

You don't have
to be Jewish to
fight by our side.
You just have to
love liberty.



Same Deception, Different Day: Tyrants Abuse “Science” for Compliance

By Frank Lee

Emerging tyrants are deceiving Americans again using time-tested techniques appealing to “science.” When you see a person walking alone with a dog on a sunny breezy day wearing a mask, you see the power of the government and media’s follow-the-science mantra. No facts—none—show that a person alone outdoors needs a face diaper. Yet authorities broadcast a story of impending doom based upon “public health science,” unleashing the twin thought-cripplers, terror and blind obedience, producing people willing to do almost anything on command.

Gun Ownership— A Public Health Menace?

For decades, the emerging tyrants framed the private ownership of defensive firearms as a national “public health” threat. JPFO’s still-available article, “Disarming the Data Doctors” (1996), outright debunked the widely-discussed Kellermann study that ludicrously claimed privately owned firearms should be treated like a contagious killer disease. Calling firearm ownership a “public health” menace never ended, of course, as it’s again being touted as “science” by anti-rights authorities and mass media. Dr. John Lott’s publications at

crimeresearch.org have consistently debunked the power-driven misuse of stats and science, but the deception just won’t die.

The emerging tyrants’ methods are successfully deluding many Americans however. Notice how the same statistical deceptions called “science” feed both the COVID-19 overreaction and the “public health” calls for civilian disarmament.

The Total-Number Deception

Watch first *what they count*—the disinformers lump together dissimilar things to maximize a “total number” to amplify soundbites. Reporting on COVID-19 on every news broadcast for months, mass media and authorities constantly updated the increasing *total numbers* of COVID “cases.” For the push to criminalize firearms ownership, claims refer to *total numbers* of firearms owned. The *Washington Post* headlined, “There are more guns than people,” emphasizing gross total numbers.

These soundbites are outright deceptions. A “case” of the plague is not necessarily a death or even a sick person. A “case” of it reflects a test for the virus (past or present) that returns positive. Counting cases lumps totally unaffected young persons together with advanced-age senior citizens with multiple health issues. An increase in “cases”

tells us nothing useful about the risk or danger of actual symptoms or deaths actually caused by the plague. With no mention of increasing numbers of tests the case count is meaningless. Yet people are misled to thinking the numbers prove a “public health” crisis.

The same occurs with raw counts of firearms owned. A single firearm used by a multiple murderer is treated the same as a million firearms owned by gun collectors, target shooters, hunters or home defenders. One firearm in the hands of a drunken fool or a calculating criminal presents an immediate danger. One thousand firearms possessed by hobbyists, retired military, widows living alone or everyday citizens for occasional target practice, present no significant danger to anyone. Yet people are taught to fear “the number of guns in circulation” as though guns were killer germs.

The Epidemic Deception

Look now at the supposed solutions to the “public health” crises—government policies to fight the “epidemic” of guns and the “pandemic” of COVID. Many authorities and government office-holders demanded and implemented “lock downs” across America (and around the world). These lock

Continued on Page 2

Will government really disarm Jews—again? Does also disarming everyone else make it better?

This is the promise of the Democrats’ new gun-rights-denial plan, HR127. It shows none of the constraints placed upon them by the rule of law. Infringement is banned, they proceed regardless. Ex post facto laws are banned. Undelegated power is banned. They have decided to ignore the stated and well known limits of their power. The public’s right to be armed cannot be infringed, not legally. Infringement like this is the very tyranny the Founders sought to arm us against.

We the people should subject those employees of ours (and their relatives) to the psych tests they seek to impose on us and our relatives (a proposed requirement to keep guns you own, or get others). Then we should decide if they can remain in public, or in office. In this proposal, if they fail to issue papers to you, every gun you own becomes felony contraband. Touching any gun without papers is a crime. They are not required to issue those papers—there is no time frame. In the event they decide to give you a permission slip, you must buy an \$800 insurance policy from the Attorney General, an appointed official. Every year. This

does not define uninfringed.

Under the laughably false cover story of seeking to deter crime, the crime and criminals running rampant are ignored on every page, and only the public is targeted. The Democrats’ followers can’t see this but everyone else can. Radical left-wing forces in America are pushing the Democrat’s party to place the public’s arms under iron-clad control of an appointed czar in this bill. That is so not The American Way. Silence from sheep in mess media reflects the degree to which journalists have been compromised. You can identify reporters since, at least, they report. In America most are no longer even stenographers.

It is one thing to be loyal to your party. It is another thing entirely to give up loyalty to your oath, your nation and rationale. We’re with you on limiting crime. Limiting us is not that. That’s tyranny. The ultimate gall is where you legislators wrote, in SEC. 3 (a) (B) (i), (referenced here in plain English): “Government agents get to keep their machine guns and everything else we have banned or infringed, you peons don’t. Prepare cells.” ☆

Sanctuary for Gun Rights

The Leftablistment, comprised of Democrats, anarchists, border-free activists and others, in a multi-pronged attempt to flood the nation with illegal immigrants (a/k/a undocumented workers, migrants, future voters, etc.) have established “sanctuary” places. They claim federal and state laws do not apply there, so people sneaking in past ports of entry, customs checkpoints, overstaying visas or “turning themselves in” can remain, unmolested, in the United States. The main problems with this approach include the unmitigated violations of law and the unfunded costs.

Second Amendment freedom activists are designing and enacting Sanctuary Policies as well, but strictly under color of law. In an era of socialist demands to wipe out existing gun rights the public currently enjoys, a new paradigm has effloresced. An article coming soon in *American Handgunner* explains:

Continued on Page 2

downs forced people who had no disease at all to isolate themselves and avoid contact with other humans—*period*. The lock downs typically carved exceptions for certain government employees and essential-services workers. Everybody else, regardless of actual risk as a carrier or target of the virus, was locked down. Businesses and facilities were shuttered. Families and friends could not socialize. Senior citizens died alone. Notice: The lock-down policy treated nearly everyone as a danger to society—regardless of any disease information, regardless of any facts, regardless of any... danger.

Millions of people accepted the policies, damaging everyone and causing havoc and starvation worldwide, because there were some vague number of other people at risk of contracting the plague. Facts publicly available at reputable sites like joelhay.com, tomwoods.com, thefatemporer.com, and collateralglobal.org, put the true situation into perspective. It's clear the official plague mortality and the actual numbers aren't the same. Prevented from learning that the fatality rate of COVID itself just slightly exceeds a severe influenza, people have believed draconian policies were "following the science."

The Biden Administration's long-expected so-called "gun-control" legislation works the same way, flowing from the same follow-the-science ruse. The proposed laws will outlaw some firearms, restrict possession of others, raise costs of ownership and use, and overall deter people from owning firearms at all. JPFO wrote about this methodology years ago: All so-called "common-sense" gun laws work together to make firearms ownership and proficiency inconvenient, expensive and the object of social ridicule.

Results? Decent people are discouraged and deterred from owning and learning how to use a per-

sonal and home-defense firearm. Decent people are rendered powerless.

Follow the parallels again: People will believe government claims that they are "carriers of the disease of guns" unless they remain disarmed. It doesn't matter if being disarmed does not affect violent crime—because it does not—it matters whether you obey. Just like wearing a face diaper in places where it cannot possibly do anything but get sweaty, snotty, soggy and perhaps give you pleurisy—people believe they create COVID dangers if they go mask-free, because they believe government and social hype.

Jews especially must remember the stark Third Reich parallel, too. Never forget Nazi propaganda emphasized that Jews (genetically) were dangerous to society, as carriers of evil social and personality traits and various diseases. It was never just "we don't like Jews." It was always "Jews threaten our health, safety, and lives!" German scientists proclaimed that getting rid of Jews was "following the science." Forcing Jews to wear yellow stars on their clothing was to protect healthy Germans from the contagion of Jewishness. Failure to wear the star was heavily punished.

Sound familiar? Wear a mask—no, two masks—to protect public health! (Even when it is absolutely worthless to do so.) Confiscate firearms, track all gun owners like virus sources, penalize noncompliance with huge fines and long prison terms—to protect public health! (Even though 99% of gun owners and their firearms present no danger to anyone while actually providing widespread protection.)

Tyrants Easily Get Cooperation

In all three examples of follow-the-science tyranny plans, public ridicule is a social enforcer. Also, citizens are encouraged to report their fellows for suspected

noncompliance. And police too often arrest decent citizens who aren't wearing the yellow star, who reject pointless mask-wearing, and who don't register themselves and turn in their defensive firearms.

Will the tyrants win again? It's up to you. Spread the word. ✨



William Wolf, host of the KKNT-960 (Phoenix) Middle East Radio Forum (Noon to 1:00 p.m. MST and on the web), who's a frequent guest at the JPFO local Political Salon discussion group, sponsored an ad spot for us on his long-running Sunday show. Next thing you know the spot was picked up, and then re-produced (with thanks to The Second Amendment Foundation) for KSNB Spokane, WA, KBNP Portland, OR, KITZ Seattle, WA and KGTK Olympia, WA, where it has gotten good play. Then Mark Walters, host of nationally syndicated Armed American Radio and newly appointed board member of JPFO, put the spot on his show. You can hear the dynamic audio clip on our website. Help us expand the reach, join, up your membership, tell friends (give memberships as gifts!). ✨

Sanctuary • Continued from Page 1

"Under Sanctuary Policy, gun rights you have now set a baseline. Proposed reductions are null and void."

"What the new Sanctuary bills are saying, in simple terms, is that any reduction of rights people currently enjoy in Sanctuary Zones respecting arms, ammo, accessories, possession, sales, transfers or anything else arms-related is infringement, and infringement is banned. Proposed reductions are null and void. Rights you have now set a baseline. Repealing any existing infringements would be appropriate. Later.

"For teeth, the bills go further. Anyone who infringes on your right to keep and bear arms commits a misdemeanor or felony—depending on the place, the nature of the offense, and frankly, how pissed off the sponsoring legislators are at people proposing or attempting these civil-rights denials. **Good legislators**

don't take lightly to abridging civil rights, which is what infringement is. No one should, whether it's 'We don't serve your kind,' or 'No coloreds at this water fountain,' to 'Carry is prohibited here even with your earned and paid for government permission slip,' Denial of rights under color of law, or by conspiring with others is illegal and harsh punishment attaches (18 USC § 241)."

So far, at least these states have or are developing strong statewide Sanctuary Policies aimed at stopping federal usurpation: Alaska, Arizona, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Oklahoma and Texas, and almost every state has at least one county on the case.

Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership endorses and supports the Sanctuary Policy approach to gun safety as a safe, legal, rational approach to peaceably prevent the spread of federal Second Amendment infringement at the local level.

Where does your state stand? **Sanctuary Policy is among the strongest answers to: "What can we do to about three branches of central government controlled by anti-gun tyrants?"** ✨



Bill of Rights Sentinel

Publisher: Alan Gottlieb
Editor: Alan Korwin
Administration: Boyd Kneeland
Rabbi Emeritus: David Bendory
Advisory Board Member: Dov Marhoffer
Contributors: Frank Lee, Grant Schmidt, J.D. "Duke" Schechter, Jeff Knox, John Marshall, Kjartan "Karno" Arnorsson, Lukas Joos, Neland Nobel, Rabbi Raziell Cohen, Richard Busch, Richard Stevens, Aaron Zelman (archival), JPFO Staff

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
 Copyright 2020 JPFO

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

JPFO's Mission Statement: 1. Destroy "gun control" (code words for disarming innocent people)*. 2. Expose the misguided notions that lead people to seek out "gun control." 3. Encourage Americans to understand and defend all of the Bill of Rights for all citizens. The Second Amendment is the "Guardian" of the Bill of Rights.

*So-called gun control is not a credible policy position: it does not control guns nor does it control criminal behavior. What it does is disarm the innocent, leaving them helpless in the face of petty criminals, tyrannical governments and genocide.

How to Lose Everything in Four Years: The Case of Switzerland

—Lukas Joos

Our colleague Mr. Joos in Switzerland offers advice on how Switzerland lost its right to arms in a few short years, and what we might watch for here.

In 1993, Switzerland adopted a constitutional Article that prohibited discretionary and no-issue regulations on both keeping and bearing arms. Four years later, parliament passed a law on firearms (Federal Weapons Act) that included a de facto ban on carry. How this turned around so dramatically and quickly is a case of self-defeat by conservatives, with four lessons for the American reader.

Thirty years ago, Switzerland had no Federal Weapons Act. It did not even have the constitutional basis for enacting one. The possession of firearms was an undisputed right. More than half of the cantons (states) had shall-issue or no-permit policies for carrying handguns. Carrying long guns without burst or full-auto capabilities was permit-free in all cantons. The patchwork of cantonal legislation did not cause significant problems in terms of crime.

However, there was consensus that a jungle of vastly different state regulations might not be the best possible situation. One of its major deficiencies was that it did not allow federal authorities to take action against the flow of arms from Swiss gun stores into the hands of foreign criminals and terrorists.

Another principle becomes clear. Repetitive bad arguments and missing arguments sway legislators...

Against this background, the 44th federal legislature (1991-1995) proposed the introduction of a constitutional article that would allow federal legislation on firearms. (Note: All changes to the Swiss Constitution are subject to approval by popular vote.) The wording of that proposal was: “Article 40: The Federation enacts provisions against the misuse of arms, accessories of arms and ammunition.” At the time, both chambers of parliament had a comfortable conservative majority. From the discussions of the proposal on the floors of both chambers, it quickly transpired that these majorities had no intention to create the constitutional basis for control of the *use of arms*. Both chambers made it very clear that Article 40 would not grant the power to pass legislation that departed from the general right of Swiss citizens—both male and female—to possess and carry firearms except *Seriefeuerwaffen*, that is to say autoloaders with burst or full-auto capabilities.

Regarding carry licenses, the speaker of the Security Policy Committee of the lower chamber even made a point of specifying that the shall-issue policy for carrying ran *counter* to the desires of the Federal Ministry of Justice and Police, which had been lobbying for a solution with a “proof of need.” The committee wanted Article 40 to be the constitutional basis for a shall-issue policy. In the fall of 1993, a sweeping majority of the people voted “Yes” to Article 40. The adoption of a Federal

Weapons Act based on a shall-issue policy for licensing both possession and carry seemed to be on track. And then it completely derailed.

First, the center-left leaning Minister of Justice and Police appointed a “commission of experts” to issue a preliminary draft of the future Federal Weapons Act. This draft contradicted the facts, logic, and the desired constitutional boundaries. Its most striking feature was that apart from a shall-issue proposition for regulating carry, it also included a may-issue variant with a “proof-of-need”. Activists must be alert to this ploy, the “expert study,” it is the camel’s nose under the tent.

When the political parties were invited to review this draft, conservatives voiced opposition to that may-issue variant. But they martialed hollow arguments and missed key points, even against stark evidence in their favor. Remarkably, the experts themselves pointed out there was no evidence that a “proof-of-need” would increase public safety, and that many people would not be able to provide proof-of-need. But conservatives failed to raise obvious questions about whether or not restricting carry would *decrease* public safety, let alone about the immorality of a may-issue system. This points to a key issue: Don’t count on your allies to make good arguments. Give them the talking points and verbal ammunition they need – or prepare for defeat. That bad draft became the hill everyone had to climb.

In the fall of 1995, the 45th federal legislature was elected. Some of the conservative members who had taken part in defining the scope and boundaries of Article 40 were re-elected, but some others were not. Meanwhile, the government acted upon its own conclusions. At the beginning of 1996, it introduced a proposal for a Federal Weapons Act into parliament. Unlike the draft of the “experts,” this proposal foresaw only one solution for regulating carry. It was a may-issue policy whose “proof-of-need” included specifics that did turn the “may” into a “no,” and displays another key issue: legislatures change with voting, and what seems rock solid evaporates.

In the following year, parliament debated passing the proposal into law. On the floor a right to carry increases violent crime; and persons wanting to carry are either criminals or would-be “Rambo” types. They openly admitted they had no hard evidence to back up their claims—they simply declared them to be a matter of “common sense.”

Conservatives argued against that. They held forth on constitutionality, government size, the militia, its traditions and symbols, sport shooting, hunting, costs, convenience—on pretty much everything except self-defense. Whether a right to carry a firearm protected law-abiding citizens from becoming victims just seemed to be outside of their scope of interest. In the upper chamber, the Federal Minister of Police and Justice insinuated that rejecting the proof-of-need amounted to “defending skinheads.” In the years of the World Jewish Congress lawsuit against Swiss banks, with nasty instances of far-right anti-Semitism on the rise, this charge carried special weight. But not a single conservative MP felt the need to demand an explanation of how preventing law-abiding Jews from being able

to defend themselves with a firearm would put a spoke in the wheels of lowlifes with shaven heads. The left consistently and aggressively asserted that eliminating proof-of-need meant blood in the streets, while the right couldn’t marshal decent arguments about saving lives.

Another principle becomes clear. Repetitive bad arguments and missing arguments sway legislators to a foreseeable outcome: dozens of conservative MPs switched sides. Four years after the adoption of a constitutional amendment that only provided for a shall-issue or a no-permit regulation on carry, parliament passed legislation that effectively banned it.

...once you accept a ban on carrying guns, a right to possess them would become indefensible and slip away...

With myopia bordering on blindness, neither the conservative parties nor the Swiss Shooting Sport Federation were willing to make use of a constitutional right to bring about a public vote. Rather, they decided to make no attempt to turn things around. They simply did not see that once you accept a ban on carrying guns, a right to possess them would become indefensible and slip away, which it did.

The Federal Weapons Act entered into force on January 1, 1999. Since then, it has been tightened every two years on average. In 2019, the people approved an EU-aligned ban on “large-capacity” semi-autos. So now, even for the ubiquitous SIG 550, the right to possess is dead. That it survived for two decades side-by-side with a ban on carry is probably a testament to Switzerland’s exceptionally freedom-loving past.

Let me conclude with these lessons:

1. *How you bear defines how you keep.* If a right to carry makes sense, chiseling off possession is hard to sell. Conversely, once restricting carry seems necessary, it is a matter of time before abolishing the right to possess becomes “common sense.”
2. *It’s about the protection of basic individual rights—and about that only.* Nothing compares to Switzerland’s history and tradition of an armed citizenry. But that did not weigh in the balance. If you digress from self-defense, you will lose.
3. *Uninformed supporters don’t count.* Though our 45th federal legislature was largely conservative, that didn’t prevent a new majority in favor of a ban on carrying. “More guns equals more crime,” may seem a tad more logical, but it’s been proven false by John Lott, Ph.D., and others. Your supporters—and especially politicians—who aren’t provided with a steady stream of facts and figures are often little more than future opponents of 2A rights.
4. *Assume no coincidences and always be vigilant.* Things started to go wrong when a center-left-leaning Minister saw to it that a may-issue solution for regulating carry was put up for discussion. Conservatives voiced opposition to it, but they allowed it to stand. Had they questioned the motives behind the Minister’s move and declared that they would vote down any such solution in parliament, it is doubtful that the problem would have escalated further. ☆

The Moyel's Tips

Were Threats Real?

Wait—are black helicopters, and Sleeper Cells, and FEMA camps... are they still a thing? These were such a big mess-media scare just a short while ago, have they, uh, gone away? How much else has been and gone, requiring armed preparedness, now in the dustbin of... melting points, drop tests and—waiting periods for getting your next new gun.

A “Woke Mob” Runs Things?

The newsmagazine *The Week* asks if *The New York Times* is, “Now run by a woke mob?” After eliminating a 45-year employee for speaking the wrong word just as an example (similar to “nagger”) during a training session in Peru, on top of dumping the editorial-page editor for allowing an editorial by a Republican Senator (Tom Cotton), “it’s cancel culture run amok,” as characterized by the leftist DailyBeast.com. Could the Gray Lady’s coverage of gun issues get worse? JPFO members know how bad it already is—if it’s in *The Times*, the opposite is probably true, as JPFO and others have documented. *The Week* quotes The WashingtonExaminer.com on how Millennials, “educated in the safe spaces of left-wing universities,” are now forcing a “hypersensitive social-justice ideology,” on everyone. “*The Times*’ unique position in American news may not be tenable,” one of its own said on its pages. The Moyel, stunned, asks, “They’re just finding this out?”

It’s Not a Conspiracy...

They just all do the same thing. It’s more accurate to call it business as usual. JPFO has already pointed out how mess media and politicians like to whitewash Jew hatred with the innocent sounding “anti-Semitism.” Since virtually all 1.3 billion Arabs are Semites (a description of ethnicity), the term is misplaced, inaccurate and obscures the true nature of vicious murderous Jew-hating hordes, officials and polite society. It’s cultural insensitivity and offensiveness, hiding below the radar. (The non-partisan Pew Center insists “only” 15% of anti-Semitic Arabs are radicalized, roughly 180 million warriors). Sympathizers are uncouneted.

“Assume no coincidences.”

Use Spelling to Obscure Enemies

In media’s follow-the-leader mold, “Xi,” doesn’t spell See, or Zee, the first name of the brutal Chinese communist dictator-for-life’s first name. That’s how the tyrant’s name is pronounced (depending on dialect). If they can’t get that right, is it any wonder they get so much else wrong? Who made that decision? Why do they only, for example, cover crimes with guns, showing a uniform bias, and never lives saved by gunfire, or the shooting sports? The what? The number two participant sport in America, bigger than golf. The U.S. won more Olympic Gold in marksmanship last time than any other pursuit, but you didn’t know that, did you. Hmmm.

Equity Is Cheating

No matter what your skill set or score, under “equity” you expect or deserve equal treatment. This is the opposite of merit, and is what equity bigots seek. The technical word for this is bullshit, a function of safe spaces and similar left-wing inadequacies and inability to handle adult situations, like marksmanship. If someone outperforms you? You get a boost! Strike out? Take first base! Hit the seven ring? Score a bullseye. Wait a minute. The people pushing this would never be at a shooting range.

Shoot... who?

When a plague unleashed on the world by communist China is denied, and lackies like the World Health Organization shill for the perpetrators—lying from the onset, denying access, covering up for destroyed evidence—with mess media playing dumb or complicit in the darkness, what to do? You can’t shoot to stop a plague. And righteous Americans are not about to shoot, well, who exactly? The Founders didn’t contemplate such a problem. How could they.

The Armed Revolt Was NOT Armed

Media and Democrats are lying, flat out. Claims by Democrats, from the very floor of Congress, of an armed revolt in the halls of Congress on Jan. 6, 2021, was preposterous. Yet it’s repeated endlessly by mess media (who wonder why no one believes them). NO shots were fired (except one still unidentified government agent who killed an unarmed white woman veteran in a hallway). Of 199 documented arrests (as we go to press), only five had firearms with them, all unfired, in violation of D.C.’s draconian possession laws. Why let truth suppress a great inflammatory adjective like armed when truthiness amplifies a false narrative so well.

“The woke snore loudest.”

The Moyel wonders:

Does religion have any connection to arms, self-reliance or protection of life against aggression? What is or should that role be? Should religious people follow “the rules” (secular rules of law as dictated by whoever is in power at the moment) or ignore the rules if they immorally threaten life and limb for yourself, your family, innocent others? With growing threats to religion itself, and the right to peaceably assemble, do you have an obligation to defend those rights? What does your Bible say?

Making good people defenseless doesn’t make bad people harmless

Ginug With the Sarcasm Already!

Try writing about the leftablistment and their woke plans (and insanity) without tongue-in-cheek and sarcasm. It’s hard to do! Listen to

your radio or TV—it’s everywhere, sarcasm instead of cool-headed dissection. Because the plans are so far out in left field (so to speak), it screams out for witty snap backs. Sarcasm however only amplifies their message (especially when read without sarcastic inflection to give nuance). Read that line again. Sarcasm normalizes them. Humor does that too. “Democrats think we should give up our guns!” With inflection, it’s an outrage. As a statement, it’s what they think: Democrats think it is right to give up our guns. Avoid the negative neurolinguistic programming. (Ginug is Yiddish for enough, like with a capital Enough!)

Get some

Would you like to get JPFO’s press releases? Just request them, we can’t add you to the list without your permission. Write to: jpfo@jpfo.org

Acts of Violence

Disarming an innocent person is as much an act of violence as robbing a person on the street who offers up no resistance to the criminal. NOTE: Disadvantaged criminals are still criminals.

“Disarm criminals first.”

Commies and Guns

JPFO’s founder Aaron Zelman cautioned us about getting involved in international affairs, outside our domestic focus and with many other groups attending to that. Preservation of firearms ownership still requires some attention to the fact that communist China poses a special gun threat not only because, as a vicious and unyielding dictatorship they ban guns for their subjects, but as devout religion deniers and thus anti-Semites they pose a double risk to Americans.

“Traditional wisdom says an hour after having Chinese food you are hungry again. The truth is an hour after a Jewish meal you are still eating.”

—Source unknown

More Plywood Please!

Storekeepers didn’t board up their windows and people didn’t run out and buy guns before the election because they were afraid that right-wing armed skinheads were going to go crazy. They did it because they were afraid far-left radicals and liberal/progressive supporters would start fires and go destruction crazy suggesting it’s the Democrats and the left who pose a real risk to America. To be fair, jihadis, foreign actors and unseen hands haven’t evaporated (and the other half of Congress is far from pure). ☆

Moyel, n. the person who performs a circumcision.

The Truth Comes Out

Freed from the constraints of a two-party system, the political left, led by the party of Democrats has revealed its true self in the 21st century. Traditional American values are not part of what that contingent represents any longer, if it ever did. The party of Civil War and Jim Crow slavery, socialism and state control is determined to “fundamentally transform” America from the thing we know and love to an abomination The Founding Fathers would neither be recognizing nor a-biden.

We used to argue and debate facts here, noting that if the myths and lies were removed from the gun debate the debate would end. Guns are good and have enormous social utility, in both official and private hands. We’re past that now. We now face a grab for power, disarming the public, where logic, reason and facts no longer play a role. It’s no longer about debate. Rule of law, fundamental principles and reality itself have been abandoned by the opposition—the political left. Take guns away, no more sugar coating.

The gun bill they have placed into Congress immediately after the controversial elections of 2021, without raised eyebrows or formal complaint, is patently illegal. Discussing it openly with them is as hard as getting a tweet from the former president of the United States, thanks to their powerful lackeys. The left relied on a stand-alone strawman to introduce this impossible burger, Sheila Jackson Lee. The bill HRI27 is so far from any delegated power or constitutional construct it defies description. Democrats, by allowing such a thing introduction is evidence of abdicating the rule of law. It is usurpation to a degree never before attempted—government and police get to bear machine guns, silencers, full capacity anything else without restrictions—and the public is disarmed, limited and under lock and key subject to arbitrarily issued licenses, registrations, and limits—at the complete discretion and whim of an appointed official.

Hypocrisy, typically a problem for essay writers, journalists and parents raising children, raises its head as a *modus operandi* now for the political class. Armed riots sponsored, planned and led by leftists, anarchists, racist rioters, arsonists and the party itself are condoned, supported and perpetuated without meaningful response. Mess media did its best to obscure 100 continuous days of takeover in downtown Portland, Ore., and similar rioting and unrest in left-run cities nationwide.

Meanwhile, acts of self-defense in the face of lethal threats are condemned as criminal acts, and

prosecuted to the point where the prosecutions themselves are literally the crimes. When the vice president of the United States, speaking about the unrest can claim, “They’re not going to stop.” And, “This is a movement, I’m telling you, they’re not going to stop, and everyone beware because they’re not going to stop before Election Day in November, and they’re not going to stop after Election Day. And everyone should take note of that, on both levels, that they’re not going to let up, and they should not, and we should not.” Stated in light of ongoing riots and arson, with such footage in the background, media and Ms. Harris now insist this is out of context.

Hypocrisy and *double standard* are not strong enough terms. You see these terms a lot, because they describe (sorta) what we face from news

media, the political left, and the irrational element of political society. But that *bides* it. What we actually see is horrific criminal-level tyranny perpetrated on the public, excused and belittled as hypocrisy. *It’s classic misdirection*. Ignoring laws, illegally changing laws and rules in midstream and by fiat—acts which earn those people ousting, prison or both—that’s *not* hypocrisy. That’s tyranny.

Sure, you can call things a double standard but a double standard you get from soap advertising. Allowing BLM and antifa to murder, rape, riot, burn and take over a police station without repercussion, commandeer city sections, promote themselves from there on TV for weeks without prison terms, that’s gross criminal activity. We’re woke to *that*. This is corrupt beyond what we expect African dictators to perpetrate. ☆

Anti-gun-rights bigotry in Congress— it’s NOT hypocrisy— it’s elitism, blind intolerance and self-imposed ignorance.



Our leaders in Washington LOVE guns! They have bathed our capitol in guns! They keep men (mostly) and some women with guns near them at all times! (Do not ask about the “at all times” or especially the “mostly men” part, you’ll face a tongue lashing and get ostracized.) Both parties do this, and one says it cannot figure out how to get the troops (and fences!) out of the capitol. (Right.) What Democrats currently seek is to disarm the public (or at least subarm them to start), since we pose a credible threat to any illegal power government might exercise. It has nothing to do with criminals. It has to do with why the Second Amendment is really there—balance of power. The Founders understood this. ☆

**Join JPFO
Now!**

www.jpfo.org

800-869-1884

JPFO AMBASSADORS OPINE:

“Is the country really in serious danger of losing the right to arms, due to Democrat-introduced anti-gun-rights proposals?”

Yes. Serious danger! You probably think I am some sort of an alarmist.

When they propose it, ping pong it back and forth (most of it is already written), pass it, it will be signed. The Supremes (especially if packed) will decide the appeal and ultimately, we will not be pleased, at all.

I suspect you do not share my views and think we (1) have more time than I do, and (2) it's so obviously unconstitutional (and of course it is!) that it couldn't get through. I fear it could. I tend to think these ideologues don't care about what we want, don't care about facts and stats, they only want power, control, and their biases to be put into play. They need to be right and live to do just that.



We are dealing with dangerous, tone deaf people in power. We agree on almost nothing and want completely different things.

I suspect you largely disagree with me. So what else is new?

It will be interesting to see what your test question turns into when you take everyone else's answers and make either an article or chapter in a book.

Who's kidding who?

—Richard Busch



“It's more like the left is making a strong effort to ban the exercise of that right, and yes, the majority of the sheeple will comply. Of course the ones doing the agitating aren't the ones who would actually come for them, but the indoctrinated masses making up the bulk of both military and police have no concept of the Constitution or of their obligation to disobey illegal orders. Do I have to point to New Orleans after Katrina?”

—J.D. “Duke” Schechter



Yes, it is. But it's always a long road to it. It's never going to be as simple as, “We are taking your guns.” It's a slow process of legislation and what they call “reasonable gun control.” Any law is an infringement of our right as Americans. It's not to say that this presidency will be the end of all gun rights. But it's most definitely a part of the process.

—Rabbi Raziel Cohen



Yes, and Ma Nishtana? We adapt. We implement. We overcome as per usual. 95% of my clients of late are Jewish and they are all switching on. This is a complete 180 from when we started this business in October of 2019 when 95% of our clients were not Jewish and the Jewish community gave me the coldest of shoulders. I'm going to write that article I promised on simulations training and teaching Jews; simulations is the key.

—Grant Schmidt ☆



**Visit the
JPFO Store!**
shop.jpfo.org

Foreigners Get It Better?

Attributed recently to a Czech newspaper, and rated false by Snopes when allegedly aimed at Obama in 2012, with curiously little detail other than “wrong style,” it is salient enough to read and understand regardless of source, write to JPFO if you disagree:

“The danger to America is not Joseph Biden, but a citizenry capable of entrusting a man like him with the Presidency. It will be far easier to limit and undo the follies of a Biden presidency than to restore the necessary common sense and good judgment to a depraved electorate willing to have such a man for their president. The problem is much deeper and far more serious than Mr. Biden, who is a mere symptom of what ails America. Blaming the prince of fools should not blind anyone to the vast confederacy of fools that made him their prince. The Republic can survive a Biden, who is, after all, merely a fool. It is less likely to survive a multitude of fools, such as those who made him their president.” ☆

WRITE FOR THE SENTINEL!

Do you have something to say? If you're ready to shout at your TV, or tell paper pundits what you think and your thoughts make sense and you can back them up with real meaning—

The Sentinel can be your platform!

JPFO's Guarantee: We listen

Our Rules: Ask for our Writer's Guidelines. • Your task: Do a good job.

Opportunity is knocking, answer the door. info@jpfo.org

~~Defund~~ ~~Defend~~ Befriend the Police

Attorney Richard Stevens & Editor Alan Korwin

We grandparents with six grandkids and their parents walked around one of their neighborhoods trick-or-treating last Halloween. There was a Gilbert, Ariz., city police SUV and officer paused at an intersection, so I (Richard) walked over to him, and noticed he reacted with a perceptible flinch as I approached his open window. I smiled broadly, no damn mask, and just said, "Hey, just wanted to say thank you for being there for us." You could see him visibly relieved and then very cordial, with a genuine returned smile say, "Thank you."

Cops like him are the ones we mustn't make enemies. Decent, peaceful gun owners correctly choose to side with "law and order" when the laws are protecting life, liberty and property. It makes sense to "support your local police" when they are protecting everyone's rights and the neighborhood.

Police in Peril

Police today face terrible and unmerited attacks. The left has declared police the enemy: "Quit your job!" Worse, "What do we want? Dead cops!" "Pigs in a blanket, fry 'em like bacon!" "Defund the police." "Disband the police." Regardless of shameless outrageous mass-media lying denials and censorship about this, video footage and audio tracks document the left's angry rhetoric and mentality—it is real.

Predictably, police agencies responded: (1) police are backing off from confronting criminal leftist activities, but not doing their bidding either; (2) police nonaction is enabling mayhem, riots, looting, thuggery, even arson and murder, and interference with commerce and transit; and (3) acquiescence by police and administrators to anti-police rhetoric and street violence, further deteriorating the fabric of society.

The triumph of intimidation and street violence will spell the end of any free society. Gun owners cannot allow that to happen. And we certainly cannot contemplate disarmament in the midst of that, as leftists increasingly (irrationally) insist.

Military in the Balance

Widespread leftist attacks on the very existence of the military date back to the 1960s. How will the military fare in this latest leftist putsch? That's a

tough one. Local police are part of the communities they are paid by and serve. The military is a machine designed to kill people and break things, on command, from a central authority, remote from local communities. Sometimes the military is ordered to do local humanitarian stuff, but that is by direct order, not by individual troop or local commander judgment about the community.

Based upon training received, the value of retirement pensions and benefits, and the threat of criminal prosecution, we can expect military personnel to do what they are told. Police officers who disobey orders lose their jobs and maybe pensions. Military personnel who disobey orders end up with all that plus prison time. They are keenly aware that disobeying orders is a court martial and even capital offense, for which they can be shot on the spot. Mutiny and widespread disobedience of military commands is vanishingly rare, at present.

What if the federal government were to violate the Constitution (more than it is) and turn tyrannical? Soldiers could face orders quite contrary to their nature. Would they rebel en masse? Or might they call in sick, as police personnel sometimes do, to avoid having to act upon unconstitutional orders? America has not faced a crisis of this sort in living memory—but the question must be asked and answered. We teeter on that brink with Democrat's infestation of the nation's capital with an occupying force of National Guard troops no one can seem to order home. Who exactly is in charge there?

Whom Will Our Guardians Protect?

The COVID-19 situation revealed that many federal, state, and local government officials and bureaucrats will rush to impose controls, directives, and mandates, without even a vote of any legislature and without any effective judicial review. "Officials" are willing to exercise near-unlimited power if they convince themselves there is a "public health" emergency, and the sheep will go along.

An autocrat in the White House apparently can order lock downs, close churches, eliminate travel, confiscate property, choke communications, summarize arrest people without charges, distribute the

treasury to non-citizens, and expect the police and military to fully support these moves. Constitutional violations are non-issues and the armed populace is not a factor (so far). Several state governors have seized near dictatorial power in the same way, relying on our neighbors in uniform and the judicial benches to enforce the edicts, ignoring the rule of law.

We should pray the need for an armed public response to restore a proper balance of power is not needed, and we have time for cooler heads to prevail. ☆



The JPFO Confiscation Clock inches two minutes closer to midnight and pauses perilously close to more motion, with Democrats' introduction of HR127.

This bill, described elsewhere in this issue, requires confiscation of many specified popular guns and ammunition owned by the public, in blatant infringement of the Second Amendment. It also outlaws any possession, transfer or sale of guns and ammo without federal permission, which government is not required to provide. Essentially it can be a total ban on all gun ownership—discretionary and arbitrary complete gun control—midnight by any measure. This is pure evil, and worse, government agents have exempted themselves from it all, they remain fully armed.

Several factors keep us from midnight. As of this writing, the introduced bill has not been enacted or even put up for a vote. If it passes both Houses and is signed by Mr. Biden, it will no doubt be immediately challenged in court, since it far exceeds any legitimate delegated authority Congress or a president has to enact law. If it makes it through the process, many scenarios are possible, and the JPFO Gun Confiscation Clock may well move past midnight, a disastrous place for America to find itself. Pray this does not happen. ☆

Support JPFO with a cup of Joe!

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.





THE Wayback Machine

KEEPING JPFO FOUNDER AARON ZELMAN'S SPIRIT ALIVE

The Aaron Zelman Interview by John F. McManus

What is JPFO's main goal?

Aaron: Our main goal is to destroy gun control. We are an organization that believes we have the moral authority to point out to the rest of the world the evils that have come from gun control and how humanity has suffered because of gun-control schemes.

Are people who aren't Jewish members of your organization?

We have members of our organization that have told us they are not Jewish. We don't ask people what their religion is. And we are not an organization that is preaching religion to anybody.

We think the history of gun-control schemes has been so harmful to Jews that we have the moral authority to speak out. We welcome anybody who accepts the JPFO (Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership) position that gun control must be destroyed.

We're not interested in compromise. We are only interested in the destruction of something we consider to be a very evil and deadly policy known as gun control.

How did you become involved in something like this?

Well, I've been involved in promoting gun ownership because of my family history to some degree. When my father was about six months old, his family had to leave Ukraine in Russia because Stalin came to power. Stalin was not interested in Kulaks owning land.

And so they lost everything they had, essentially, and fled to Canada where my dad was raised and served in the Canadian Army during World War II. So, I learned at a very, very early age what happens when you can't defend your life against a government gone bad.

Could you give us some examples of what has happened in other nations where gun control

was in place?

Well, there are several. Why don't we start with the film we created called *Innocents Betrayed*? The film shows the history of and connection between gun registration, confiscation, and how a police state is able to come about. It shows how the police state can target individuals they don't want to live and murder them—otherwise known as genocide.

Where has this happened?

Historically it happened in Turkey, known as the Armenian Genocide, and then, of course, in China, Russia, Germany, Cambodia, Rwanda, Uganda, and even now in Darfur.

Could you tell us about "Goody Guns"?

Goody Guns is a program we started to save our children from the clutches of the gun prohibitionists in the public school system. Goody Guns are cookie cutters in the shape of revolvers or pistols, and the purpose of using them as you bake cookies for your children or grandchildren, is to teach them firearm safety while they are eating their cookie.

You tell them to eat the cookie from the back of the gun where the handle is to the front of the gun where the muzzle is. And so they learn an important fact on firearm safety—controlling where the muzzle is pointed. You start early with the Goody Guns, and by the time they get to the public school system and they hear all the propaganda about guns being bad, they will know better.

When we first introduced Goody Guns, gun prohibitionists had a conniption fit because they knew the psychology behind our program. They realized they can't get into your home when the kid is two years old; they have to wait until your child is six years old in the school system, and by then they've lost.

You've actually obtained some of the documents from these different countries, and you've translated them so that we who read only English can read them?

A number of years ago we started this project trying to find out if there was a connection among governments and if governments did the same thing. As we put it, these folks all go to the same dictators' school. Indeed, there is a connection because there is a pattern.

They realize they can't stay in power if the peasants have pitchforks and can march on the gates of the city. The way to bring about a dictatorship or po-

lice state is to make sure the people are disarmed.

I understand you have done work showing the source of the 1968 gun law here in the United States.

The 1968 Gun Control Act, as we know it today, became law during the (Lyndon) Johnson administration. The history behind the 1968 act is indeed fascinating.

The author of the federal Gun Control Act, Senator Thomas Dodd, was an attorney with the U.S. Department at Nuremberg. He obtained the Reichsgesetzblatt, which is the German equivalent of our *Federal Register*. He was able to use the German gun-control laws after giving them to the Library of

Congress to translate for him. They did indeed translate the laws for him, and that was the model, the basis, for the 1968 Gun Control Act in America.

Many Americans believe that it is the duty of police to protect them. Comment?

The police do not have a duty to protect individuals. The shield on the side of the car may say "to protect and serve," but the reality is, and by state law and the state statutes and case law, you do not have a right to police protection.

We have a book we publish entitled *Dial 911 and Die*. It's written by an attorney named Richard Stevens. The book details laws in every single state in the Union, the state statutes as well as case law, concerning calling 911.

You can sue police if they fail to protect you, and your heirs can sue the police if you die during a criminal's attack on you, but you won't accomplish anything because the judge will finally tell you that there is no duty for the police to protect an individual unless there's been a prior agreement that they will offer you protection.

If you've been an informant for the police, if you are involved in some type of work for the police where the police are not able to protect you, if it's dangerous work, you are entitled. But short of that the police have no duty to protect you.

Copyright 2008 used by permission.



JEWES FOR THE PRESERVATION OF FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

12500 N.E. Tenth Place • Bellevue, WA 98005 • jpfo.org • (800) 869-1884 • info@jpfo.org

☐ Yes, I agree that Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership deserves the support of freedom-loving Americans who cherish their constitutional right to keep and bear arms. Enclosed is my check or credit-card contribution.

☐ **Join or** ☐ \$25 Annual ☐ \$40 Two Year ☐ \$55 Three Year ☐ \$500 Life

☐ **Renew** ☐ \$30 1-Year Friend of JPFO ☐ \$360 Senior Life (over 65 years old)

☐ I want to make automatic contributions of \$_____ per ☐ Month ☐ Quarter

☐ **Donate** ☐ \$25 ☐ \$50 ☐ \$100 ☐ \$250 ☐ \$500 ☐ \$_____ other

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

JPFO is a 501(c)3 organization and donations are 100% deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes.
See our website for merchandise and promo you get automatically when you join up with us!

Donate Online at jpfo.org

"We make other groups look like moderates."



Please be as generous as your means will allow.

Card Number _____ CVC code _____

Expiration Date _____ Phone Number _____

Name on Credit Card _____

Email Address _____

Cardholder's Signature _____

**"You don't have to be Jewish to fight by our side.
You just have to love liberty."**