

Memo

To: Sheriff Babeu
From: Captain Jeffrey Karns
CC: Deputy Chief Grizzle/Chief Deputy Henry
Date: January 2, 2013
Re: Discussion/Recommendation Reference Pending Federal Anti-Constitution Action
(Gun Control/Semi-Auto Ban)

Sir,

As you are well aware, there is a draconian deliberate proposal in process at the federal legislative level, to ban 'so-called' assault weapons and other semi-automatic firearms, high-capacity magazines along with other measures. In addition, this pending bill includes various licensing, permitting, fingerprinting, photographing and registration schemes, potentially even a forced gun 'buy-back' plan, ala Australia's recent disarming of her citizenry.

The bottom line is that such a move, even if not passed in the fashion currently proposed by Senator Feinstein (the current bill's architect), is textually unconstitutional and diametrically opposite to the fundamental liberty to keep and bear arms which was specifically enumerated in Amendment II: "...the right to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed".

Amendment II has the purpose, not of providing a means to hunt, sport shoot, target practice or defend against crime, but of insuring that 'the people' have the means to defend against tyranny in government. This current proposal and other recent anti-constitutional federal government actions, such as the provisions of the NDAA, the Patriot Act, Amended FISA and a plethora of others, is frightening in its implication, and seems to be just such a situation as envisioned by our founders.

'So-called' assault weapons are as close to the necessary military-equivalent arms as America's citizens have to provide what our founders envisioned as 'Liberty's Teeth'. It is these very type firearms that the right to 'keep and bear' is to remain unincumbered and unalienable.

Disturbingly, our government which was created to secure our individual liberties is now actively seeking to abrogate or severely limit them. This must not be allowed to continue. Who then is to be the bulwark to stand in defense of our liberty?

Individual citizens are concerned and even frightened and as individuals, they are functionally powerless to stem the tide or make any statement that would even be noted or cared about.

It is my sincere belief that the public would benefit from seeing that a constitutionally elected LE Official and the agency he leads, is taking an open stance against any such potential enforcement and, rather, is staking out a position on the side of the Constitution and of protecting the liberties of citizens from an out-of-control federal gov't. This would provide people some courage and hope, perhaps providing a rallying point for citizens and other government entities which would send the message to the federal government that a segment of the populous and certain government entities will not comply.

Such an open stance by you and other citizens may well have the effect of heading off the proposed action and of a horrific reaction by both the government and a segment of the populous, in the event the action were to be taken.

I appreciate having the opportunity to lay out some of my concerns and thoughts on this issue and I appreciate having a Sheriff that I believe is open to hearing such '*radical*' concepts and who is as constitutionally attuned as you seem to be.

Captain J.B. Karns