

The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

We have all seen the horrible riots that occurred across our country in the last several weeks. I'll not get into the purported reasons for the protests but many of these protests degenerated into looting, mayhem and murder. These riots were mostly in the public square where it was the stores that were the targets of the looting and the arson. But as these were happening I was thinking what happens when the rioting mobs go to the neighborhoods? Whether you are white or black, rich or poor, it will not matter as the mob makes no distinctions when the fervor of rioting takes hold. Are you ready? Self-defense is a natural right. Defense of your family is a natural right. Are you ready?

Many Americans have determined that they are not ready and have sought out the means of self-defense. Gun sales are rocketing and especially for first time gun buyers. Ammo sales are also soaring and many calibers are in short supply.

In normal times the saying goes "when danger is seconds away, the police are minutes away." I've read that the average response time for the police is 20 minutes. So I have reasoned that when there is danger to myself, my family, and my home is seconds away, I will be prepared to defend.

We are blessed to live in Tennessee where protests have not degenerated into riots except in Nashville. But what is the future?

The Political Left's Lust for Violence and the Control of Guns

Posted on June 8, 2020 by Ammoland By Dan Wos

When I say "gun violence" doesn't exist, some people look at me cross-eyed because the term has become so common in the media and left-wing talking points. The truth is, there's no such thing as "gun-violence."

"Gun-violence" doesn't exist. It is a made-up nomenclature created as a tool to demonize guns in the pursuit of more gun restrictions on lawful Americans. It's impossible for a gun to be violent. Violence can only come from people. What the gun grabbers are really talking about is "human-violence." But if the discussion were focused on "human violence," we would all be forced to work on solving the problems that cause people to act violently.

The gun-grabbing left does not want to do that for two reasons.

Number one, it doesn't help their pursuit to demonize guns and implement more gun-restrictions.

Number two, focusing on "human-violence" would expose their culpability in its perpetuation.

If we were to talk about human-violence, we would be forced to talk about gang and mob violence, terrorist groups like Antifa, open borders, sanctuary cities, welfare dependency, fatherless homes, abortion, foreign terrorism and drugs (both legal and illegal.) These are all things the left directly or indirectly supports. So anytime violence occurs and a gun is used, the

left will call it “gun-violence” to keep the spotlight off of them and get the latest gun-restriction passed in Congress. Gun restrictions cause more good people to be unarmed and helpless, resulting in more gun-related deaths because we know, the bad guys pay no attention to the restrictions.

Then, they use the numbers of gun-related deaths to push for even more gun restrictions. If they really wanted to solve the problem of death and violence in America, wouldn't they join us in abolishing the Gun-Free School Zone for instance?

Ever since Joe Biden introduced the Gun-Free School Zones Act and it was signed into law, school killings have nearly doubled.

The anti-gun left capitalizes on those preventable attacks to push for even more gun restrictions. Some would argue, they don't really want the problem of “human-violence” to go away.

The left's lust for human-violence is real. This is why you see them doing nothing to stop the rioters in the streets of Democrat-run cities across the country. During a time of massive riots, violence, looting, and the burning down of buildings across the country, the political left doesn't try to stop it. They actually call for the defunding of police departments while walking the streets themselves in protest of the very problem they perpetuate.

They use a false narrative, dishonest media and vague terms to keep the problem alive while pretending to fight against it. You've heard them say things like, “we need to tear down the system and rebuild it from the ground up.” How exactly do they propose to do this? They'll never tell you because they have no idea, but they do need to be perceived as the righteous, justice warriors in the eyes of those who don't know any better. How about when they say we need to “re-imagine the police department?” What exactly does that mean? The answer is, nothing. The term “re-imagine the police department” means absolutely nothing and they know it. They know YOU will never be able to define it and they know THEY will never be called out on it out of the fear people have of being labeled a racist. These are vague terms that they create so they can continue to perpetuate the problem of “human-violence” without the possibility of a solution. It would seem that the political left doesn't want human-violence to go away.

They do want to take away your guns and make the police departments weak and ineffective.

So, when they talk about “systemic racism,” “institutional racism,” “gun violence” and “re-imagining the police departments,” what they're really saying is:

“We don't really want to fix the problem of human-violence, so we're giving you meaningless terms that you will never be able to define, so the problem will never be solved. Human-violence in America serves us well politically and we don't really want it to stop.”

These are the people our Founders warned us about. They are why the 2nd Amendment was written.

The 2nd Amendment is not a privilege. It's your right. Read more:

<https://www.ammoland.com/2020/06/the-political-lefts-lust-for-violence-and-the-control-of-guns/#ixzz6OsrLOTQ5>

Supreme Court Denies Certiorari to 10 Second Amendment Cases

Posted on June 16, 2020 by Dean Weingarten

Arizona -(Ammoland.com)- In an unexpected move, the Supreme Court has voted to deny certiorari (refuse to hear) ten Second Amendment cases which have been held at the court, some of which have been waiting for years.

Much speculation has been written about the cases, with the expectation the Supreme Court would hear at least one of them in order to clarify splits that have occurred in the circuit courts on the issues of carrying firearms outside the home, bans on gun magazines and semi-automatic rifles.

The court is believed to have four justices inclined to enforce the Second Amendment: Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch, and Kavanaugh. There are four justices believed to wish to render the Second Amendment impotent and toothless: Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan.

Chief Justice Roberts is speculated as being the swing vote which could go either way. He voted for both the Heller and McDonald decisions to uphold the Second Amendment as written and applied to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment.

Many conservatives see him as unreliable. Who knows what pressures are brought to bear on nine of the most powerful men and women in the world?

Something happened to change the balance and bring about a majority to deny certiorari to the ten Second Amendment cases.

The Supreme Court does not tell us who voted for the denial of certiorari. We know two justices disagree strongly enough to dissent.

Thomas Rogers, et al. v. Gurbir Grewal Denied

Justice Thomas wrote the dissent on the Rogers v. Grewal case. Justice Kavanaugh joined the dissent for Parts I and III of the dissent but did not join for Part II.

In Part I, Justice Thomas explains the need to reign in the circuit court's decisions on the Second Amendment. Justice Thomas writes:

This approach raises numerous concerns. For one, the courts of appeals' test appears to be entirely made up. The Second Amendment provides no hierarchy of "core" and peripheral rights. And "[t]he Constitution does not prescribe tiers of scrutiny." *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, 579 U. S. ___, ___ (2016) (THOMAS, J., dissenting) (slip op., at 12); see also *Heller II*, supra, at 1283 (Kavanaugh, J., dissenting) (listing constitutional rights that are not subject to means-ends scrutiny). Moreover, there is nothing in our Second Amendment precedents that

supports the application of what has been described as “a tripartite binary test with a sliding scale and a reasonable fit.” *Duncan v. Becerra*, 265 F. Supp. 3d 1106, 1117 (SD Cal. 2017), aff’d, 742 Fed. Appx. 218 (CA9 2018).

Part II is a strongly reasoned argument that Second Amendment rights exist outside the home. In Part II, Justice Thomas writes this:

“The most natural reading of this definition encompasses public carry.” *Peruta v. California*, 582 U. S. ___, ___ (2017) (THOMAS, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari) (slip op., at 5). Confrontations, of course, often occur outside the home. See, e.g., *Moore*, supra, at 937 (noting that “most murders occur outside the home” in Chicago). Thus, the right to carry arms for self-defense inherently includes the right to carry in public. This conclusion not only flows from the definition of “bear Arms” but also from the natural use of the language in the text. As I have stated before, it is “extremely improbable that the Framers understood the Second Amendment to protect little more than carrying a gun from the bedroom to the kitchen.” *Peruta*, supra, at ___ (opinion dissenting from denial of certiorari) (slip op., at 5).

In part III, which Justice Kavanaugh agrees with, Justice Thomas writes this:

It appears that a handful of States throughout the country prohibit citizens from carrying arms in public unless they can establish “good cause” or a “justifiable need” for doing so. The majority of States, while regulating the carrying of arms to varying degrees, have not imposed such a restriction, which amounts to a “[b]a[n] on the ability of most citizens to exercise an enumerated right.” *Wrenn*, 864 F. 3d, at 666. The Courts of Appeals are squarely divided on the constitutionality of these onerous “justifiable need” or “good cause” restrictions. The D. C. Circuit has held that a law limiting public carry to those with a “good reason to fear injury to [their] person or property” violates the Second Amendment. *Wrenn*, 864 F. 3d, at 655 (internal quotation marks omitted).⁷ By contrast, the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Circuits have upheld the constitutionality of licensing schemes with “justifiable need” or “good reason” requirements, applying what purported to be an intermediate scrutiny standard. See *Gould*, 907 F. 3d, at 677; *Kachalsky*, 701 F. 3d, at 101; *Drake*, 724 F. 3d, at 440; *Masciandaro*, 638 F. 3d, at 460.

In eight states and two American territories, the right of citizens and residents to bear arms outside of the home is arbitrarily restricted by a governmental agent, be it a law enforcement officer, board, or administrator, who can deny a permit to carry outside the home on a subjective basis.

It is the rule of man as envisioned by the progressive left, instead of the rule of law.

The eight states are: California, Delaware, Hawaii, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Rhode Island. The two American territories are the U.S. Virgin Islands and American Samoa. Those political entities contain about 26 percent of the population of the United States.

More than a quarter of the United States population have their Second Amendment rights infringed on a regular basis. The Supreme Court has voted to do nothing to correct this situation.

What changed at the court to precipitate the decision to continue the uneasy status quo? What tipped the balance toward the situation where circuits are allowed to accept, or even encourage, states to render the Second Amendment impotent?

The internal politics of the Supreme Court are hidden. It is unknown which justices voted to deny certiorari. The message from the court seems to be: Your Second Amendment rights are not respected here.

It could have been worse. The Court could have accepted a case, and reversed *Heller*. It shows a strong commitment, by at least one justice, to avoid the issue. It appears they do not wish to rule on Second Amendment issues, probably because the logic is clear.

Expect the rights of citizens in California, New Jersey, and the other states which view the Second Amendment with disdain, to be abused in more imaginative ways.

The remedy for the Supreme Court appears to be the appointment of at least one more Supreme Court justice who views the Constitution, as written, as the Supreme Law of the United States.

The remedy of the ballot box is available to citizens of the affected states. It is possible the current unrest will convince voters their Second Amendment rights are worth preserving.

Read more: <https://www.ammoland.com/2020/06/supreme-court-denies-writs-on-all-pending-second-amendment-cases-2/#ixzz6PdSMFmYs>

WHAT IS TAKING PLACE IN OUR NATION TODAY IS NOT A PRETTY PICTURE

Chief Justice Roberts and the liberal wing of the High Court will make damn sure that the rulings of those two seminal Second Amendment (*Heller and McDonald*) cases will never be clarified. That is where we are now and where we will remain unless or until another Justice sits on the High Court who actually honors the oath he takes to the Constitution.

We are seeing a massive campaign of brainwashing taking place in our Nation at this very moment, and we are getting much more than a foretaste. We are getting a choking mouthful of what the Marxists, Communists, Socialists, Anarchists, and billionaire Neoliberal Globalists have in store for each of us.

We are holding onto our Nation by a thread. Make no mistake about that. The puppet masters have brainwashed the mass of Lemmings, and they intend to destroy those of us who are immune to the nonsense spouted.

Today we see every monument to our glorious past—our ancestral memory—being wiped out; erased. Tomorrow, we will see the absolute destruction of our Bill of Rights. No question about it.

If Trump fails reelection and if the Senate is lost, we will lose everything irreplaceable: but likely not before the “cold” War at home turns “hot.”

I know what my next purchase will be; and it won't be a toy.

<http://arbalestquarrel.com/just-out-supreme-court-denies-writs-on-all-pending-second-amendment-cases/>

Richard Stouder
oakridger48@msn.com