

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



Middlesex County, MA. Defends Violent Antisemitism

JPFO is issuing a travel warning to Jews and other 2A supporters and urging an economic boycott for Middlesex County, Massachusetts after Newton Police arrested Scott Hayes for defending himself from a violent, antisemitic attack.

Scott Hayes was peacefully exercising his rights protected under the First Amendment with a small group of people in the town of Newton, MA. A person in the group was carrying an Israeli flag when a man began yelling antisemitic remarks at the group from across the street, calling them “sick” for supporting Israel.

After a few words were exchanged, the man charged across the street, tackling Scott Hayes to the ground and attempting to wrap his arms around his neck in order to cause

even more harm than he had already done. At that point, Mr. Hayes exercised his natural right to defend himself, pulled out a gun and shot the assailant in the abdomen. After freeing himself from the man’s clutches, Scott retreated and attempted to get his assailant medical attention. The assailant is expected to survive.


Mr. Hayes was arrested by the Newton Police who sought and obtained a criminal complaint against him for assault and battery with a dangerous weapon. The District Attorney is pursuing charges against Mr. Hayes for having defended himself against a violent antisemitic attack. While many state officials in Massachusetts have, for years, been enemies of the Second Amendment, this latest event is a record-breaking atrocity even for them. State actors

actively defending violent antisemites while leveling criminal charges against those who defend themselves against them, sends up a warning for all Jews to steer clear of Massachusetts, if at all possible, especially Middlesex County. Antisemitism is on the rise and now we have state officials in Massachusetts formally and proudly defending it.

“It’s unconscionable,” said JPFO Projects Director James Jones, “that state actors are now openly promoting antisemitic violence by prosecuting people who defend themselves against it. ‘Never Again!’, is the famous saying, yet here we are again. This is beyond politics and beyond the pale. The state agents responsible for this egregious and erroneous prosecution must be held to account.”

“I’m a Gun Owner”

Public figures in favor of civilian disarmament have adopted a new, sleazy method of predatory ingratiation of the citizenry. People like notorious, freedom-hating David Hogg—a political opportunist and a model of narcissism—and Vice President Kamala Harris—who says, “Just because you legally possess a gun in the sanctity of your locked home, doesn’t mean that we’re not going to walk into that home and check if you’re being responsible and safe in the way you conduct your affairs,”—have donned a shiny new mask, poorly designed to convince



you they’re someone other than themselves.

After realizing that their strict anti-civilian-firearm position is entirely untenable, they’ve repugnantly and deceptively tilted on their wobbly moral axis to gain favor with the gullible and uninformed. In order for liberiphobes such as them to effectively gain a person’s trust after openly and frequently attacking the Constitution, they’ve concocted a new way of sidling up to them to get in backstabbing range. Their four chosen nefarious, precursor words are,

Continued on page 3

I Trust

Much of what we say is not found in the words we explicitly speak or write but in those things we don’t. The undertones and literary elements lingering under the surface of our sentences speak volumes to what we implicitly believe. Often, some of the most insightful aspects of a conversation can be found in between the words we speak or the lines we write. It is not without complete disregard for the truth that we ignore such critical aspects of communication.

There are millions of voices in this great country submissively echoing, in corrupt tones of subservience, their desire to

Continued on page 2

“ban guns.” Those are the putrid, deceptive words they speak and write *en masse* when they say, “We need to ban guns now.” But what is lurking underneath those seemingly-straight-forward words? In alignment with one of the most ancient evils in our world, those deceived into repeating such a phrase are (often unknowingly) forwarding a cascade of linked and sequential underthoughts, all carefully and treacherously intertwined toward a malicious purpose of complete enslavement of the populace.

The first layer is the implicit lie under which all others silently work, tricking the mind into accepting things unimaginable for us to say aloud. The phrase "ban guns" belies the incontrovertible fact that not all guns can or will be banned in the sense it implies—complete removal with the implied promise of freedom from violence.

While laws can be made such that criminals (and even non-criminals) are forbidden from having guns, effectively and fully enforcing such laws is a practical impossibility. Therein lies the first issue. Criminals will still be armed. Lacking the restraint of the common, law-abiding citizen and with the knowledge of other civilians being disarmed, they would be essentially free to wantonly commit crimes and terrorize the citizenry with little-to-no resistance. Those without guns will use knives, rocks, fists and any other means at their disposal to commit crimes with the knowledge there will be no armed citizen to resist them.

Next, the outright lie of the phrase is revealed. No government agency or agent will have their guns banned or removed. They will all retain full force and power with no limit on the growth

of that power in terms of what and how many firearms they may acquire, possess and carry or where they may carry them.

The only readily available, effective means of lethal force would now be in the hands of criminals and government agents. Herein rests the dark, implicit belief, tempered by the lack of critical thought, defended by untamed atavism, bolstered by intransigent dogmatism, and nurtured though relentless repetition.

That, even though there is ample existential evidence of historical and contemporary crime, there is no real threat of criminal violence to me. And, if there were, the government is not only capable and willing, but responsible to protect me from it.

Darker still, hidden beneath the specious illusion of a benevolent government, is the implicit phrase, “I trust.” I trust the government. I trust the government to make the right decisions for me. I trust the government to defend my life, I trust the government to never harm me, I trust all government agents with every aspect of my well-being and safety as well as that of my family. I trust, despite the overwhelming historical evidence to the contrary, that this government will be the exception to the rule and that it never has, is not and never will become corrupt in any way whatsoever. I trust, in contradiction to our historical record, that the government has never violated the rights of its citizenry, nor does it now, nor ever will it. I trust each and every politician to pursue my best interests. I trust every single police officer with my life. I trust every judge on the bench, I trust every bureaucrat behind a desk. I trust this system absolutely and yield my entire being and those of my family to it, to do with us what it will. I trust.




ARMED MINORITIES



ARE HARDER TO OPPRESS

If you know someone who wants to “ban guns” or any class of them, ask them to speak this paragraph aloud and observe them laugh at you in absurdity. No sane person would dare say it aloud, yet they live it out daily and promote it in thought, word, and deed, driven onward by their fear, deception and ignorance. They openly wish for a benevolent tyranny, garbed in the alluring rhetoric of safety and security, and secretly believe the historically-inevitable torments of such a wish come true will not be the final, catastrophic outcome of their deluded, insidious ambitions.



Publisher: Alan Gottlieb
Editor: James Jones
Editor Emeritus: Alan Korwin
Rabbi Emeritus: Rabbi Dovid Bendory

Contributors: Kjartan “Karno” Arnorrsson, Felicity Bower, Craig Cantoni, Dr. Julius Decker, Charles Heller, William Barclay Masterson, J.D. “Duke” Schechter, Grant Schmidt, Richard Stevens, Barrett Tillman, Dean Weingarten, 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 2024 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.

“I’m a Gun Owner.”

Despite being willing to sell their souls for a few votes or a small amount of ever-devaluing cash, their sordid efforts have met with limited success at best. It would seem that the pesky facts of history have yet again asserted themselves into the conversation, revealing the embedded subterfuge in their underdeveloped tactics. In their feverish rush to repair their already-tarnished reputations with their new lies, they seemed to have missed the basic logic that their owning guns does not imply in even the slightest manner that they don’t oppose you owning guns or that they don’t support civilian gun bans. Perhaps they’re hoping that very obvious, simple truth will be lost on the people they hope to enslave.

Some of the most vile, anti-liberty people in history have been gun owners. Kamala Harris and Hitler could both say, “I’m a gun owner” while simultaneously seeking civilian guns bans. She gets zero proverbial points since, while she boasts about her guns, she tries to take yours. Unfortunately, her behavior isn’t surprising. Lying and pivoting are expected maneuvers for less-than-honest politicians while hypocrisy is a staple of any good, political swindler. In classic, tyrannical fashion, her

statement screams only one thing: freedom for me, not for thee.

**Join
JPFO
Now!**

www.jpfo.org
800-869-1884

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




practically-affordable, effective, and efficient weapons available at the time. While repeating firearms were also available, they were rejected by the Continental Congress (and presumably most civilians) due to their very high cost. It’s exceedingly clear just how the framers viewed “military-style” weapons and “weapons of war.” They not only enshrined their protection in the Second Amendment but also required militiamen to privately own and bring them to muster.

So, what precisely changed from then until now? Rights don’t change with time, liberty doesn’t change with time, humans do change over time but not in such a short span. The only relevant factor remaining is arms. Arms have changed. Their efficacy, availability, and reliability have all vastly improved since the time of the Founding. But why, if rights don’t change, does the government now restrict our access to arms, in direct violation of the text, history, tradition and plain meaning and intent of the Second Amendment?

Some claim that it’s for our own protection (says every tyrant in history) and that these weapons are just too dangerous for civilians to own, that the government is somehow more responsible than the citizenry. These same people perhaps think that governments have been responsible with their weapons (and other implements) thus far though this presumption irrationally pushes up against the mountain of historical evidence to the contrary. Human nature dictates that no man or system of man is

Continued on page 5

Private Arms, Public Liberty

We have a natural right to keep and bear arms for all ethical purposes. This includes, but is in no way limited to, our protection from unlawful violence. Such violence includes not only private violence, where citizens commit criminal violence, but also unlawful public violence committed by state actors under color of law. It was this latter type that caused the framers to wisely establish the Second Amendment, theoretically prohibiting the government from infringing on our natural right to keep and bear arms. In this proper historical context, we find

resolution to the debate over which arms civilians may own.

The framers had just thrown off a tyrannical government using every conceivable advantage they could using arms designed to be as effective and deadly as possible. They chose those arms most expedient to victory in their war. In addition, after the war, American militiamen were required to bring their privately-owned arms to muster. Privateers owned warships and civilians had cannon (among other weapons such as swords, knives, etc.) all because they were the most

JPFO Files Amicus Brief in Supreme Court

JPFO has submitted an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in a case challenging the ATF's "Final Rule" equating firearms parts kits and gun components with functioning firearms. The case is known as *Garland v. VanDerStok*.

Joining JPFO in this important brief are the Western States Sheriffs' Association, Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, California Rifle and Pistol Association, Second Amendment Law Center, Second Amendment Defense and Education Coalition, Ltd., International Law Enforcement Educators and Trainers Association, Law Enforcement Legal Defense Fund and the National Association of Chiefs of Police. They are represented by attorneys C.D. Michel of Long Beach,

Calif., and Dan M. Peterson of Fairfax, Va.

In their brief, JPFO and its partners note that Congress "has implicitly approved that longstanding definition by amending the *Gun Control Act of 1968* on multiple occasions while leaving the definition of "frame or receiver" untouched and


uncriticized. It has delegated no power to ATF to change that definition."

"Executive branch

agencies," said JPFO Projects Director James Jones, "have no authority to make law. That privilege is reserved for Congress alone. And, considering how the ATF has flip-flopped on their presumptively unconstitutional 'Final Rule', it's a good thing for all Americans that they can't. Of course, someone needs to tell that to the ATF

since they still think they're in charge."

"The ATF has a long, checkered history of overreaching in their unabashed, ill-willed efforts to infringe on American's right to keep and bear arms. Sadly, their current encroachment is not a surprise to us here at JPFO but we see this new, brazen attempt to prevent Americans from lawfully building their own firearms as just another nail in the coffin of Joe Biden's ATF."



True Colors

Often, we, as pro-liberty advocates, must sift through clues left by anti-freedom activists in order to discern their true motives. We can spend a lot of time gleaning gems from small video clips and news excerpts, piecing together the "man behind the mask" as it were. But, sometimes, the villains do all that work for us and just come right out and tell you they're villains.

Jason Beck, Associate Director, Total Force Requirements & Sourcing Policy is just such a villain. Employed by your government in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Beck is openly advocating for repealing the Second Amendment and confiscating all civilian firearms using state-sponsored violence. The entire intent behind this vile atrocity would be to secure "the state's monopoly on violence" so "...we're the only ones with guns...."

He suggests using the National Guard to impose his evil will on citizens, indicating that even soldiers opposed to the orders would still follow them and forcibly disarm millions and millions of guns owners. And, to facilitate all of this, he suggests opening the border, eliminating the Electoral College,

Continued on page 6

Bill of Rights Sentinel



SEVEN MORE WAYS TO SUPPORT THE IMPORTANT WORK OF JEWS FOR THE PRESERVATION OF FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

- For a donation of \$36 or more (twice "Chai," it's Hebrew for *Life*), you get an insightful JPFO book.
- Make a monthly tax-deductible donation *automatically!* JPFO handles all the details for you. \$10 \$18 \$20 \$36 \$72
Give any donation amount in multiples of 10 or 18.
- Give a gift membership to a member of the tribe, or anyone you choose. "You don't have to be Jewish to support JPFO, you just have to love Liberty"
- Sign up a friend or relative for our free eblast announcements. It's double opt-in, JPFO just offers a chance to join, which must be confirmed by your referral. Turn on someone you know to the inside scoops you've been getting. Lists are welcomed!
- Increase your membership for another year right now, whether it's due or not. It helps JPFO, supports the cause, and you want your membership to stay active, right? Do it. You'll do it later anyway.
- Walk our safety brochure into your local Rabbi and have a chat. Increasingly, religious leaders are now becoming aware of a need for enhanced security, and that starts with personal safety. Every shul in America needs to know about JPFO. Call or write for a few free copies. We're glad to send you a batch! Just ask. Wise Rabbis like armed congregants.
- Become an Ambassador or a volunteer. Belong to something serious. Ask for info or a Volunteer Menu.
- Just donate a few bucks because you can, and you know it's a good cause. Write the check. Fill in the blank.
Stop wishing for a better world, make it so. *Please remember to remember JPFO in your will.*


incorruptible as is evinced by the cabal of alphabet agencies unlawfully surveilling citizens as well as other noted abuses of power including internment and murder of citizens. But, for the sake of discussion, let's grant that people do not have a right to weapon systems unlawfully and immorally forbidden to us by our overreaching government.

If the people do not have a natural right to own tanks, machines guns, grenades, carriers, battleships, cruisers, A-10s, F-22s, etc. then why does the government? What specifically imbues the government with that right? And, what intrinsic property of the collection of paper, equipment and personnel inculcates the government with such a right? If it's not a right for a large group of people, how does it become a right for a small group, a group that already has disproportionate power over every aspect of the lives of the people in the larger group?

Since rights are bestowed upon us by the force that fashioned us, we must assume that if the large group does not have the right to those weapon systems, then neither can the small group; therefore, we must assume it's not a right at all. That ownership of such advanced weapon systems is a matter of dictate, not rights. Herein is the conundrum where the question of who decides

which items fall within the category of "right" or "dictate," must be answered. And, more importantly, who decides who decides?

As it stands, at any time, the state may grant or revoke access to operate such systems. They are purported to be "publicly" owned, but the public does not have access, nor can it dictate how and when they are used. The public does not choose the targets of aggression, it doesn't allocate funding to purchase them, it doesn't establish the aspects of training with them nor the details of retention and dissolution. The small group decides. And, since we've granted it's not a right to own these systems, it must be fiat. Then, if it's by fiat there is no moral claim that can be made by government in its restrictions of these weapon systems to citizens.



Furthermore, any citizen can make the same claim as the government to the validity of their access.

But every moral, rational, human knows better. Access to these weapon systems is a basic, fundamental human right and it's the height of absurdity to claim that an overbearing, abusive, historically-violent, small group of people, who hold overwhelming sway over a large group, somehow has an inherent right to implements of violence to which the larger group has none. Such a false claim underpins the malignant, genocidal philosophy of every tyrant in history.

The government's power is not absolute. Governments rise and fall like the tide, but individual liberty endures. We have natural rights that predate and will postdate government and even civilization itself. Chief among those rights is to not only defend ourselves, but to have the ability to fashion, acquire and possess the tools necessary for that defense. The continued abuse of power by state actors against the populace exemplifies the perpetual need for citizens to have the means to defend themselves against their government.

To that end, we should and must possess the arms needed to protect ourselves from tyranny and we must be able to acquire them without timidly asking permission from the very entity against which we aim to defend ourselves.

JPFO *always* appreciates good submissions and wants to put **your** content into the next edition of the

Bill of Rights Sentinel

If you have something to say related to the right to keep and bear arms, please feel free to submit your content to our editor. We read and consider every submission.

See Details Here→

WRITE FOR

The Bill of Rights 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.

editor@jpfo.org

Emergent Tyranny

Often, in places that have an impending natural disaster bearing down upon them, some state officials take the opportunity to impose even more hardship upon the citizenry than what they must already endure from Earth's fury. At a time when the weather is wreaking havoc and some less-than-savory individuals may begin looting and rampaging, villains cloaked behind the veil of law devise ways to make suffering people helpless against



Chief Hagan



criminal violence. When citizens need their right to keep and bear arms most, these tyrants strike!

Okeechobee, Florida saw Police

Chief Donald Hagan, recently do just that. Under storm, as citizens scrambled to save themselves and what parts of their lives could be salvaged

from the devastation of Hurricane Helene, state actors plotted against

them, contriving ways to keep them from obtaining and carrying arms for their protection. As if the loss of life and property were not enough, tyrants like Donald Hagan, who signed the illegal ordinance, and those in positions of power in the City of Okeechobee who crafted it, have demonstrated that state actors like them will not hesitate to weaponize a horrific disaster against citizens if given the chance.

The bad news for the Chief is that Florida has a preemption statute preventing municipalities from creating such ordinances, and those who violate that protection can face termination and fines. For the sake of the people under his inept "protection," we, at JPFO, wish the best to those affected by the hurricane and hope justice is served.

**Obey
Florida
Law
Infringe on
Citizens'
Rights**

True Colors - Cont. from Page 4

packing the Supreme Court and abolishing the Senate.

Jason Beck is, at best, misguided in his demented views of what the relationship between the people and the government should be. He sits, collecting taxpayer money, scheming all the while to destroy every liberty we value by his genocidal agenda. Jason Beck is precisely the type of person our founders warned us about when they spoke of tyranny, a prime avatar of the enemy against whom we hold our weapons ready.

If the day ever came where his dark plan went into action, oath breaker Jason Beck should be the first in the stack on Americans' doorsteps, but he won't be. Cowards like him hide behind walls and men with guns while plotting evil against the American people.


The O'Keefe Media Group covered the story, sourcing the original material through an interview with Jason Beck. You can watch the entire exposé at the link below.

<https://tinyurl.com/JasonBeckTyrant>

Support JPFO By Reading!


\$24⁹⁵

**"GUN CONTROL"
Gateway to Tyranny**



**Proof that U.S. Gun Law
Has Nazi Roots**
by Aaron Zelman
with contributions by attorney Richard Stevens

**The Nazi Weapons Law of 1938
compared side-by-side with the
U.S. Gun Control Act of 1968**

 **Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership**
America's Aggressive Civil Rights Organization


**the
Mitzvah**



For those
who love freedom -
and for those who should

**Zelman
eil Smith**

**DIAL 911
and DIE**



The Shocking Truth about
the Police Protection Myth

by **Richard W. Stevens**
ATTORNEY AT LAW

With an Introduction by James B. Stewart,
Author of *Lost Rights and Freedom in Disguise*

store.jpfo.org

Wisdom from SCOTUS

“The Constitution,” Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas said when he visited Arizona in 1999, “is designed to protect us from government, which in turn is designed to protect us.” The Bill of Rights, he observed, does not state or affirm rights, it is stated as limitations on government (read it, it’s true). Limits on government is how we maintain liberty. This is why “...shall not be infringed,” and “...shall make no law...” are so crucial.

Many Guns, No Harm

In 2023, some 6,737 air passengers were found by TSA to possess firearms, up about 3% from 2022. While it sounds like a lot, and we have no idea how many people managed to board airplanes armed, it’s a tiny percentage of the two million travelers through checkpoints daily. Atlanta, Dallas and Houston had the most arms found. NOTE: No one was shot, and except for the technical offense committed by infringement laws, no actual *malum in se* crimes were committed. Guns on planes until the 1960s was routine, searches didn’t begin until after Islamic extremist terrorist attacks in 2001.

Make Life Tough, Instead of Forcing Bans

The same “inconvenience factor” being used by Marxists and other enemies of America, to skirt difficult legislation and get you out of your car (automated highway traps, local speed traps, unreasonably slow speed limits, restricted zones, mechanical limits, driving taxes, road diets to shrink roadways and backup traffic, 15-minute cities) have been used against your guns—no-carry zones, no-possession zones, anti-self-defense laws, burdensome licensing and

registration. Lefties learn quickly from each other.

Election Season Is Upon Us

In the coming months, candidates will be campaigning at a place near you, often with time for Q&A. Instead of asking about wedge issues or topics-of-the-day (abortion, climate, drugs, crime, guns, corruption, bad officials, etc.), ask real questions detailing your rights and where the wannabees stand:

-- Should someone who has sworn an oath “to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution,” but who then votes to allocate tax funds to programs or departments not authorized by that Constitution, be removed from office? Defend your answer.

Can you name any current areas of government operations that are outside the authority delegated to government (e.g., “...shall not be infringed”)?

Can you name areas where government might serve the public interest, but where it has no authority to act? If not, is it still accurate to say we have “government of limited powers”? Does this matter?

Time for Only One Question

If there’s only time for one, ask The Big Q: “What’s the purpose of government?” Many candidates just guess, hem and haw, or make things up on the spot. These are not the people we want or need. The Declaration of Independence states the answer our Founding Fathers provided:

“... all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the

governed... To secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men.”

Police Gun Inventories

In a research project conducted by Alan Korwin and Richard Shaw—the builder and co-owner of Shooter’s World in Phoenix—one notable finding was that guns held in police property offices were not just confiscations or crime-scene weapons, though this is the impression mass media presents. That reflects media’s demonstrated and unbridled hatred and ignorant fear of guns (and anyone who would willingly possess the damnable things).

Police firearm inventories include many things: guns turned in by people too old to use them any longer, lost and found and not reclaimed (a major component), so-called weapon “buy-back” programs, out-of-business store inventories, turn-ins by relatives of former gun owners, RICO seizures, spousal turn ins from a deceased partner, people who change their minds about ownership, temporary withholds not later claimed, ... it’s complicated. Guns gathered with nefarious histories are only a part of the picture. Of course, media, with its false belief that all guns are bad, can’t be relied upon to accurately portray this situation.

Read it here:

<https://www.gunlaws.com/mesamelt.htm>

A gun is designed for the safety, protection and enjoyment of its owners.

You will rarely notice this in mess media.

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

Warning: Known to the State of California to Cause Laughter

The aspiring dictator of California, Governor Gavin Newsom, has put yet another notch in his belt of tyranny. Seemingly bored with attacking the Second Amendment, he has begun targeting free speech protected under the First Amendment. After a deepfake parody video of Kamala Harris (<https://tinyurl.com/KamalaParody>) surfaced on X, Gavin Newsom threw a legislative hissy fit, fast-tracking a new “law” outlawing such parody in California.

Specifically, deepfake parody that is of a political nature is no longer permitted in the People’s Republic of California. As expected, this is being sold as beneficial to the well-being and safety of California residents and all thanks to the low tolerance for humor by authoritarians like Gavin Newsom. This retaliation against the citizenry is almost certainly a backlash of bitter jealousy since **the left can’t meme**. In his benevolent mercy, the Fearless Leader of the People’s Republic went on T.V. to ensure his subjects that free speech and parody were still lawful just so long as they didn’t stray out of the bounds he had so wisely placed

around their liberty for their own good. His lackeys in the California legislature were only too happy to violate their oaths of office and sign this atrocity into law, likely hoping to get a pat on the back from the king for their treachery.



In response to this new attack on freedom by Gavin Newsom, the YouTube & X user and creator of the Kamala Harris parody video, Mr. Reagan, created a parody video just for Gavin Newsom to celebrate his public temper tantrum (<https://tinyurl.com/GavinParody>). In addition, California is being sued for

infringing on the free speech of its citizens in violation of First Amendment protections. Both videos are designed to be digs at the politicians and are apparently very effective since Gavin Newsom has lost his proverbial marbles over them.

It's fair to say that anti-liberty radicals like Gavin Newsom are perfect examples of why we need our firearms to defend ourselves from

government. Men like him would gladly see us put in internment camps in order to protect their political agenda and “careers.” He’s the kind of person that would imprison someone for life for saying the “wrong” thing. Without tyrants like him, we would have little need to fear our government. His ilk is a constant reminder that humans are flawed as are the systems of government they construct.

While these malicious actions by state actors don’t technically qualify as treason under U.S. law, they are so closely related in practice, it’s sometimes difficult to tell the difference between them. Attempting to subvert a government through fiat and unlawful legislation is only one slippery step above outright attacking it for the same purpose. Even Sun Tsu argues that the former is more effective and more desirable than the latter. In the end, the tyrants willing to undermine liberty and our Constitution are, without a doubt, enemies of the state and of the people.

“The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting.”
 “The greatest victory is that which requires no battle.”
 — Sun Tzu, The Art of War



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.”