



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*The 'Collective' Creeps Into the Armory—In Hushed But Measured Steps*

Tomorrow, my 'blue state', Oregon, will vote on its own somewhat water-ed down rendition of a Washington state, draconian, unconstitutional, gun ban. Two main provisions in the combined Oregon Bill are intended to restrict semi-autos from non-military, 18/21 year olds, and adding municipal discretion for places where 'no guns will be allowed'.

This is an email I sent to my state representative who lives down the alley from me: "Hello Pam—Erik Down the alley. Tomorrow is my wife's birthday and also the day of the scheduled vote on gun restriction. May I remind you of a constitutional mandate (the Constitution that you are sworn to uphold), that all able-bodied males between the ages of 17 and 45 are bound by law to serve in State Militias, and, as such, by necessity, must possess those weapons capable of 'repelling invasion, quelling insurrection, and enforcing the laws of the US'. Also, The same Constitution provides for no locales from which armed members of the Militia are prohibited. Respectfully, Erik"

Is Pam aware of the role of State militias? Doubtful. If so, does she adhere the duty imposed on 18/21 year-olds? Likely she does not. Instead, citing statistics for school shootings, blame is focused on guns and young (white?) men (seldom is race/ethnicity of minority shooters identified by networks in mass shootings). And, without diving-deep into government policy/Pharma responsibility as causes for mass (school) shootings, the elite do all they can (presumably from a place of caring), to ensure the peace.

Just now I received a reply from Pam Marsh: "Hi Erik, Thanks so much for your email. I hope you are planning something wonderful for (name withheld) birthday! I think your concern may be that individuals under 21 who are serving in the military will be unable to carry firearms as a result of HB 2005. If so, recognizing the issue, the bill exempts individuals who are under the age of 21 who are in the military from the restriction on carry. I hope that helps with that concern. You may also be referencing the section of the bill that allows local governments to disallow the carry of firearms onto publicly owned property. This would have no effect on firearms carriage outside of public buildings and their adjacent grounds and would not mandate that any community take action if they do not wish to. At this point, I'm not aware of legal analysis that suggests this would be unconstitutional. We already enforce a prohibition on the presence of firearms in other facilities, including courts, schools, certain museums, state capitols, etc., so I assume that local government facilities would have the same status. Please

let me know if I've completed misunderstood your concerns. I recognize that you and I will likely disagree on this bill, but I want to be as transparent as I can be about my positions. Again, thanks so much for getting in touch. Best, Pam.

Before my reply to Pam's followup, there are things in her reply that need addressed: State Militias are the constitutional standing army, whereas, unfortunately, US Armed Forces have come to be, that entity that 'forces', 'rules-based order' (our rules—your orders), upon the world. This 'standing army' has become the worst nightmare of our founders, and, is neither mandated, nor a legal entity, under the US Constitution.

Pam Marsh assumes a matrix of locations where guns are not permitted to be legal—with a consequence that in those locations (none of which are specified in the Constitution), State Militia would be unable to enforce the laws of the United States. Ms. Marsh, being "not aware of legal analysis that suggests this would be unconstitutional", begs the question. The 2nd Amendment: "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." What about "shall not be infringed" does Pam Marsh not understand?

Recall EU tactics on Dutch farmers before the farmers voted them out: they created a matrix of restrictive areas such that there was virtually nowhere in the country where farming was legal. That's the tactic here: make it such that 'bearing arms' constitutes a crime each few blocks one travels. As with the rationale that no one forced mRNA 'vaccines', Oregon is not mandating local municipalities to pass ordinances restricting gun locales—hiding behind a 'Faucian Bargain', they allow municipalities to restrict carry.

What was it Carl Sandburg wrote? "The fog comes on little cat feet." Oregon, creeping, in hushed but measured steps, brings a 'fog' to real intentions—wherever it treads.

Oregon doesn't care that the Supreme Court's recent Bruen decision re-affirmed citizen rights to 'keep and bear' arms. Under divisive 'identity politics', the elite forsake not only the Constitution, but also the constitutional arbiter of law—the Supreme Court.

My latest reply to Ms. Marsh: "Hello Pam—There are no 'standing armies' in the Constitution. Able-bodied 17/45 year olds 'comprise' the State Militias that cannot be divested of arms necessary to 'repel invasion, quell insurrection, and enforce the laws of the United States'. Yes we disagree, because you do not take seriously your oath to defend the Constitution... Simply stated, any who vote for 'gun restrictions', as such, are not Americans. They are surely something—but not Americans. Respectfully, Erik

A harsh reply? Not really, considering my 2 rules for life: do what you say you will do, while not aggressing on the persons or property of others. This does not mean we cannot defend ourselves—but only after we are attacked. Gun restrictions, in general, 'attack' citizens duty/ability to defend the republic from enemies, foreign and domestic.

The battle is raging and the field is in doubt. A tyranny of 'equity' over 'opportunity', cancelling The Bill of Rights, requires they take our guns. Will they be successful? I harken back to when I was 19, in Sicily, in the Navy, and 2 great philosophers would pass by my cubicle, each morning. One, a 'lifer', a burly, black, cook offered his take: "There will be no survivors." Then Ed passed by: "Whip, piss on em—they ain't shit."

Cobbled together, nobody gets out of this thing alive, so go as a patriot—let the chips fall where they may. Ed had it right: those who would rob us of our heritage, forcing us into their rat-infested welfare state of mind—bring it. Do as you must. But when push comes to shove you are each constitutional traitors—piss on ya—you ain't shit.

Contrarians can get my articles by email, by request: erik@neverhadaboss.com