

THE BULLET

DONATIONS ACCEPTED

Official Publication of Western Missouri Shooters Alliance

July 2019

Mental Health Restrictions Are a Dangerous Gun Control Smokescreen

By José Niño

Cries for gun control have reached deafening levels since the Stoneman Douglas High School shooting in Parkland, Florida.

Exploiting the tragedy that left 17 people dead, gun control advocates are using every means possible to ram gun control measures across legislatures nationwide.

One avenue that gun control proponents have pursued is the advancement of legislation containing mental health restrictions. Consequently, legislators at both the federal and state level have recently proposed extensive background checks and mental health screening processes to ensure that guns don't fall into the hands of the mentally unstable.

For many gun control proponents, the current National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) is simply not enough and must be vastly expanded.

Even if we took these assumptions at face value, one must first ask the following question: Are the mentally ill actually more prone to committing acts of violence?

In a 2016 study, "Mental illness and reduction of gun violence and suicide," estimates indicate that only 4 percent of violence is associated with mental illness alone. Moreover, in the book *Gun Violence and Mental Illness*, authors Liza H. Gold and Robert I. Simon highlight how the mentally ill are actually more likely to be victims of gun violence instead of being perpetrators.

Despite evidence to the contrary, why do gun control proponents insist on using mental health as a pretext to usher in gun control?

The reality is that gun controllers have encountered numerous roadblocks over the past few decades in their attempts to restrict, if not completely ban, gun ownership in the United States. From gun buyback programs, to mandatory trigger locks and gun taxes, gun control advocates have thrown everything but the kitchen sink into their relentless quest to put the clamps on gun ownership. Now, the gun control crowd may have found a new tactic that might actually stick.

But what makes the mental health strategy particularly appealing to gun controllers?

Economist Ludwig von Mises shed light on the appeals to psychiatry as a means to discredit and quell dissenting views in *Human Action*: The Soviets understood this dynamic and added it to their tyrannical playbook.

In order to crush dissenting views, Soviet authorities deemed any individual that who strayed away from orthodoxy to be mentally unfit. As a result, countless opposition figures were incarcerated or forced to go through psychiatric treatments on the grounds of mental illness. Mental illness not only served as a convenient pretext for authoritarians to use state coercion against individuals they see as a threat, but it also gives them another tool that facilitates their consolidation of power over every nook and cranny of civil society.

The Soviet Union may be long gone, but the specter of its tyrannical tactics still reside among aspiring demagogues in the West. The weaponization of psychiatry and other medical venues against gun owners could be a reality in America if the gun control crowd has its way.

With the support of powerful organizations like the American Medical Association (AMA), which has publicly stated that gun violence is a "public health crisis," gun control advocates can count on a reliable ally to expand their reach. Historically speaking, the AMA has a proven track record of repeatedly favoring top-down solutions to solve whatever perceived "crises" they face. There's no telling what an unholy alliance of this sort is capable of if it successfully gains control of the levers of state power — the ability to turn doctor's offices into de facto gun control enforcement agencies or have sensitive medical information at the federal government's disposal could be all fair game if mental health focused gun control is passed.

Regardless of whether or not mental health is the main driver behind mass shootings, no government has the right to pre-emptively strip any individual who hasn't committed a crime of their right to self-defense.

If certain firearms vendors want to screen potential buyers for mental disorders, or a medical provider would like to inquire about a patient's guns on a voluntary basis, they are within their right to do so. However, enterprises that engage in the restriction of firearms sales may find their actions to be unprofitable from a business standpoint.

Ultimately, the fixation on mental health in the wake of mass shootings overlooks the main causes of these shootings — the presence of gun-free zones and the lack of market incentives to provide adequate security services in schools across the country.

If passed, new mental health provisions could open up the floodgates for further interventions and possibly bar an unprecedented number of law-abiding citizens from owning guns. Policymakers and pundits alike should stop falling for the mental health smokescreen, and start striking at the root of the problem — gun

MENTAL (Continued on page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE

EVENTS PAGE 2

LIBERTY NOTES PAGE 3

PRESIDENT'S CORNER PAGE 5



...dedicated to the restoration of the inalienable right to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment

The Alliance is a regionally-based, grass-roots organization that seeks to:

1. **Counter the designs of malicious legislators.**
2. **Confront the media's twisted portrayals of gun rights issues.**
3. **Politicize and activate gun owners in defense of their rights.**
4. **Acquaint the public with the true nature of the Second Amendment.**
5. **Network with other pro-gun groups to coordinate local, state and national strategies.**
6. **Train people in basic firearm safety and handgun defense.**
7. **Sponsor and support pro-gun legislation**
8. **Make politicians aware that gun owners are awakening from their accustomed apathy and**
WILL TOLERATE NO FURTHER EROSION OF THEIR FREEDOMS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS:

Kevin Jamison, President
 Carl Smart, V-P
 Bill Bland, Recording Sec. & Membership Coordinator
 Bob Hanson, Treasurer

BOARD MEMBERS:

John Kurtz, Board Member
 Open , Board Member
 Eric Burger, Board Member
 Roger Thomas, Board Member
 Gary Davis, Board Member & Newsletter Coordinator

EX-OFFICIO:

Richard Hime, Corporate Secretary
 Bill Shelley, Gun Show Director
 Paul Allen, Gun Show Coordinator

CONTACT:

- Business correspondence - WMSA, P O Box 11144, Kansas City, MO 64119
- Editorial correspondence - E-mail to: Bob.WMSA@gmail.com
- WMSA Hotline/Fax - (877) 333-WMSA (9672)
- Web page - www.wmsa.net



DISCLAIMERS:

The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Board of Directors, Officers or the Western Missouri Shooters Alliance.

The writer, editor and others contributing to this publication are neither engaging in terrorist conspiracy nor advocating acts of violence against the government of the United States. Statements are presented to stimulate political discussion in real or hypothetical contexts pursued in the spirit of free inquiry.

All material contained herein is copyright © 2019 WMSA and **may** be reprinted unless otherwise specified, with attribution to this publication, author, and date of issue.

COMING EVENTS

•••

WMSA

General Membership Meeting

7:00 PM

July 23, 2019

Sept. 24, 2019

Nov. 26, 2019

Bass Pro Conservation Room
 Independence, MO

•••

MVACA

Missouri Valley Arms Collectors Assn.

July 27-28, 2019

KCI Expo Center
 Kansas City, MO

••

R. K. Shows

KCI Expo Center

August 17-18, 2019

October 26-27, 2019

Dec. 21-22, 2019

•••

WANENMACHER'S

TULSA ARMS SHOW

EXPO CENTER-EXPO SQUARE

(TULSA FAIRGROUNDS)

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

Nov. 9-10, 2019

•••

American Legion Gun & Knife Show

Sept. 28-29, 2019

16701 E. 40 Highway

Independence, MO

•••

Call 877-333-WMSA or check the web site
www.wmsa.net



MENTAL (Continued from page 1)

control— when it comes to solving mass shootings in the United States.

Reprinted with permission from *Gunpowder Magazine*

LIBERTY NOTES

By Kevin L. Jamison

It is a good day for Liberty.

A company called “True Velocity” has come out with ammunition with plastic cases instead of brass. They say this creates a 30% weight reduction. They offer 5.56, 7.62 NATO, .338, .50 BMG and 12.7 (Russian equivalent of our .50 BMG). They say they are serving the international market at this time but I saw their ad in a gun magazine and they say they want to expand to the domestic market. I don’t know if it is reloadable. It would seem to be recyclable. Other companies have offered plastic ammunition cased ammunition in the past but not for very long. True Velocity uses white plastic for their cases. Perhaps if they used camouflage colors.

The current issue of the NRA’s “First Freedom” magazine features the evils and the problem of so-called “Red Flag” laws. These laws allow any person to report that someone is dangerous. After this report this someone’s guns will be confiscated. There are several problems with such laws. They rely only on the word of a person and do not demand to know how this informer knows that the person is dangerous. They do not allow the victim of this report to know about the hearing; much less speak in his own defense. There are other problems but this is enough. There is a complete lack of due process of law. Perhaps this issue of the magazine will put to rest the canard that the NRA supports such laws.

I hear that the usual suspects are bragging that they stopped all pro-gun bills in the Missouri Legislature this last session. Of course, not one of their bills got so much as a hearing. They are putting their spin on it. The legislature may be nervous about offending either group. We have to show that we can be better friends than they can.

A convenience store clerk in Oregon was assaulted by a robber with a hatchet. The clerk showed him his pistol. The robber dropped the hatchet, apologized profusely, abjectly and submissively; and ran. No shots fired. His employer fired him because it has a “zero tolerance” for weapons. This is something they should have discussed with the robber. If the robber had killed the clerk what would they have told the clerk’s family? “At least we have a zero tolerance for weapons?”

Zero tolerance is for organizations that find thinking is just too hard.

I have listened to an audiobook “The Trial of Lizzie Borden.” This is the lady who is said to have “given her mother 40 whacks, and when she saw what she had done, she gave her father 41.” There was evidence for and against her. Her initial stories were inconsistent. This is why we have the right to remain silent. Some of her comments did not seem likely to the police. They could not believe that a woman would stop ironing handkerchiefs and go into the barn looking for a bit of metal to use as a sinker in an upcoming fishing trip. This put her out of the house when the father’s murder occurred. There were witnesses that said she had been in the barn. Unfortunately, they did not speak good English and the prosecutor used the American translation method of talking slower and louder. This did not work. The best evidence in her favor was that there was no blood on her body or hair. There was a speck on her slip but that was attributed to menstrual blood. An axe attack on two persons would have left the killer drenched in blood. The scene was locked down and searched within the capabilities of 1891. The day after the murders Lizzie burned a dress that had been damaged with paint. There were witnesses. Everyone seems to accept that it was damaged with paint, not blood. But it was suspicious. It led people to wonder if there was blood among the paint. It did not appear among the inventory of dresses made by the police on the day of the murders. Things done in the aftermath of a shooting may get one convicted; especially if it smacks of destroying evidence. There were multiple hatchets in the home. None seemed to be covered with blood, although one was the right size. Lizzie was acquitted. Her lawyer’s closing statement claimed that evidence of her innocence, and the real killer would have been found, if the police had done a better job. He told the jury that “one does not find the greatest ability inside a policeman’s coat.” I would never make such a statement. This is partly because it would not go over well with local juries, but mostly because I do not enjoy being struck with nightsticks. There are people who enjoy being struck with nightsticks. I know this because there are so many persons who provoke such attention.

I listened to an audiobook called “The curse of Oak Island.” Driving between courthouses it is the only productive use of my time. The book is part of the TV series, “The Curse of Oak Island.” In 1775 some boys found evidence that something had been buried on Oak Island off Nova Scotia Canada. Their minds went to pirate treasure and the digging began. For the next two hundred and twenty-years various concerns dug. The problem was that their excavations kept flooding. They tried to pump them out but eventually found they were flooded with sea water. They brought in bigger pumps to see if they could pump out faster than the ocean could pour in; with predictable results. After all, they were pumping water back out into the ocean. It is strange that they kept digging but only made intermediate at-

LIBERTY (Continued on page 4)



LIBERTY (Continued from page 3)

tempts to find out how this water was coming in. But the usual suspects keep imposing gun control and keep failing. They keep continuing under the delusion that if they pump hard enough they will succeed.

The original excavation is a stunning engineering feat. The question is who did it? The book goes into great detail over various theories. It even goes into the dispute over who wrote Shakespeare's plays. There is a theory that lost Shakespeare plays are in the tunnels. Who built the system and what is down there is just guesswork until they find a way to keep the ocean out of the digs. People like to make up stories and this is a great one.

Amy Dickenson is a syndicated advice columnist. In a recent column she printed a letter from a father whose adult daughter has moved back in with him. He is "Dumfounded" that his adult daughter has a gun. He does not feel safe and locks his bedroom door because he doesn't know what she might do. The gun is a "criminal gun" on the strength of being a .40 and she has hollow point bullets. Ms. Dickenson increases his paranoia, claiming that her research shows that hollowpoints are illegal in 11 states. This is untrue. Only New Jersey and San Francisco largely ban them. She implies that the daughter may be involved in criminal activity. She urges the man to kick his daughter out of the house. Some think that the letter was invented for her to spread her disinformation. This is what we are faced with lies and prejudices masquerading as proof. We can respond with the truth. Women have protected themselves and their children. A personal touch is always better.

The principal of Compass Elementary School in Platte County Missouri responded to a tweet by anti-gun activist David Hogg with photos of people shooting guns. He was suspended for this act of free speech. I do not know the context of the initial tweet or the photos in response. It seems like one of the "zero tolerance" things.

Rally Day has been changed to 7 April, 2020 still in the Capital Building in Jefferson City.
We shall overcome.

Lawmakers Reintroduce Bill to Bankrupt Gun Manufacturers, Dealers

One of the primary goals of anti-gunners is to bankrupt the gun industry by repealing the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA). Rep. Adam Schiff (D-CA) and Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) reintroduced legislation this week that would do just that.

Rep. Schiff and Sen. Blumenthal call their bill the, "Access to Justice for Victims of Gun Violence Act," and say it allows victims to have "their day in court."

"Our simple measure will give victims of gun violence their day in court and unlock the doors to justice —repealing the sweetheart deal that Congress granted to the gun lobby," said Sen. Blumenthal, referring to the PLCAA which was enacted in 2005.

Rep. Schiff, added, "This bill would pierce the gun industry's liability shield by putting an end to the special protections the gun industry receives when they shirk their fundamental responsibility to act with reasonable care for the public safety. Victims of gun violence deserve their day in court."

Schiff and Blumenthal are grossly mischaracterizing the purpose of PLCAA. It does NOT protect members of the gun industry from product liability suits for manufacturing or design defects or certain types of negligent conduct. It merely prohibits lawsuits against gun makers for damages resulting from the third-party criminal misuse of their firearms.

The PLCAA is common sense. So much so that even Comrade Bernie Sanders gets it. While debating Hillary Clinton in Flint Michigan in 2016, the Bern-Man explained why he voted for the PLCAA more than a decade ago.

"If I understand it, and correct me if I'm wrong, if you go to a gun store and you legally purchase a gun, and then three days later you go out and start killing people, is the point of this lawsuit to hold the gun shop owner or the manufacturer of that gun liable?" Sanders asked.

"If that is the point, I have to tell you I disagree. I disagree because you hold people in terms of this liability thing where you hold manufacturer's liable is if they understand that they are selling guns in an area getting into the hands of criminals, of course they should be held liable," Sanders continued.

Sanders went on to say that if gun makers and dealers are going to be held accountable for the rogue actions of killers then "what you are really talking about is ending gun manufacturing in America."

Bingo. That's exactly what the goal is. Ending gun manufacturing in America.

LAFAYETTE GUN CLUB,
Higginsville, MO

IHMSA—USPSA/IPSC—SASS
Sporting Clays
Match & Membership info
www.lgconline.org

KEVIN L. JAMISON
Attorney at Law



2614 NE 56th Terrace
GLADSTONE, MO 64119
KLJamisonLaw.com
KLJamisonLaw@earthlink.net

OFFICE: 816-455-2669
RES: 816-453-2376
FAX: 816-413-0696



PRESIDENT'S CORNER

WERE ARE WE?

K. L. Jamison

We have two new Supreme Court justices and many lower court judges who will shape the Second Amendment cases working through the courts. The Supremes will be hearing a case on an absurd New York City ordinance prohibiting persons from taking licensed guns out of the owner's home. It is excellent that the ordinance is absurd. This makes it more likely that the Court will find it unconstitutional and set a standard for reviewing gun laws under the Second Amendment. New York is desperately trying to sidetrack the case. It repealed the ordinance in an effort to make the case moot; without a controversy for the court to hear. That has not worked. This case looks good for our side.

When President Trump was elected, we expected some of the more obnoxious anti-gun regulations to be repealed. That has not happened. There was a massacre involving bump stocks and President Trump immediately announced his willingness to ban them. There has been a massacre involving suppressors and President Trump immediately announced that he did not like them. This does not even leave us room to negotiate a trade. While he has been slow to do something specific for us, all his opponents are anxious to do something against us. They will be quick to shred our rights. We have no choice except to re-elect him. When there is a choice between uncertainty and disaster, we must choose uncertainty. Given the stakes we must work hard for his re-election.

In Congress, there has been no action in our favor. There has been no action against us either. Congress has been busy investigating the president to no avail. There is every indication that they will continue spurious investigations until the election. The old saying is "Vilify vilify, some of it will stick."

At the state level the legislature ended its session and passed nothing in our favor. It passed nothing against us either. The usual suspects proclaim that they blocked all pro-gun legislation. We can brag that no anti-gun bill even got a hearing in committee. For the first time in many years the opposition has brought people to the capital to oppose our rights. The legislators may be waiting to see which side will be their best friend. The best news is that the legislators find the opposition abrasive. We have told our members to be excruciatingly polite. We should continue to work that way. The legislature is out of session until January. In that time, write to your legislator. Find out if he or she is term limited out in 2020. See how we can help them in the next election.

The governor of Missouri does not appear to have firmly declared himself either for or against us. He has not had a clear opportunity to do so.

Our devoted lobbyist will be retiring soon and we need to find someone with equal experience to take over. This will not be an easy task.

We have a healthy treasury due to the efforts of Treasurer Bob Hanson. We will need more to support candidates in 2020. We have hundreds of members to support candidates. We will need more.

Popular media presents anti-gun propaganda as facts. We can only respond with personal stories of guns used in self-defense. This is tricky. If a person becomes known as the guy whose only topic of conversation is gun; other people stop listening. I know.

This is where we are in June, 2019.

I thank-you for the honor of being your president.

The Second Amendment Tech Threat

Another Silicon Valley company virtue signals its anti-American agenda.

Salesforce, the San Francisco-based business software company, has been working behind the scenes to pressure retailers to stop selling "military-style" firearms — or stop using their software. The Washington Post reports, "The pressure Salesforce is exerting on those retailers — barring them from using its technology to market products, manage customer service operations and fulfill orders — puts them in a difficult position. Camping World, for example, spends more than \$1 million a year on Salesforce's e-commerce software, according to one analyst estimate. Switching to another provider now could cost the company double that to migrate data, reconfigure systems and retrain employees."

Mark Oliva, Second Amendment advocate and public-affairs director of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, called Salesforce's anti-firearm ultimatum a "corporate-policy virtue signal" that discriminates against gun owners. "It is a very chilling effect when a company as large as Salesforce puts out a policy like this," Oliva stated. Then again, he added, "A policy like this is not surprising from a company based in that part of the country."

Salesforce's new policy bars customers from using their software to sell semiautomatic firearms, "magazines capable of accepting more than 10 rounds," and "multi-burst trigger devices."

This kind of corporate crackdown is a growing problem that clearly threatens First and Second Amendment rights. That companies may now begin dictating how their products are to be used *after* having been lawfully purchased introduces a slippery slope that goes far beyond the selling of firearms. For example, it isn't hard to imagine a company dictating what types of beverages a retailer can sell using its software product. Like Citibank and Dick's Sporting Goods before it, Salesforce has fired just the latest salvo in a new era of "progressive" business discrimination.



Trump Administration, Other Pro-Gun Heavyweights Lend Support on Pending Supreme Court Case

As NRA-ILA Executive Director Chris W. Cox reported in March, the U.S. Supreme Court has taken up a challenge by an NRA state affiliate to a New York City gun control scheme that effectively prohibits lawfully licensed handgun owners from leaving the city with their own firearms. The plaintiffs in the case have raised a number of objections to the regime, the foremost of which is that it violates the Second Amendment. The case is *New York State Rifle and Pistol Association v. New York City*.

Given the uniquely oppressive and bizarre nature of the challenged restrictions, many observers believe the real question in the case isn't whether New York City will lose but on what grounds and how badly. The City itself, in fact, recently made a desperate attempt to avoid a ruling on its laws by claiming to the court that it was in the process of revising the regulations to address the issues raised in the case. The court rejected that gambit, and proceedings in the case have continued, with a number of stakeholders filing friend of the court (*amicus curiae*) briefs this week to help inform the justices' deliberations.

Chief among them was none other than the Trump administration, with the Department of Justice (DOJ) filing a brief in support of the plaintiffs. The DOJ offered two possible bases for finding New York City's regulations unconstitutional, including that the "transport ban infringes the right to keep and bear arms guaranteed by the Second and Fourteenth Amendments."

The government's brief offers the most detailed account to date of how the Trump administration views the Second Amendment. Critically, it makes clear that the Second Amendment does not end at the property line of one's own home.

"The Second Amendment guarantees both the right to 'keep' and the right to 'bear' firearms," the brief states. "Read naturally, the right to 'bear' firearms includes the right to transport firearms outside the home; otherwise, the right to 'bear' would add nothing to the right to 'keep.'"

The administration also seeks to establish a method for resolving future cases that is faithful to the Supreme Court's opinion in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, which has been largely ignored by lower courts. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals decision being challenged in the New York City case, like many other lower court Second Amendment decisions before it, used a judicial balancing test that *Heller* specifically rejected to uphold the disputed gun control measures.

The government's brief, on the other hand, urges the court to "look first to the text of the Second Amendment, the history of the right to keep and bear arms before ratification, and the tradition of gun regulation after ratification" to judge the validity of a gun control law.

Applying this test to New York City's travel ban, it states:

Few laws in the history of our Nation, or even in contemporary times, have come close to such a sweeping prohibition on the transportation of arms. And on some of the rare occasions in the 19th and 20th centuries when state and local governments have adopted such prohibitions, state courts have struck them down. That is enough to establish that the transport ban is unconstitutional.

Also filing in support of the plaintiffs was a coalition of pro-gun states led by Louisiana and including Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia. Like the DOJ's brief, the states' brief urges the Supreme Court to use text, history, and tradition to find that New York City's travel ban violates the Second and Fourteenth Amendment.

Alternatively, the states' brief argues, if the court should adopt the Second Circuit's approach to applying a tiered level of scrutiny, it should subject the law to a rigorously applied heightened scrutiny. "New York City could not possibly meet such scrutiny here," the brief concludes.

One hundred and twenty pro-gun members of Congress, led by Bradley Byrne (R-Ala.), urged the court to rule in favor of the plaintiffs as well. Emphasizing that "[t]he Second Amendment enshrines the fundamental right of citizens to protect themselves from violence and tyranny," the congressional brief joined the chorus criticizing the dismissive treatment the Second Amendment has received in the lower courts.

"This case," according to that brief, "is a quintessential example of how courts of appeals have treated the right to keep and bear arms as a second-class right by not reviewing regulations infringing on the right with any meaningful scrutiny." It then argues that whether the court applies text, history, or tradition or a suitably stringent level of scrutiny, the challenged New York City regime must fail.

The NRA weighed in on the case with an *amicus* brief of our own. That brief amplifies the arguments of the government, the states, and the pro-gun members of Congress. It points out that "[i]n the decade since [*Heller*] was handed down, most lower federal courts have openly flouted [the Supreme Court's] instructions" on how to resolve Second Amendment cases.

It goes on to state that "because Respondents' transport ban restricts both the right to keep and to bear arms, and because it is unsupported by any even remotely analogous restriction historically accepted by the People as consistent with the Second Amendment, this Court should strike it down categorically, like in *Heller*, without resorting to the interest-balancing 'tiers of scrutiny.'"

Tellingly, even certain well-known gun control groups – including the Giffords Law Center and the Brady Cam-

COURT CASE (Continued on page 7)



COURT CASE (Continued from page 6)

paign – filed briefs that made no attempt to argue that New York City’s travel ban survives Second Amendment scrutiny. Rather, their briefs merely urge the court to rule narrowly in the case and in a way that preserves ample leeway for states and localities to continue to regulate firearms.

This case illustrates what the legacy media and other anti-gun interests are hoping gun owners ignore: that the election of President Trump, his appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the work of the National Rifle Association all continue to play a vital role in preserving the right to keep and bear arms.

Supreme Court Denies Case Regarding ‘Illegal’ Suppressors

Suppressors and short barreled rifles are regulated by the National Firearms Act of 1934. However, for Kansas State residents, they are allowed by the Kansas Second Amendment Protection Act of 2013. Shane Cox and Jeremy Kettler thought that law allowed them to make, sell, and own suppressors, but the ATF said otherwise.

The Supreme Court decided against hearing petitions from men prosecuted for the illegal manufacture and purchase of suppressors in Kansas. Shane Cox manufactured and sold suppressors from his Army/Navy Surplus store.

Jeremy Kettler, an honorably discharged veteran, bought suppressors from Cox and posted videos of their use on Facebook, which eventually led to the ATF charging both Kettler and Cox with violations of the National Firearms Act of 1934.

Cox and Kettler both claimed that they had not violated the law because the Kansas Second Amendment Protection Act of 2013 specifically says that suppressors are legal to manufacture, sell, and own as long as they are kept within the state of Kansas. Cox kept a copy of the Kansas Act on display with the suppressors he sold. Kettler and Cox claimed that their “reasonable reliance on the Kansas Second Amendment Protection Act rendered the federal prosecution unjust,” as stated in Cox’s petition to the Supreme Court. But the Tenth District Court said they couldn’t rely on that state law to supersede federal law, and continually instructed the jury to disregard the state law.

The two also claimed that this was a violation of their 2nd Amendment rights, but the Tenth District Court said that didn’t apply because suppressors are not firearms and are not covered by the 2nd Amendment.

In the end, Kettler, the buyer, was sentenced with one year of probation while Cox, the manufacturer/seller, was sentenced with two years of probation in 2016.

Their petitions to the Supreme Court in January 2019 would have challenged the constitutionality of the National Firearms Act, enacted 85 years ago, which taxes the sale of suppressors and heavily restricts their distribution and ownership. The petitioners claim the NFA is outdated and no longer reflects the current needs of the country.

The Supreme Court decided against hearing their cases on Monday, June 10th. The Court did not offer comment or dissent on their reasons. This comes less than two weeks after a suppressed handgun was used in the shooting of 12 city employees by a coworker in Virginia Beach, VA on May 31st. The Trump administration advised the Court not to hear the cases.

Dems Continue to Display Firearm Ignorance

Harris and Booker level false claims in their ongoing crusade against guns.

One would think that if politicians wanted to be taken seriously on a given issue, they would take the time to educate themselves before making policy recommendations. But who are we kidding? These are Democrat presidential candidates we’re talking about.

Recently, presidential hopeful Kamala Harris has taken her anti-gun message on the campaign trail, where she has been offering her own fallacious definition of an “[assault weapon](#).” She opined, “When we look at the issue of assault weapons, let’s be very clear: Assault weapons are designed to kill a lot of people in a very short period of time. We cannot any longer afford to allow people to make this a partisan issue.” Well, if Harris were serious about not making the right to bear arms a partisan issue, then she would stop talking about it in partisan terms. But we digress. She continued, “Those guns, those assault weapons, do not discriminate and determine, ‘OK, is the person pointing it at a Democrat or a Republican?’ This can no longer be a partisan issue.”

Once again, for Harris’s benefit, a firearm cannot do anything of its own accord. It has no volition. It is merely a tool designed to be fully directed by the user, a human being who points it in whatever direction he or she chooses. All intention and responsibility lie with the individual wielding the firearm. “Assault” weapons are a misnomer, as no firearm has ever assaulted anyone.

Equating if not surpassing Harris’s foolish statement is Sen. Cory Booker (D-NJ), who in touting his anti-gun agenda made the nonsensical claim that “nowadays there is more regulation over toy guns than real ones.” This statement was so ridiculous that even the leftist Washington Post called Booker’s claims false, giving him three Pinocchios for the lie. Nevertheless, he also asserted, “Gun manufacturers have little incentive to make their products safer.” Not to worry, though; he “will work to close this loophole in federal oversight.” He’s dead wrong, of course, but when did that ever stop a Democrat from grandstanding about guns? Or anything else?



Washington State Wants To Snatch Guns For Wrong Think

The idea behind Extreme Risk Protective Orders, otherwise known as “Red Flag Orders” is that they can be used to disarm those considered to be a threat to themselves or others. That first bit is there so they can be justified under mental health grounds as proponents figure they can count those potential uses as wins to pad their statistics somewhere down the road.

But the idea of taking guns from people who may be a threat is a tempting proposition.

However, in Washington state, legislators are taking that concept and considering a proposal which would take it in a very different direction. Of course, The Trace loves the idea.

Now, the state wants to use ERPOs for more gun owners who, like the man who went to Northwest Hospital in early April, and threatened to commit hate-fueled violence. Among a slew of gun violence prevention bills signed by Governor Jay Inslee in early May was an amendment to the current ERPO law that specifies that judges should consider whether a troubled gun owner has been convicted of “malicious harassment,” a category that includes behaviors like burning crosses and defacing property with swastikas. It’s the first hate-specific ERPO law in the country.

“Since the 2016 election, we’ve seen an enormous increase in hate-fueled animus,” said Marko Liias, the state senator who conceived of the reform. “If someone’s spewing hate and making threats in concrete ways, and law enforcement can detect that, we should encourage police to take action.”

First, that “increase in hate-fueled animus” is usually one of two things. The first is progressives who are lashing out at their ideological opponents at every opportunity. That includes shouting people out of restaurants, harassing people who are officials from the wrong political party, or things of that sort. The others are hoax “hate crimes” that almost always turn out to be false flag situations.

That’s not to say that there are no cases of racially motivated hate crimes out there. The Tree of Life Synagogue shooting is a prime example. The Chabad of Poway Synagogue shooting another.

However, as awful as those two shootings were, they’re still a minority of the supposed hate crimes out there. The vast majority either seem to come from the extreme *left* or are false flags. It’s that simple.

The problem with this new measure, however, is that it uses statutes that amount to thought crime to justify taking away someone’s Second Amendment rights.

White supremacists are filthy scumbags who try to intimidate people and lash out at folks of another race. White supremacist ideologies need to be purged from the world, but this isn’t how you do it.

If you’re going to have a law that says you can take a gun away from someone who represents a threat, then that’s all you need to consider. You don’t need to get into their personal beliefs and perhaps punish those who think in an unpopular manner. That’s all Washington state is looking to do.

Right now, it’s racism. The problem is that it always starts with something like that; something no one wants to defend. It doesn’t stay there, though. Next, it’ll be targeting someone else who is less than popular, maybe Christians who espouse negative opinions on gay marriage or transgenderism. Maybe it’ll be someone else. Who knows?

What I do know is that once you start targeting what people think, it becomes more and more likely that the groups of folks on the outs will continue to grow. Eventually, it will be folks like you and me.

New Federal Law Will Promote Target Range Development on Public Lands

On May 10, President Trump signed the Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act into law. This NRA-backed law will help promote firearm safety and training and enjoyment of the shooting sports by freeing up more federal funds for use in public shooting range development and construction.

Beginning in 1937 with the passage of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act – commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act (P-R Act) – federal excise taxes on firearms, ammunition, and archery equipment have been returned to the states to help promote wildlife conservation and restoration. Participating states must ensure that hunting license fees are used exclusively for the administration of the state’s fish and game department.

Fifty percent of the excise tax revenue from handguns, bows, and arrows may be used for hunter education programs and the development and operation of archery and firearm shooting ranges. Additionally, there is an \$8 million annual set-aside for firearm and bow hunter education and safety program grants within the states, which can also help fund ranges.

The P-R Act has been critical in preserving America’s hunting and sport-shooting heritage. State wildlife management programs have brought back species that in the early 1900s were in severe decline or on the brink of extinction, including white tailed deer, wild turkey, and wood ducks. Managed hunting, of course, plays a critical role in this responsible stewardship.

The Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act (S. 94/H.R. 1222) amended the P-R Act to provide states greater opportunities to use the P-R funds apportioned to them for public range development.

First, the Act reduces the states’ mandatory matching share for a range development project from 25% to 10% (a state, in other words, only needs to provide 10% of the funding, while P-R funds can provide up to 90%).

It also extends the time a state has to obligate and expend the funds for range development from two fiscal years to five fiscal years.

Finally, the Act provides a new revenue stream for funding range development. It will allow up to 10% of specified apportionments from the wildlife restoration account to be used for this purpose. These funds were formerly unavailable for range construction, maintenance, or expansion projects.



When Can I (Legally) Draw My Gun?

John Caile - 05/31/2019

One of the most critical decisions those of us who carry firearms will ever make is when to draw our guns to defend ourselves. That being the case, it's a good idea to consider some basic strategies before we find ourselves in a high-stress, chaotic scenario.

Every situation is different. For example, it's pretty easy to see why any individual might immediately go for his or her gun upon hearing angry voices, cursing and violent pounding on the front door.

But say you notice several young men merely standing near your car in a mall parking lot. In that case, pulling your gun simply because you think they are "scary-looking" is unlikely to meet the "reasonableness" standard. And remember that a jury will decide what is reasonable, not you.

Self-Defense Preparation Improves Your Odds

It's a good idea to regularly run through typical situations in your mind and consider the best way to deal with them. While you're walking through a parking lot, ask yourself, "What would I do if someone approached me in a threatening way right this minute?" You will find yourself looking around for things like escape routes and potential cover.

Note that this kind of mental preparation is precisely what Navy SEALs and other professionals such as SWAT teams do all the time. They prepare for as many potential scenarios as they can imagine, then practice their response. As a result, they can react quickly and decisively. OK, most of us aren't "Tier 1" operators, but we can certainly benefit from mental preparation.

What Would a Jury Say About You Drawing Your Firearm?

Let's look at the example of the "scary-looking" young men in the parking lot mentioned above. If instead of just standing there, they were to say or do something that any normal person would view as a serious threat, then the situation has escalated and pulling your gun may be seen as justified.

But even then, the details will matter. Juries will ask how close the young men were as well as what, exactly, they said to you. What other option did you have? Was there an easy way to move to safety?

Juries are notoriously reluctant to accept the use of deadly force in the first place. And even if your state has some version of "stand your ground" legislation on the books, if you could have easily gotten out of the situation instead of using deadly force, they will be less inclined to rule in your favor.

'Brandishing' or Justifiable Reaction With Your Gun to a Threat?

I remember the case of Robert Lawrence, an Air Force veteran who was hassled by three people in another vehicle. They screamed at him and threw a can of soda at his car at a stoplight. Instead of immediately calling 911, Lawrence drew his pistol and held it up so they could see it.

Wrong move.

The people who were harassing him did call 911, and Lawrence wound up being charged with aggravated assault. Luckily, his lawyer finally discovered another 911 tape. This led to a citizen who testified that he witnessed Lawrence being hassled and attacked. As a result, Lawrence was vindicated, but not before he had been put through hell (and a lot of legal expenses) for months.

Again, every situation is different. And unfortunately, you'll likely have only seconds to decide how to respond. But being prepared can help you make the right move.

About John Caile

John Caile, a contributing writer for USCCA's *Concealed Carry Magazine*, has more than 35 years of experience in concealed carry training and practical handgun shooting skills. As Communications Director for the Minnesota Gun Owners Political Action Committee, John was instrumental in passing Minnesota's landmark concealed carry permit law. Certified through the NRA as an instructor of Pistol, Rifle, Shotgun, Home Firearm Safety and Personal Protection in the Home, John continues his lifelong activism for gun owners and their rights in Palm Coast, Florida. He has appeared on national talk radio and network and public television and is frequently published in the press.

NEW CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

Thompson Plumbing

CERTIFIED MASTER PLUMBER
CERTIFIED BACKFLOW ASSEMBLY TESTER

9822 N.E. HWY. 121
CAMERON, MO 64429

MAX THOMPSON
816-632-6020



**Incredible Precision.
Unsurpassed Quality.**

FULL-COLOR PRINTING • COLOR COPIES
BANNERS & SIGNS • OFFICE PRODUCTS
PROMO ITEMS • GRAPHIC DESIGN
MAILING SERVICES

1301 S. Broadway • Oak Grove, Missouri 64075
(816) 690-3515 • Fax: (816) 690-3510

art@sandsprinting.com • www.sandsprinting.com

From start to finish... and everything in between!

EST. 1985
FAMILY OWNED



We're having a raffle!

We're raffling off a Kel Tec Sub 2000 9mm Pistol Caliber Carbine

We will have a limited number of raffle tickets. We will not mail tickets to members to sell. Tickets will be available at all General meetings and at events where WMSA has a table. Additionally to build our treasury for the coming year, this year's raffle is aimed towards gaining more WMSA members.

The tickets are \$5 each or 5 for \$20. As an added incentive, bring in a new member at a General Membership Meeting and get a free raffle ticket. Any current member who brings in a new WMSA member gets a free raffle ticket for each new member added to our rolls.

Bring your prospective new member to a General membership meeting and when the new member completes the membership application and pays their dues, you are handed a ticket, no charge! The drawing for the rifle will be at the January 2020 RK Gun Show at the KCI Expo Center.

Go recruit new members, get a free ticket for every member and exhaust our limited number of tickets.

Tickets can also be obtained via mail by sending a check to the WMSA, P.O. Box 11144, Kansas City, MO 64119.



If you win, what will you get? You get more than just the rifle.

Kel Tec Sub 2000 9mm Pistol Caliber Carbine w Laser Sight 2-Glock 17 Magazines and soft carry case

Tickets are \$5 each or 5 for \$20

Here's your chance for a Kel Tec folding carbine with accessories.

Come to our next General meeting and buy your tickets!



MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

WESTERN MISSOURI SHOOTERS ALLIANCE

The Alliance is a regionally-based, grass-roots organization that seeks to;

- 1) Counter the designs of malicious legislators.
- 2) Confront the media's twisted portrayals of gun rights issues.
- 3) Politicize and activate gun owners in defense of their rights.
- 4) Acquaint the public with the true nature of the Second Amendment.
- 5) Network with other pro-gun groups to coordinate local, state and national strategies.
- 6) Train people in basic firearm safety and handgun defense.
- 7) Sponsor and support pro-gun legislation.
- 8) Make politicians aware that gun owners are awakening from their accustomed apathy and
WILL TOLERATE NO FURTHER EROSION OF THEIR FREEDOMS!

Date: ____/____/____

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State: _____ Zip: _____

Occupation: _____

Mail to:
Western Missouri Shooters Alliance
P.O. Box 11144
Kansas City, MO 64119

Hotline (877) 333-WMSA
www.wmsa.net
 County: _____

Home Phone: (____) ____ - _____

Cell Phone: (____) ____ - _____

E-Mail _____

NRA member? ____ Registered Voter? ____

Check membership type:

____ Annual
\$30

____ Senior (65+)
\$20

____ Associate
\$15 (spouse, no newsletter)

____ 3 Year Annual
\$87

____ 3 Year Senior
(65+)
\$57

____ 3 Year Associate
(spouse, no newsletter)
\$28

____ Sponsor
\$100 (4 business card
ads per year.)

____ Sponsor
\$250 (12 business card
ads per year.)

Dedicated to the restoration of the inalienable right to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the Second Amendment



Western Missouri Shooters Alliance
P O Box 11144
Kansas City, MO 64119

*...dedicated to the restoration of the inalienable right to
 keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment*

PRESORT STD
 AUTO
 U.S. POSTAGE PAID
 OAK GROVE, MO
 PERMIT NO. 60

REMINDER Next General Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 23, 2019 at 7:00 PM
 Meeting located at Bass Pro Conservation Room, Independence, MO

CONTACT INFORMATION - *Let them know what you think!*

Missouri State Senate

Jason Holsman—D -Dist 7
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 421
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-6607

Mike Cierpiot—R -Dist 8
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 431
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1464

S. Kiki Curls—D -Dist 9
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 434
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3158

John Rizzo—D—Dist 11
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 425
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3074

Dan Hegeman—R -Dist 12
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 332
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1415

Lauren Arthur—D - Dist 17
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 331A
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-5282

Denny Hoskins—R—Dist 21
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 431
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-4302

Ed Emery—R—Dist 31
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 420
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-2108

Rob Schaaf—R—Dist 34
 201 W Capitol Ave., Rm. 423
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-2183

Missouri House

Jim Neely—R—Dist 8
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 110A
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-0246

Delus Johnson—R—Dist. 9
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 302-1
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3666

Bill Faulkner—R—Dist 10
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 200BC
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-9755

Brenda Shields—R -Dist. 11
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 407A
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3643

Kenneth Wilson—R _Dist 12
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 206A
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-9760

Vic Alfred—R— Dist 13
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 400CC
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-6593

Matt Sain—D— Dist 14
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 101G
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3618

Jon Carpenter— D - Dist 15
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 103-BC
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-4787

Noell J Shull - R Dist 16
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 412 C
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-9458

Mark Ellebracht - R Dist 17
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 135-BA
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1218

Wes Rogers - D Dist 18
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 135BB
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-2199

Jonathan Patterson—R Dist 30
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 405A
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-0907

Dan Stacy - R - Dist 31
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 116-3
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-8636

Jeff Coleman— R Dist 32
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 115-J
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1487

Donna Pfautsch - R Dist 33
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 404-B
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-9766

Rebecca Roeber - R Dist 34
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 102
 BA
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1456

Keri Ingle - D Dist 35
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 109-
 E Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1459

Doug Richey - R Dist 38
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 116A1
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-2238

Peggy McCaugh - R -Dist 39
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 409 B
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1468

Dean Dohrman - R Dist 51
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 415A
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-2204

Brad Pollitt— R - Dist 52
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 201-CA
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-9774

Glen Kolkmeier - R Dist 53
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 400CA
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-1462

Dan Houx - R - Dist 54
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 116-A1
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3580

Mike Haffner— R - Dist 55
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 115 E
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3783

Jack Bondon - R - Dist 56
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 201F
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-2175

Rodger Reedy - R - Dist 57
 201 West Capitol Ave Rm. 115-C
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
 (573) 751-3971

WEB ADDRESSES - *Get educated!*

Gun Owners of America
www.gunowners.org
 703-321-8585

Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership
www.JPFO.org
 262- 673-9745

The National Rifle Association
www.nra.org
 800-672-3888

The Second Amendment Foundation
www.saf.org
 425- 454-7012

Gateway Civil Liberties Alliance
<http://www.gclastl.org/>
 866 385-GUNS (4867)

Missouri Sport Shooting Association
www.missourisportshooting.org/

Western Missouri Shooters Alliance
www.wmsa.net

Missouri Carry
 Online Forum
www.missouricarry.com

Arming Women Against Rape and Endangerment
www.aware.org
 877-672-9273

Women Against Gun Control
www.wage.com
 801-328-9660

NewsMax.com
www.newsmax.com

The Washington Times
www.washtimes.com

The London Telegraph
www.telegraph.co.uk

The Drudge Report
www.drudgereport.com