APPROXIMATELY 3000 MEMBERS

vol. XXXV no. 1, January 2026

The RANGEFINDER

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE OAK RIDGE SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Please remember that when using any of the ORSA Ranges, safety should be your number one concern. Everyone must be diligent in observing and correcting unsafe actions by anyone on the ranges. Also remember that you should always wear proper EYE and EAR protection regardless of whether you are shooting or just watching.

ORSA Website: **ORSAONLINE.ORG** *ORSA Membership Info:* **JOINORSA.ORG**

Range Work Rules

As a reminder regarding work being completed on the grounds at ORSA:
If you are on a range shooting, or show up to a range to shoot, you are required to yield to anyone working on the ranges or property. This includes contractors and/or volunteers. Under no circumstances should you begin shooting, or continue shooting, on any range where a contractor or volunteer is working or shows up to perform any work activity - mowing, weed eating, maintenance, etc.
HP maintenance Monday 8am-2pm and LR maintenance Monday 2pm-dusk.
Thank you for your cooperation and abiding by this rule. **- *ORSA BOD***

The ORSA Rifle and Pistol Club is Pleased to Offer the NRA Certified Range Safety Officer Course

The class is open to all ORSA members who would like to earn this certificate and are willing to volunteer to serve as a RSO on the Rifle and Pistol Club ranges. The class will be held on Saturday February 7, 2026, from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

Applicants for the training must agree to commit to working at least one four-hour RSO tour each month on the Indoor Range and/or on the four outdoor ranges near the Indoor Range. Depending on the number of available RSO's, an additional tour may occasionally be necessary during a month.

Class is limited to 20 participants on a first come-first served basis. Cost for the class is $30.00 which will include the training manual, and all materials. Class will also include “Stop the Bleed” and AED training. Drinks are available at the Indoor Range. In addition, be sure to bring a snack lunch and some snacks as it will be a long day. Upon completion of the class, each participant will also receive an NRA RSO Course "proof of completion" from Chief RSO John Barone. A copy of that proof must then be submitted to the NRA Training and Education Department, along with a $35.00 certification fee, in order to obtain the ORSA-required three-year NRA RSO Certification Card.

Please Dress for Indoor and Outdoor activities. If late Fall is any indication of Mid-Winter, it will be Cold and Wet!

For more information or to register please contact the course facilitator Doug Calvert at orsarsos@gmail.com 865-607-3032. OR you may choose to register online: R & P Club page inside the ORSA website for the official registration: https://www.orsaonline.org/facilities/rifle-pistol/. Registration closes on January 23, 2026.

Ladies' Day at the Indoor Range

Starting August 22, we will have **Ladies' Day at the Indoor Range** on Fridays from 9 a.m. to noon. This is open to all women age 16 and up, beginner to expert.

For too long, many considered shooting sports to be a male-dominated arena. But we're here to tell you that's changing, and there's never been a better time for women to get involved.

Why Should Women Get Involved?

- **Empowerment:** Mastering a firearm and hitting your target is an incredibly empowering experience. It builds self-assurance and a sense of capability that extends beyond the range.

- **Focus and Concentration:** Shooting sports require intense focus and mental discipline. It's a fantastic way to sharpen your concentration skills and clear your mind.

- **Community:** The shooting sports community is welcoming and supportive. You'll find opportunities to connect with like-minded individuals, build friendships, and learn from experienced shooters. Ladies' Day is an ideal opportunity for us to make friends and help each other learn and improve at the range.

- **Self-Defense Skills:** Whether your interest is sport shooting or self-defense training, familiarity with firearms and safe gun handling is a valuable foundation. Anyone who lives in a home with firearms should have a basic knowledge of how to safely load, clear, and use the weapon if needed.

- **It's Plain Fun!** Let's be honest, hitting a target is satisfying! Shooting sports offer a unique and enjoyable way to challenge yourself, whether you choose to compete with others or simply improve your own score.

For more information, contact Angi Agle, 865-272-9215 or ORSAladies@gmail.com

• • • ACTION PISTOL NEWS • • •

- Access to the Action Pistol range for practice requires participants to attend an AP Orientation session. Classes are held monthly at the AP building.
- Due to limited seating and health restrictions Walk-ins are not allowed.
- Use the link below to register for the AP orientation class of your choice.
  https://practiscore.com/clubs/oak-ridge-sportsman-association

“Congress Shall Make No Law” vs. “Shall Not Be Infringed”

Ammoland Inc. Posted on November 15, 2025 by Alan Chwick, Joanne D Eisen & Gary Mauser

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

The First and Second Amendments of the United States Constitution serve as foundational elements of American law and governance.

Each amendment, while relatively brief in its phrasing, carries profound implications for the rights of individuals and the limits of governmental power. A close examination of the language — *“Congress shall make no law”* in the First Amendment and *“shall not be infringed”* in the Second Amendment — reveals significant differences in scope, interpretation, and historical application.

I try here to explore these distinctions and their broader constitutional ramifications.

The First Amendment states:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

The phrase “Congress shall make no law” explicitly limits legislative power at the federal level. The framers of the Constitution designed this language to protect individual liberties against governmental overreach, specifically targeting Congress, the legislative branch. Over time, through the incorporation doctrine under the Fourteenth Amendment, these protections have been extended to state governments, as well. *This textual structure underscores a negative liberty — a prohibition against certain types of governmental action rather than an affirmative grant of rights.*

The Second Amendment states:

“A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.”

The phrase “shall not be infringed” is broader and more abstract in its scope. Unlike the First Amendment, which directly addresses Congress, the Second Amendment imposes a general prohibition overall on the infringement of the right to bear arms, without specifying which branch or level of government it restrains; thus, all branches plus under the Fourteenth Amendment to the states. The lack of direct reference to any governmental body opens the language to broader interpretation and debate regarding its application spanning both Federal and State levels.

The First Amendment explicitly names Congress, emphasizing its role as the legislative body that could threaten freedoms of speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition. In contrast, the Second Amendment’s passive construction (“shall not be infringed”) leaves the scope open-ended, implying a universal prohibition against any infringement, regardless of the actor. This distinction has led to different judicial approaches in interpreting these amendments.

The First Amendment protects expressive and participatory rights, central to democratic governance. These rights are seen as essential for individual autonomy and collective decision-making. By contrast, the Second Amendment protects a specific individual and collective right — *the right to keep and bear arms* — which has been interpreted as connected to personal defense, resistance to tyranny, and the maintenance of a militia.

The Backstory

Historically, the First Amendment emerged from the Enlightenment’s emphasis on individual liberty and the abuses of speech and religious freedoms under British rule. Its phrasing reflects a reaction to specific historical grievances.

Meanwhile, the Second Amendment was influenced by the colonial experience of armed resistance against Britain and concerns about standing armies. The phrase "shall not be infringed" again reflects a universal principle aimed at ensuring both personal security and the collective defense of liberty.

Judicial interpretation of the First Amendment has produced a robust body of jurisprudence. Cases such as *Schenck v. United States* (1919) introduced the "clear and present danger" test, while *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969) refined protections for speech, ensuring that only incitement to imminent lawless action could be restricted. The incorporation of the First Amendment through *Gitlow v. New York* (1925) extended its protections to state governments, reinforcing its role as a cornerstone of individual rights.

Interpretation of the Second Amendment has been *less consistent*. For much of American history, courts viewed it as (improperly) linked to the maintenance of state militias. However, *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) marked a significant shift, affirming an individual's right to bear arms unconnected to militia service. This decision emphasized the personal right to self-defense, expanding the understanding of "shall not be infringed" as a broader safeguard against governmental action.

The phrase "Congress shall make no law" clearly delineates the boundaries of legislative authority, framing the First Amendment as a direct check on governmental power. In contrast, "shall not be infringed" in the Second Amendment suggests an overarching protection of a pre-existing right, implying that the right to bear arms is fundamental and not contingent on any governmental recognition.

Modern controversies surrounding the First Amendment include debates over the limits of hate speech, the regulation of misinformation, and balancing free speech with societal harm. The absolute nature of "Congress shall make no law" is tempered by judicial recognition that some speech, such as libel or incitement, can be regulated to protect other rights.

While the Second Amendment faces intense debate over gun control and public safety. Opponents of expansive gun rights argue that the universal nature of "shall not be infringed" must be reconciled with the government's responsibility to protect citizens, *but this is very wrong*. Supporters contend that any regulation constitutes an infringement on a fundamental right. Courts have struggled to balance these competing interests, causing a patchwork of state and federal regulations, which, by my humble understanding, should not be.

Historically, the First Amendment's foundations in safeguarding discourse and participation highlight its role in fostering democratic resilience. By contrast, the Second Amendment's roots in self-defense and resistance to oppression reflect its orientation toward individual autonomy and security. This difference manifests in contemporary discourse, where First Amendment issues often revolve around societal impacts of speech, while the Second Amendment revolves around balancing individual freedoms against the collective's safety.

Both amendments endure constant scrutiny in a changing social landscape. The First Amendment contends with new digital-age challenges, such as social media regulation and artificial intelligence's role in shaping public discourse. Similarly, the Second Amendment must address evolving weapons technology and the sociopolitical (read: emotional) dynamics of gun ownership.

Wrapping it all up, the differences between "Congress shall make no law" and "shall not be infringed" reflect distinct approaches to constitutional rights.

The former is precise and directed, limiting legislative authority to safeguard democratic freedoms. The latter is broad and universal, applied to State & Federal governments, protecting a fundamental natural right without specifying the scope of any restrictions. These linguistic nuances have shaped their interpretation, application, and role in American legal and cultural frameworks.

Simple breakdown:

"Congress shall make no law" applies to governmental/legislative roles, while "Shall not be infringed" applies across the board!

References:

1. *U.S. Const. Amend. I.*
2. *U.S. Const. Amend. II.*
3. *Schenck v. United States, 249 U.S. 47 (1919).*
4. *Brandenburg v. Ohio, 395 U.S. 444 (1969).*
5. *Gitlow v. New York, 268 U.S. 652 (1925).*
6. *District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008).*
7. *Amar, Akhil Reed. America's Constitution: A Biography. Random House, 2005.*
8. *Rakove, Jack N. Original Meanings: Politics and Ideas in the Making of the Constitution. Knopf, 1996.*
9. *Balkin, Jack M. Living Originalism. Harvard University Press, 2011.*
10. *Winkler, Adam. Gunfight: The Battle Over the Right to Bear Arms in America. W.W. Norton, 2011.*

About Alan J. Chwick:

Alan J. Chwick, A.S., B.S., FL/NY/SC Paralegal is known for his involvement in legal articles usually related to firearm regulations and for his contributions to discussions on gun rights.

https://www.ammoland.com/2025/11/congress-shall-make-no-law-vs-shall-not-be-infringed/

DOJ Forms New Second Amendment Rights Section

Ammoland Inc. Posted on November 27, 2025 by John Crump

The Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) is launching a new unit dedicated to protecting Americans' gun rights.

The office, known as the Second Amendment Rights Section, is scheduled to open on December 4. The office's focus will be on investigating local policies and laws that violate an American's right to keep and bear arms as protected by the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution. The section is a direct result of Donald Trump's Executive Order (EO) on gun rights, issued earlier this year.

The Civil Rights Division of the DOJ was created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Its mission is to investigate systemic violations of constitutional rights. For most of the department's history, it has ignored the gun rights of Americans. In the past, it has concentrated chiefly on race issues. The expansion of the Civil Rights Division does not require congressional approval. All that is needed is for the DOJ to notify Congress of the reorganization, which it did yesterday.

The DOJ Civil Rights Division has challenged local and state laws it believes run contrary to the Second Amendment. Recently, the Department of Justice sued the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department over delays in issuing concealed carry permits. That case is working its way through the court system. The new section will run that suit going forward.

Also, Harmeet Dhillon, the head of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, recently argued before the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit against Illinois' "assault weapons" ban, known as the Protect Illinois Communities Act (PICA). This action was the first time the Department of Justice argued against a gun law in the federal court system.

Earlier this week, the Civil Rights Division filed an amicus brief in support of the petitioners in *Jason Wolford v. Anne Lopez*, Attorney General of Hawaii, which challenges Hawaii's stringent firearm laws. The law prohibits carrying firearms on private property unless the property owner gives the gun owner explicit permission. The Ninth Circuit upheld the Hawaiian "vampire" law, and the plaintiffs filed for a writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court. The writ of cert was granted, and for the first time ever, the federal government filed a brief on behalf of the plaintiffs.

Although the Civil Rights Division has taken pro-gun actions, the DOJ has also upset the Second Amendment community by taking what are perceived as anti-gun actions. These actions include requesting membership rolls from the Firearms Policy Coalition (FPC) and the Second Amendment Foundation (SAF) after the two gun rights groups defeated the post office gun ban in court.

Pam Bondi and the Department of Justice have also vehemently defended the National Firearms Act (NFA) by using anti-gun groups' talking points in a case filed by Silencer Shop, Gun Owners of America (GOA), Firearms Regulatory Accountability Coalition (FRAC), and Palmetto State Armory (PSA). The DOJ argued that short-barreled rifles and shotguns need additional regulations because they are "easily concealable," which could apply to all handguns. They also demonized suppressors and machine guns in the same case. A DOJ spokesperson responding to the criticism claimed that the courts should not have the power to overturn laws passed by Congress, putting the DOJ in direct opposition to *Madison v. Marbury*, a legal precedent set over 200 years ago.

The DOJ's actions have been a mixed bag for gun owners. Many hope the new section will address states' abuses of the Second Amendment, but are also concerned about the DOJ's previous actions.

About John Crump

Mr. Crump is an NRA instructor and a constitutional activist.

https://www.ammoland.com/2025/11/doj-forms-new-second-amendment-rights-section/

Supreme Court Kills Missouri's Second Amendment Protection Act

Ammoland Inc. Posted on December 11, 2025 by José Niño

The Supreme Court just delivered a significant blow to Second Amendment advocates across the nation. On October 6, 2025, the high court refused to hear Missouri's appeal of its Second Amendment Protection Act, effectively killing one of the most ambitious state-level efforts to shield gun owners from federal overreach. For those who believe in robust gun rights and state sovereignty, this represents a devastating setback with implications that reach far beyond the Show Me State.

Missouri's Second Amendment Preservation Act, passed in 2021, aimed to establish a firewall between state resources and federal enforcement of gun control measures. The law declared certain federal firearms regulations "invalid" within Missouri's borders and prohibited state and local officials from assisting federal authorities in enforcing them. Perhaps most notably, it authorized private citizens to sue agencies that cooperated with federal gun enforcement for $50,000 per occurrence.

The Department of Justice under Attorney General Pam Bondi attacked the law relentlessly, maintaining the Biden administration's litigation strategy despite President Trump's executive orders directing agencies to protect Second Amendment rights. Benjamin Hyun Sanderson, Deputy Director of Federal Affairs for Gun Owners of America, minced no words about the betrayal. "Why did the Department of Justice with Attorney General Pam Bondi, at the helm, attack and effectively end Missouri's Second Amendment protection?" he asked in a video statement. "This was seen to fly in the face of President Trump's own executive order, protecting Second Amendment rights."

Federal courts showed no sympathy for Missouri's federalism arguments. A district judge struck down the entire statute as unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause. The Eighth Circuit affirmed that decision in August 2024, treating Missouri's law as impermissible nullification rather than legitimate non-cooperation with federal enforcement.

Missouri's petition to the Supreme Court raised fundamental questions about state authority. Can federal courts second-guess a state's reasons for exercising Tenth Amendment rights? May states decline cooperation with federal enforcement when their motivation stems from constitutional

disagreement? These questions deserved answers from the nation's highest court. Instead, the justices simply denied certiorari without comment, leaving Missouri gun owners without recourse.

The practical consequences hit immediately. Local police departments in Missouri can now rejoin federal task forces without fear of crippling civil penalties. Information sharing with the ATF and other federal agencies will resume unimpeded. Federal firearms prosecutions in Missouri will proceed with full local cooperation available. The state-level shield that the Second Amendment Protection Act attempted to create has been dismantled entirely.

"Through a deliberately layered program of professional development, artificial intelligence-assisted archival research and open-access instructional media, the Firearms Research Center will empower teachers to cultivate in K-12 students the habits of mind essential to critical inquiry, evidentiary reasoning and civic deliberation," Mocsary says in explaining the educational initiative. But for Missouri gun owners facing renewed federal enforcement cooperation, educational programs offer cold comfort.

The broader implications extend nationwide. Every state that considered similar Second Amendment sanctuary legislation now faces clear judicial hostility. The Supreme Court's refusal to intervene sends an unmistakable message that aggressive state resistance to federal gun enforcement, particularly laws declaring federal statutes invalid or penalizing local cooperation, will not survive constitutional scrutiny.

"Thanks, Pam Bondi. They're killing a state-level Second Amendment protection law. What a major mess up by the Department of Justice," Sanderson stated bluntly. His frustration reflects a movement that expected different treatment from a Republican administration but instead watched the Trump Justice Department maintain Biden-era legal positions that undermine state attempts to protect gun rights.

Missouri legislators are already working on revised versions of the law, attempting to craft language that might survive federal challenge. But the Supreme Court's decision leaves little room for optimism about bolder approaches to state-level Second Amendment protection.

About José Niño

José Niño is a freelance writer based in Charlotte, North Carolina.

https://www.ammoland.com/2025/12/supreme-court-kills-missouris-second-amendment-protection-act/

Richard Stouder
oakridger48@msn.com

ORSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NO CALLS AFTER 9:00 PM PLEASE

PRESIDENT: Jerry Zorsch
zorsch@highland.net ; 423-628-5471

VICE PRESIDENT: Mike Madden
mmsr@comcast.net ; 865-414-4636

SECRETARY: Patrick Hackett
orsasec@gmail.com ; 865-567-1574

MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY: Jody Zorsch
orsamembership@gmail.com ; 423-628-5471

TREASURER: Eric Fowler
ejfowler2@gmail.com ; 865-310-3559

ROADS & GROUNDS: Bruce Moulton
bkm1953@hotmail.com ; 865-316-4285

RIFLE & PISTOL: Frank Ashby
orsariflepistol@gmail.com ; 281-723-4443

SKEET & TRAP: Larry McNamee
ataorsa@gmail.com ; 865-216-9864

ARCHERY: Don Wood
tndeerhunter117@gmail.com ; 865-435-0746

ACTION PISTOL: Byrl Adkisson
orsaidpa@comcast.net ; 865-300-6003

TRAINING OFFICER: Ed Allen
edwarddallen43@gmail.com ; 865-548-2773

EX-OFFICIO: Ed Johnson
edjohnson144@comcast.net ; 865-483-9573

ORSA HISTORIAN: Ron Raymond
knoxvilleron@gmail.com

WEBMASTER: Chris Melhorn
cjmelhorn@gmail.com ; 865-456-0602

CLUB OFFICERS

CMP PROGRAM: Kyle Kirschenmann
865-621-5506

JUNIOR ACTIVITIES: Ed Johnson
865-483-9573

SASS: Ron Green (Uncle Ethan)
865-207-7005

NRA PRECISION PISTOL LEAGUE: Ben Valdez
865-441-0217

NRA PRECISION PISTOL EIC: Ben Valdez
865-441-0217

LONG RANGE: Thomas Colyer
precisionwelding01@comcast.net ; 865-919-5245

IDPA: Byrl Adkisson
865-300-6003

USPSA / IPSC: Paul Avery
423-836-1068

STEEL CHALLENGE: Kenneth Reesor
865-389-8877

MULTI-GUN: Douglas Pichardo
757-409-7316

SPORTING CLAYS: Cletus Mitchell
865-599-0591

SKEET: Lou Berretta
Lou@rescomcm.com ; 973-919-4232

TRAP: Don Conover
donconover1@outlook.com

HEALTH & SAFETY EMERGENCIES: 911

SEND MEMBERSHIP STATUS & CONTACT INFORMATION CHANGES TO: ORSA, PO BOX 6094, OAK RIDGE, TN 37831-6094
MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE AT JOINORSA.ORG

THE RANGEFINDER is published monthly by the Oak Ridge Sportsmen's Assoc. (ORSA).
ORSA is an organization of shooters, hunters, archers, fishermen and others dedicated to outdoor sports and conservation.

Send email correspondence (but NOT address changes) regarding this publication to: **orsasec@gmail.com** with a Subject Line: ORSA Rangefinder

If you wish to submit an article for publication, you must first submit it to the ORSA Secretary via email.
The article will then be distributed via email to the ORSA board for approval. When the board approves the article, the author will be notified.