

# Arms Rights Round-Up



By Sidney Secular

March 18, 2022

Your “straight shooters” take a shot at bringing you up-to-date on some important recent Second Amendment issues:

“Backdoor” Gun Registry: The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATF) is in the process of creating a massive database via digitization of Form 4473 people fill out when purchasing a firearm. In 2021 alone, ATF processed at least 54 million of these forms, a process that began during the Obama Reign of Error. As an indication of the quantity involved, over one million of these records are sent to the ATF each month and that bureaucracy employs a small army to register them. By law, gun dealers must maintain these records for 20 years. If a dealer retires, sells out or goes out of business, he must send the last 20 years of his records to the BATF. Far from this being just more bureaucratic “make work,” the government through this agency is gunning for a requirement necessitating gun dealers to maintain these forms indefinitely in order to create a practicable firearms registry in preparation for that time at which anti-gun lawmakers are able to criminalize the private transfer of firearms through “universal background check” legislation.

But this is not even an effort to prevent illegal gun sales because, as a practical matter, it takes on average over eight years from the time of the original legal sale of a gun until the time that the weapon may be found at the scene of a crime! And, of course, this does not take into account guns that are

stolen and then used in a crime. Most criminals don't bother to purchase their means of livelihood as they are into "stealing stuff" anyway! The simple fact is that faux "Presidunce" Biden and his leftist cadre want to treat lawful gun ownership as a crime and therefore blame gun store owners for arming criminals, the vast majority of whom are ordinary law-abiding Americans! The simple fact is that all Americans – and especially gun owners – should be suspicious of any FedGov involvement in keeping records of gun sales and ownership!

US Supreme Court Case on the Right to Bear Arms: On November 3, 2021, the Supremes heard oral arguments in the case of NY State Rifle and Pistol Association vs. Bruen, an NRA backed challenge to New York State's highly restrictive may-issue licensing scheme for "concealed carry". These licenses are the only way for New Yorkers to carry a gun outside their dwellings for the purpose of self-defense something that is essential in these days of mass anarchy especially within our cities! Unless a New Yorker lives in a rural area with a pro-gun sheriff or in populated areas if you are not a judge, a former police officer or a celebrity, you can basically forget about getting a gun much less obtaining permission to open carry because the law requires applicants to show a "special need" for "self-defense" that distinguishes you from the general population! For example, Jewish diamond sellers can obtain such a license for obvious reasons! The fact that a pro-criminal "justice system" has made New York's streets into modern versions of the Alamo, seems not to influence our "leaders" with regard to public safety. Thus, the right to bear arms becomes a special privilege reserved for the few who are "connected" or are special in some other acceptable WOKE way.

Arguing for the petitioners is former US Solicitor Paul Clement, one of the most experienced Supreme Court litigators in the US. He has noted that there are several cities where shall-issue concealed carry is already the norm, and there has

not been any surge of violent crime by those with permits. Indeed, it is probable that violent gun crime by those who don't feel the need to seek such a permit is also down because most criminals are not totally stupid! Believe it or not, the two lefty women on the Court, Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan seem to be on the pro-gun side while retiring fossil Justice Stephen Breyer – who believes there is no individual right to own, carry or use a gun under the Second Amendment! – has dealt with the matter by attempting to dismiss the case! The tenor of the proceedings so far is encouraging for the pro-gun side, but the decision will take some time to come and heaven alone knows what the prevailing situation will be once it does come down.

James Bond Misfires: One good thing about the latest James Bond film, "No Time to Die" is that it should be Daniel Craig's last adventure as "007." It's amazing that this supposed model of an armed warrior is not a fan of guns. He has said, "I hate handguns. Handguns are used to shoot people and as long as they are around, people will shoot each other. That's a simple fact." Unfortunately, the same can be said for anything that can be used as a weapon from hammers to hatpins! Removing every possible means of doing our fellow man harm would leave us all naked and pray to larger animals with bigger teeth! Of course, fictional "James Bond" goes around in films using handguns to save people from villains but the actor who portrays the "hero" still can't appreciate the fact that guns can be – and often are – used by law-abiding citizens to protect themselves and other law-abiding citizens from violent criminals!

As with most lefties, Craig lives in an alternate reality where common sense has now become very much "uncommon." In this latest Bond flick, Director Cary Fukunga has given us a "hero" symbolic of today's emasculated, insecure man more able to engage in soap opera dialogue than taking confident action. We expect Fleming's Bond character to be fighting for his life

and the lives of those he protects from the film's beginning to its end, albeit interspersed with some romantic and clever interludes thrown in for variety. Instead, we get a verbose, hesitant capon embarrassed by his own occupation and the tools required to practice it. In the end, the audience is left with what is, in fact, an anti-Bond film! Indeed, nearly all films nowadays that involve white heroes devolve into flimsy, repulsive themes and scenes designed to validate the present culture's view of whites in general. The only truly "masculine" movies today have non-white "heroes" (or anti-heroes) but no matter the theme, comedy, drama or "action," almost all celluloid epics are used to promote racial politics, perverted sex, political correctness, and other furtherance of the "WOKE" culture.

Virginia is Again for Second Amendment Lovers: In the last election, pro-gun candidates won up and down the ballot in the Old Dominion. This includes the Virginia House of Delegates which has flipped and will (\*should?) have a majority that understands the importance of Second Amendment rights. (\*Of course, we must always keep in mind that politicians, like lovers, often promise far more than they deliver!)

Another of Bummer Biden's Bum Choices, the fibbing, floundering, flunky David Chipman – who had been a special agent for the BATF for twenty-five years – was nominated by Clueless Joe to head that important agency. Fortunately, his gaffes with the media eventually resulted in his name being withdrawn – thank God for small favors! Chipman was a typical chip off the Biden blockhead, a cretin who claims that the "gun industry" profits from gun violence. He declared without any evidence and, indeed, against huge amounts of available evidence, that retailers routinely sell guns without any accountability and implied that they deliberately sell to "criminals and terrorists." Of course, he may have been thinking of former Attorney General Eric Holder's strategy to get illegal guns into the hands of Mexican cartels by forcing

honest gun dealers in Texas to provide those weapons; this little “strategy” was called Operation Fast and Furious. If that is so, then Chipman was blaming the wrong person for the crime! A background check through the FBI’s National Instant background Check System is required for each and every sale of a gun, and it is illegal to knowingly sell to any person prohibited by law from owning a gun. Chipman’s biggest idiocy – you can hardly call it a lie as lies must have some credibility to be useful! – came when he said that it is easier to buy a gun than a beer. Maybe he lives in a “dry” state?

Defending the Flock: There is an increasingly common and serious problem with regard to violent criminals who target churches. These present peculiar challenges to those confronting the problem because houses of worship strive to be open and inviting, are refuges for the vulnerable and needy, their doors are left unlocked, and strangers are welcomed. These conditions are ripe for any psychopath or terrorist to use as an outlet for violence. In addition, people are usually not permitted to carry guns into a church facility either through local laws or through the rules of the church itself. As a result, crimes against church congregations are all too common. In 2019, the FBI chronicled a wave of thousands of assaults, vandalisms, burglaries, homicides and even kidnappings that occurred in churches. That same year, the FBI recorded 1,715 crimes motivated by anti-religious sentiment, an increase of 7% over previous years and FBI estimates showed a 35% increase in attacks on churches between 2014 and 2018, about 57% of these involved firearms. The problem has drawn national and even international scrutiny.

In 2019, President Donald Trump provided \$25 million from the federal government to protect religious sites and churches. The Department of Homeland “Obscurity” and the FBI have each released guidance for mitigating attacks on houses of worship. And while a few states ban guns in houses of worship

completely, six require express permission to carry and some states like Florida have recently eased up on church-carry restrictions after some high-profile attacks on local congregations. Of course, the FedGov and the states have no right to disallow firearms on church property although it can be hidden under regulations denying "open carry" permits for firearms. Barring various state and local restrictions, religious institutions have the right to make their own decisions in these matters as it involves the exercise of First Amendment rights to make decisions regarding the Second Amendment.

Across the various Christian denominations as well as non-Christian religions there is little consensus on the issue and many religious leaders are reluctant to take a public stand for fear of seeming "unchristian" or otherwise anti-human. Among some churches who have not yet been fully compromised by leftist pacifistic leanings, some host shooting events and concealed-carry classes to assure that any members who find themselves in a difficult situation are sufficiently proficient to help rather than harm in the matter. To get a conversation started on the issue at one's local church, interested parishioners should address the problem as a component of public safety. Of course, this is much easier after one of these incidents when the danger about which one warns is obvious for all but the most closed-minded to see. However, one should avoid details on firearms themselves until those involved including the minister have taken the matter to the point at which plans are being considered if not actually made. As well, a "guns-only" approach can be too narrow a response because threats come in many forms and good security protocols have to be both simple enough to carry out and diverse enough to handle any situation that may arise.

In these matters, anyone who considers bringing the subject up must first contact the minister and such members who represent

the lay governing board of the community. Of course, more structured and traditional religious bodies like Roman Catholics, Methodists, Episcopalians and other large groups are a very different matter as these require the "blessing" of a person and/or group outside of the local parish. With small Protestant groups, the perceived "leader" of the program must be prepared to be the facilitator and educator as pastors are usually too busy to get involved in the day to day running of such programs. One can be a pacifist but to ignore the threat of a violent intruder is not pacifism, it is suicide. There are many subjects involved in this type of program such as de-escalation training, nonlethal resistance and lockdown procedures that can also be addressed. Overcoming inertia and resistance takes time, patience, understanding, awareness and, most important pertinent information about the gravity of the situation for today we must also deal with the ongoing fear that is smothering our culture and making a strong response to threats very difficult to create and/or encourage. Initiating and distributing a newsletter about church crime in general can raise awareness. Also, it can demonstrate that people do not need to be "victims" if they have in place a planned response to threatened violence. The subject has been gaining much needed attention around the country as our local governments continue to fail to respond to violent crimes within our cities and neighborhoods thus further putting our churches in danger.

Toxic CDC Focus Treating Gun Ownership As A Disease: There are only two realities with respect to guns. One respects them or one disrespects them – at least in the hands of ordinary citizens. The urban, supposedly urbane bunch in Guvmint just sees people of color shooting each other and extrapolates from that situation that all guns in the hands of blacks are, in a strange way, "good." Why? Because the ongoing slaughter can be blamed on whites as the culture is basically both violent and white. The hapless and helpless "minorities" are merely "aping" eeeevil whites in their innocent apelike ways. In this

factually odd scenario, gun violence is portrayed as a symptom of this “white-caused” “disease” for which no cures are ever found though the phenomenon is studied endlessly. The result is that “crime” – especially minority crime! – is considered and treated by the “criminal justice system” as a public health issue and increasingly “diagnosed” as “white caused!” Of course, the outcome of this “diagnosis” results in minority criminals being released willy-nilly by wokesters within the system before serving any meaningful time – or even any time at all!

As well, minorities having to atone for crime is passé as they say, a leftover from our racist past. This results in the belief that those who use guns as an essential tool for survival rather than crime: self-defense, hunting, sports activities and keeping the dark criminal leviathan at bay, are spreaders of a COVID-type virus; that is, white culture and whites are a deadly pandemic on the body politic. Thus, according to these “cultural doctors,” the use of guns in criminal activities can be lowered by the establishment forcefully maintaining a high level of morals and general ethics promoted by legal directives aimed mainly at whites.

Of course, criminal violence also includes the use of many weapons other than firearms. Knives, fists and other blunt instruments inflict harm far more often than do guns and although firearms were used in about 74% of the homicides committed in 2019, that figure comprises less than 9% of the violent crimes committed in America. Indeed, the vast majority of violent offenses including robberies, rapes and assaults almost always involve either weapons other than guns or no weapons at all. Therefore, “outlawing guns” – that is making a special law to prevent the use of one particular “weapon – is just one more (and worse) encroachment on our liberties. Parenthetically, the actual incidence of the use of guns by whites in criminal activity is not only quite low but it appears uniform in any majority white culture whether it be in



the US, Canada or Europe so there is nothing inherently problematic about a country having a white heritage vis a vis gun violence. This means that the “racial aspect” of the matter makes a huge difference in the situation. However, there cannot be special laws covering every facet of human activity. That would result in total slavery! Statistically, from the years 2011 through 2013, gun-related deaths were identified according to race thusly:

Whites: approximately 80% of gun deaths were the result of suicide.

Blacks: over 80% of gun deaths were the result of homicide and that did not include blacks killed by the police.

Having decided that the best way to deal with guns is by making them into a “pandemic” like COVID, the CDC is hellbent on wasting yet more taxpayer money on new research on “gun violence.” Studies on this subject have already been conducted numerous times with a vast duplication of effort and profligate spending by different sources, none of which resulted in any actionable or definitive solution since they are not only directed at an imaginary problem but contain a desired result that is simply too unbelievable to be put forth for public consumption – even today. For instance, in 2016 media mogul Mike Bloomberg gifted \$300 million to the “Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health” to address issues including “gun violence” as a “target category.” In 2015, California established the “Anti-Gun Firearm Violence Research Center” at the University of California using \$5 million of public money. In 2019 clueless Governor Newsom added another \$3.85 million to this dead-end endeavor, a true example of the liberal belief that an effort is as good as a solution. New Jersey has its own “Gun Violence Research Center” at Rutgers University funded by \$2 million. Lawmakers in Hawaii are agitating to create their own anti-gun research center in the Aloha State and in 2020, the CDC issued more than \$8 million

in funding to cover 18(!) firearms-related research grants, with the quiet understanding that its only implied purpose was the justification of gun control! A \$650,000 award to Brown University has been made for a similar purpose. Not to be left out of the leftist largesse, a \$600,000 award was made to the University of South Alabama for development of "novel" strategies for introducing gun control measures. A \$350,000 award was made to Baylor University in 2019 for a similar purpose. The NIH has joined the spending spree issuing \$8.5 million in 2020 and another \$14.3 million in 2021 for research on "violence perpetrated with firearms." Of course, what is understood if not stated is that the "problematic" firearms are in the hands of decent, law-abiding citizens rather than the arsenal held by terrorist groups, drug cartels and liberal-supported "minority organizations." With no money at all, the average American can easily determine that gun violence and death would shrink to near nil by removing these groups from the culture rather than the guns themselves.

There seems to be an epidemic of establishing anti-gun violence research centers and blowing money on anti-gun research all over the map not to arrive at any useful conclusions but to justify what is unjustifiable: disarming American citizens. It is apparent that all these expenditures have not produced any worthy results, at least so far, as the naughty people of color continue to kill each other and us with handguns at increasing "clips." But then, that particular "gun violence" was never the problem. The problem was you and me and our refusal to become victims to government gun violence.

The Second Amendment Defines America: A state legislator in Texas recently introduced a bill that would require homeowners to to retreat and/or evacuate their homes in the face of an armed home invasion. The reason for this idiocy was, the politician assured us, "so that nobody would be hurt." This bleeding heart idiot would not have us bleed under any

circumstances or, more to the point, it is infinitely more important that the violent criminal not be injured as he might be a protected minority. It's a bet that Beto O'Rourke must be braying over that. If someone invades their home, they should flee – if that is indeed even possible! – and allow themselves to be fleeced or forced out, says the supposed defender of people's rights. If such a proposition were raised only 30 years ago, the advocate would be ridden out of town on a rail or thrown out on his tail. With the US succumbing to far left lunacy, such outlandish talk is no longer considered ludicrous. To worry that a criminal invader could be hurt by a resident exercising his second Amendment prerogatives shows more concern for the criminal than the innocent victim.

Unfortunately, Texas seems to be one of “many states” with “retreat to the wall” legislation requiring homeowners to retreat but not necessarily to evacuate their homes in such a scenario. I guess the victims are expected to watch the criminal do his thing and enjoy being robbed and even physically abused. Homeowners in these states might as well not acquire guns or defensive weapons since criminals will take offense at them – and then take them – the guns – to be used in other home invasions. The gun controllers have apparently won the day in these places at least figuratively, without a shot being fired.

Other states “allow” the homeowner to stand his ground and do not require retreating or evacuating – but it is not the place of the state to dictate circumstances in such cases. It is a God-given, constitutionally defended right to protect one's person and property. Here again, these states allow homeowners to stand and defend using whatever reasonable force might be necessary, but what is “reasonable” when white is always wrong and nonwhite always right?

This is a nebulous concept and one can't expect homeowners to be legal beagles or to make completely rational decisions when their lives may well be at stake. Let us remember the case in

a very, very blue Northwestern state in which a pair of armed Hispanics had “cased” a home containing a working father and his nine year old daughter. These beasts had determined to wait for the father to leave for work before breaking in and doing unspeakable things to the child before killing her and robbing the home. One morning after Dad left, they put their plan into effect. The child heard them break in and retreated upstairs to her bedroom. The men taunted her about what they were going to do to her and advising that she “had no place to run.” With that threat, the girl came out of her room with her rifle – she was a champion skeet shooter! – killed the first man and wounding the second so badly that he died in the street after running from the house he believed would provide him with sexual “jollies” and lots of loot! Of course, had the shooter been an adult white – even a woman – charges might have been made by the loony libs, but a nine year old child – white or not! – was too big a hurdle even for them!

The Second Amendment grew out of the knowledge that an unarmed populace of any race is a target for tyrants. All government pogroms and mass murders were committed on an unarmed populace. One wonders if Australia would have been so willing to attack its own people during the COVID lockdowns had they not been disarmed in 1996! America’s Founders were very much against a disarmed populace. They had seen the results of British tyranny when the people were armed! The libbers are deliberate know-nothings on this and any other important matter when it comes to anything that does not support their agenda. They are also unaware or, more to the point, don’t care that guns save about fifteen times as many lives as they take. They will not be shaken in any way from their unreality by statistics showing the benefits of gun ownership.

However, it is necessary to remember, that liberals are very much in favor of force but that force must be government run. An armed public is a great deterrent to the use of such force. Below are just a very few statements on the matter of armed

citizens made by some of our Founders but let's start with the definition of a "militia." Many gun-control advocates say that the requisite for a well-armed militia refers to a standing army rather than individual citizens and therefore, there is nothing in the Constitution that requires that individual citizens be armed. This was addressed by one of the founding patriots, George Mason who said: "I ask who are the militia? They consist now of the whole people, except a few public officers."

In other words, no mention is made here of an established military but of "the whole people," a definition that requires no further explanation. As to the rest, these are but a very few comments on this all important matter:

"A free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined..." – Washington

"No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms." – Jefferson

"What country can preserve its liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance. Let them take arms." – Jefferson

"The laws that forbid the carrying of arms . . . disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes . . . Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man." – Jefferson

"The Constitution of most of our states (and of the United States) assert that all power is inherent in the people; that they may exercise it by themselves; that it is their right and duty to be at all times armed." – Jefferson

"To disarm the people...[i]s the most effectual way to

enslave them.”- George Mason

“Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed, as they are in almost every country in Europe. The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword; because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops.”- Noah Webster

Anglo-Saxon concepts once promoted by civilization’s bards are going by the boards including the concept that a person’s home is his castle, just another casualty of the “new normal.” One also hears other newfangled and purposefully mangled concepts such as: “property is not worth dying – or killing – for; the saving of a single life is worth any effort; people are more valuable than “things” and other “fatalistic aphorisms” that convey the concept that people should just surrender and let the perps have their way, come what may. Of course, if you get raped, brutalized or killed in these proceedings, so be it! The anti-gun folks don’t mind as most of them have armed guards to protect not only their persons, but their belongings! Yet these passive and pacifistic polemics help fuel the “defund the police” and other anti-gun campaigns because we are supposed to accept whatever comes our way from the Cancel Culture without complaint. As a result, we passively accept that our safety is being compromised by police resigning in droves because they are blamed for not treating blacks, the criminally inclined and habitual perps with the kid gloves and exaggerated deference that they have come to expect.

Law enforcement can be let go for not taking the job even when they have legitimate medical or religious objections and even when they cannot readily be replaced. Suddenly those who keep us safe are treated as “non-essential” workers and much of the public is apathetic over their loss. In a related if diametric vein, many police forces are underfunded and have antiquated equipment. As a result, they eagerly accept donations of military weaponry whose use results in “overkill” when

employed. The true irony arises here when the libbers and anti-gunners say we are supposed to rely on law enforcement and not our own devices while their own actions assure that law enforcement is legally hobbled and can't properly perform the functions on which we are supposed to depend. Law enforcement personnel can't – and never could! – be everywhere at once and so we must be able to protect ourselves when the occasion arises that they are not available to assist us.

One of the many benefits of choosing to live in a social setting or “society” is the protection offered by that society! Since the time that man lived with his fellow man in caves so as to provide all with the protection of the many, this has heretofore been a given. Frankly, if all we gain from a “society” are armed enemies against whom we have little or no protection, what is the point of having a society? There really isn't any and this is where we are today if we allow the critical theory anarchist promoters like Saul Alinsky to have their way. When you take this concept a step further, why protect a nation and the people in it from external enemies when our present far leftist government abandons our legitimate borders and allows anyone and everyone in? When a nation has adopted such madness, it is the end of that nation and paves the way for the New World Order to be fully – and finally – established. Think about it!

© 2022 Sidney Secular – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Sidney Secular: [Success\\_Express@yahoo.com](mailto:Success_Express@yahoo.com)