful ancestry DNA testing services, which have literally raked in billions from people voluntarily supplying their DNA to authorities (though contracts, if you read the small print, almost say they would never do that, except if required by law).

With clear memories of Germany numbering human beings, DNA databases are doing an even better job

“The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding.” —Justice Louis Brandeis (1928)
The Data Supports Defense: Arming Civilian Attendees Works

By Frank Lee

Wife Deena Lee, a sensible, no-nonsense Midwestern mom, cares deeply for her kids and grandkids. She understands the need for home-defense firearms in this increasingly dangerous world. But the idea of “arming teachers in schools” struck Deena as going too far. She worried that troubled kids would find stored guns or would take them from school adults and then start shooting. She imagined schoolteachers and staff would be poor marksmen who would likely harm bystanders and miss the perpetrators. More guns in schools, more danger, she reasoned.

This same fear can arise about arming people in synagogues and churches. Would arming worshippers, clergy and staff just create more danger? Based upon school research, we need not wonder. Research results published in December 2018 and updated in April 2019 by the Crime Prevention Research Center give answers: “Often gun-control debates involve things that might go wrong if people are allowed to have guns. But we don’t need to guess. Schools that have allowed teachers to carry guns have been remarkably safe. There has yet to be a single case of someone being wounded or killed from a shooting, let alone a mass public shooting, at a school that lets teachers carry guns.”

Clear Results Drawn from Nationwide Data Sources

The 2019 research report compared schools that posted signs declaring their campus a “gun-free zone” versus schools with signs declaring school staff are armed. Data was collected on all K-12 school shootings from January 2000 through August 2018, using the National School Safety Center report, the Washington Post database, law-enforcement reports, direct contacts with schools and police departments, and other databases for completeness. The data and research methods are detailed in the report, “Schools that Allow Teachers to Carry Guns are Extremely Safe: Data on the Rate of Shootings and Accidents in Schools that Allow Teachers to Carry,” available at crimerease.org.

Danger of homicide at school has certainly risen: “the number of people killed at [gun-free-zone] schools has increased significantly—doubling between 2001 and 2008 versus 2009 and 2018.” Meanwhile, schools permitting armed teachers and staff have experienced no problems with firearm homicides in that same period.

Are these findings surprising? No—not if you consider both the theory and reality of human behavior. In principle, rational human beings who have a choice will opt to pay the lower price for a given product, service, or other opportunity. Criminals think the same way—they pick weaker targets and defenseless people to attack. “Killers often openly talk about their desire to attack where no one is there with a gun to stop,” reported another article on crimerease.org featuring direct quotes from mass murderers in Canada, California, and Michigan. If the goal is to murder people, then go where there will be little to no resistance. “Gun-free-zones” fit that bill.

Effective Point-of-Contact Defense

Arming people at the target, whether a school, church, or synagogue, makes that target less attractive. The 2019 study report shows the difficulties with other approaches:

(1) Placing an officer in every school is quite costly and offers less protection than imagined. A single police officer faces an “almost impossible task in stopping mass public killings;” murderers can spot plain-clothes officers fairly easily, and all such officers are the criminal’s likely first targets.

(2) Trying to identify mass murderers through mental health professionals has low success. Commonly, mass killers have already seen psychiatrists or psychologists who did not identify them as posing risks of such violence.

(3) Campus security measures, such as limiting all access to one door area can impede evacuation for fires. Requiring everyone to enter via a door with a metal detector means the killer’s targets are grouped in one place. A determined sociopathic killer can shoot past a metal detector anyway.

New Zealand Leaves “Officials” Dangerously Armed

New Zealand prime minister Jacinda Ardern’s announcement, to ban good guns from the public after a psycho-maniac murdered people while they were praying, was wildly and widely celebrated by left-leaning news outlets worldwide. Unmentioned, the proclamation leaves all those dangerous guns in the hands of “officials” with shiny badges. The reason for the glaring omission was unclear at press time.

Experts at JPFO note that heavily armed government operators are no more immune to trouble-making and murderous misuse of firearms than any other human beings. In fact history shows they are responsible for more death and destruction than any other people on the planet, using their official status as an excuse. Courts routinely fail to prosecute or punish officials for malfeasance or mass murder, and are sometimes complicit in such crimes. Mass media and New Zealand’s government could not be reached for comment.

In other news, poorly reported, local New Zealand police announced only 211 firearms were turned in by New Zealanders, despite the loud hubbub surrounding the announced bans. Citizens there are believed to possess upwards of 1.5 million firearms, with 13,500 licenses issued for the specified “military-style” self-loading and now-out-of-favor type of firearms. Conflicting reports suggest about 500 guns have been turned in, with critics noting only “honest” people have taken the step, leaving criminals, gangs and psychos still armed, along with government agents. Reason magazine recently put the number at 700, which would equal a compliance rate of four ten thousandths of the available guns.

Visible the JPFO Store!

shop.jpfo.org

Bill of Rights Sentinel
Presidential Hopefuls Embrace Party of Infringement

By Jeff Knox

The first round of democrat’s presidential debates is over, and its first casualty has fallen: “gun control” zealot, Rep. Eric “Nuke’em” Swalwell, dropped out shortly after the first debate. The second round is on the way, as the large—and growing—field of candidates continues jockeying for position. During the first round candidates made it pretty clear that even the most “moderate” of their number are seeking support from the far-left socialist/communist, anti-rights element of the democrat’s base. A couple of these candidates may just be pandering to the hard-left, while actually holding positions that are more moderate, but it appears the majority have committed to “progressive” policy positions including, among so many, ever more restrictive gun control.

While not all candidates in the debates got a chance to express themselves on the Second Amendment, those who did were frankly frightening, and the others took no opportunity to offer any push-back on their radical ideas.

All the candidates have publicly embraced basic “gun-control” planks of the democrat’s party platform: banning good weapons (demonized with adjectives like “assault”) criminalizing private firearm transfers, and confiscating guns based on unsubstantiated claims by a family member, an angry ex, or a feuding neighbor. Some statutes would loosely allow police to even act on their own.

Most candidates seek even more extreme measures. It’s pretty clear that, if elected, any would immediately sign any gun-control bill that might make its way through Congress. Several, like Sen. Kamela Harris, have declared their intention to use executive orders, if Congress fails to give them the “gun control” they want.

In the debates, Joe Biden, currently declared the party moderate, represented the entire field when he declared that the “enemy” is the firearms industry, and said he would have the government “buy back” the scary semi-auto rifles. Which candidate will resist his suggestion that it should be illegal to sell any gun in the United States that isn’t equipped with mythical, “smart gun” technology, to prevent it being used by anyone not authorized to do so? In classic Biden style, “Uncle Joe” said, “No gun should be able to be sold unless your biometric measure could pull that trigger.”

At this point it is pretty clear that GunVoters will have a choice in 2020 between a republican who claims to be on our side, but has proven unreliable, and a democrat promising to actively work to criminalize our rights. Given the importance of court appointments and the good that has been done in that regard over the past three years, I think GunVoters must choose the “maybe” over the “definitely.” But much more important will be making sure that whoever is in the White House doesn’t have an anti-rights, democrat-controlled House and Senate to work with. That would be a very bad thing for individual rights.

Jeff Knox is a second-generation political activist and director of The Firearms Coalition. @JeffKnox, firearmscoalition.org

Support JPFO with a cup of Joe!

JPFO introduces The “Don’t Mug Me Mug!”

Show your office colleagues where you stand! Taste some fine brew! Give gifts! Support our important work and get something back you can touch. “You don’t have to be Jewish to enjoy Irish coffee.”

Discounts for quantities above… one. Order now: https://store.jpfo.org/
Microwave and home dishwasher safe.

Democrat Oval Office Candidates: 100% Focus on Your Legal Gun Zero Focus on Crime

Criminals were the missing element in the gun plans of the Democrat’s presidential hopefuls in the first round of televised presidential debates, held in June. Careful analysis shows that each person’s scheme attacks some form of ownership or possession of legal private firearm ownership by the public, without attention to armed criminals, or criminal conduct.

Each proposal would outlaw something already legal and widely exercised. Every candidate’s gun-related proposal was specifically banned by the U.S. Constitution. Neither the lack of criminality, nor the prohibited nature of the proposals was mentioned by the moderators, the candidates vying with each other, or legacy “news” reports following four arduous hours of jousting. The portion of the nation taken in by these diatribes are buying into ideas so radical they could not have been taken seriously a few decades ago. Any focus on real issues was completely missing, replaced by holophobic fear mongering and familiar left-wing mythologies now predictable and threadbare. The exercise of Second Amendment rights were labeled a health crisis, in need of licenses, mandatory reeducation programs, sales restrictions, brags about polling support, forced confiscation by type, or in total, verbal demonization by type, repudiation of civil-rights groups, bans on popular firearms along with their magazines, criminalizing innocent transfers, government approvals and registration systems, even rights-denial through populism and ballot initiative.

Review that list again, it’s a summary of the gun positions democrats took. Do you see enforcement against criminal activity in the list? No, they’re all civilian sub-armament and disarmament manifestos. Officials remain fully armed throughout.
by Aaron Zelman and JPFO Staff

Ten years ago JPFO’s Founder Aaron Zelman opined on the history of early Jews’ arrival in the American West. It is a stark contrast with Jews of today, and how our values have changed, or perhaps deteriorated is more accurate.

Interviewer: What is your original background with firearms?

Aaron: I was raised in Tucson, Ariz., where, I like to say; there were more guns than cactuses. Like most rural youths, I fired a .22 when I was ten or twelve. Ironically this was at a Jewish day camp in Tucson! I seriously doubt that this would be happening today, because liberal Judaism has become so widespread. Additionally, one of the nation’s experts on ammunition reloading lived across the street from me. I bought my first guns via mail order. Obviously, today’s America isn’t what I grew up with. [Editor’s note: Until the Gun Control Act of 1968, mail-order gun sales were a freedom Americans possessed. The Sears Roebuck catalog featured 12 pages of firearms. Aaron had proved the ‘68 GCA law was based on pre-Holocaust German gun-control statutes, in Gateway to Tyranny, available at the JPFO store.]

Many in Arizona’s Jewish community were the ancestors of pioneers who came to the Southwest in covered wagons. In nearly every photo of the descendants in the book We Were There the pioneer Jews are armed. Many of these Jews came from Eastern Europe or Russia and were probably very grateful to finally be on the right end of a gun.

Interviewer: In my conversations over the years, when I mention JPFO by its full name, people are a bit startled, but then so many of them say: “Well, that makes sense, seeing what Jews have historically been through.”

“They don’t trust themselves to possess a firearm and therefore don’t trust others who do own guns”

Aaron: That non Jews seem to comprehend that in greater percentages than Jews continues to disturb and disappoint me, considering that Jews are commanded to choose self defense.* The Jewish religion teaches the absolute responsibility of self defense and the defense of the helpless. I can no longer refer to Jewish gun prohibitionists as incidentally misguided, because JPFO has constantly provided them with common-sense reasoning and the lessons of history.

I now understand that many of them must be tently suicidal and, in many cases, emotionally unstable. They don’t trust themselves (because of their repressed anger against humanity) to possess a firearm, and therefore don’t trust others who do own guns. They (Jewish gun prohibitionists) don’t trust themselves (because of their repressed anger against humanity) to possess a firearm, and therefore don’t trust others who do own guns. In some cases of like evil, authoritarian essence running through their core.

“Aaron refers here to teachings in the Torah, also known as the Five Books of Moses, or the Old Testament. Though these holy writings are rejected or conveniently overlooked by modern, reform or other secular-type Jews, they could not be more clear. Scholar David Kopel has analyzed them all in his 42-page seminal law-review article, “The Torah and Self Defense,” for Penn State Law Review (2004, Vol. 109:1), citing, e.g., “In the fourteen-volume Mishneh Torah (“Repetition of the Torah”) ... Maimonides elaborated on the law regarding self-defense against burglars: 7. When a person breaks into [a home]—whether at night or during the day—license is granted to kill him. If either the homeowner or another person kills him, they are not liable.”