

DOES THE SECOND AMENDMENT STILL EXIST?

PG. 1

AN EXAMINATION OF THE POWERS CONGRESS POSSESSES TO REGULATE MACHINEGUNS AND OTHER STATUTORILY DEFINED "FIREARMS" UNDER THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT (TITLE 26 U.S.C. § 5801 et seq.) AND THE GUN CONTROL ACT (TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 921 et seq.).

SCHUYLER BARBEAU

DECEMBER 9, 2016

FDC

IN THIS ARTICLE, I AM GOING TO BREAK DOWN THE LAW FOR YOU SO THAT YOU MAY BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE LAW AS I DO, I AM GOING TO PROVE TO YOU THAT THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS DOES STILL EXIST. LAW IS REALLY COMPLICATED AND BORING TO TRY TO READ AND UNDERSTAND SO I'M GOING TO TRY TO KEEP THINGS AS CLEAR AND SIMPLE FOR THE LAWMAN AND THE COMMON FOLK. I WILL QUOTE FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT CASES, UNITED STATES CODE (USC), UNITED STATES CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS (CFR), THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, BILL OF RIGHTS, AND MAYBE SOME OTHER SOURCES. EVERYTHING I QUOTE CAN BE LOOKED UP AND VERIFIED YOURSELF, AND I ENCOURAGE YOU TO DO SO, THAT YOU MAY FURTHER EDUCATE YOURSELF. KNOWLEDGE IS POWER, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU WIND UP FACING FEDERAL CHARGES FOR EXERCISING YOUR SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS. NONE OF WHAT I WRITE CAN BE GUARANTEED AS LEGAL ADVICE, HOWEVER, AT THE TIME OF THIS WRITING, THIS IS MY, NEARLY, ENTIRE LEGAL ARGUMENT THAT I WILL BE PRESENTING TO THE COURTS FOR THE CHARGES I AM CURRENTLY FACING IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM. I AM STAKING MY FREEDOM ON THIS "LEGAL THEORY," IF YOU WANT TO CALL ~~IT~~ THAT. I HAVE SPENT THE LAST YEAR IN FEDERAL DETENTION DOING HARD STUDY INTO THIS, SO THERE IS NO YANKING ANYONE'S CHAIN HERE.

Nobody believes that you can legally have a machinegun today without having some license or possessing one of those grandfathered ones made prior to year 1986. Well, I'm here to tell you otherwise. The government, courts, ATF, prosecutors,

ATTORNEYS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND OTHERS HAVE ALL WORKED HARD TO KEEP PEOPLE IN THE DARK ABOUT THE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REGARDING FIREARMS. I SHALL SHINE A LIGHT ON THIS DARKNESS TO REVEAL A LITTLE SOMETHIN' CALLED LIBERTY.

I BEGAN STUDYING THE CONSTITUTION AND BILL OF RIGHTS BACK IN 2013. I REMEMBER MANY PEOPLE TELLING ME HOW WE HAVE NO SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS ANYMORE. IN THE SUMMER I DECIDED I WANTED A GUN. I SETTLED ON AN AR-15 TYPE RIFLE. I DID ALL KINDS OF RESEARCH, ABOUT EVERYTHING AR-15. I SPENT ABOUT 5 MONTHS LOOKING AT EVERY MANUFACTURER FOR EVERY PART OF THE RIFLE. I DECIDED THAT I WAS GOING TO BUILD MY OWN. I'VE ALWAYS LIKED CUSTOM ANYTHING AND I HAD SEEN MANY CUSTOM BUILDS ON THE INTERNET AND THAT'S WHAT I WANTED. I'D SPEND WEEKS LOOKING AT BARRELS, WEEKS LOOKING AT COMPENSATORS, WEEKS ON TRIGGERS, AND SO FORTH. I MAINLY SHOPPED ON RAINIERARMS.COM AND BROWNELLS.COM, AND SOME PARTS WERE ORDERED OFF THE MANUFACTURER'S WEBSITE. I STUDIED THE BALLISTICS FOR 5.56/.223, THEORY OF OPERATION FOR THE AR-15, MATERIALS SCIENCE AND THE TECHNOLOGY BEHIND ALL THE PARTS BECAUSE I WAS ESSENTIALLY DESIGNING MY PERFECT, DREAM RIFLE, COST ASIDE. THE RECIEVER SET WAS MY HARDEST ~~to~~ CHOICE BECAUSE THERE'S SO MANY TO CHOOSE FROM AND I WANTED SOMETHING UNIQUE AESTHETICALLY AND HIGH PERFORMANCE. I ALSO LEARNED ABOUT WHAT'S CALLED AN "80% LOWER RECIEVER" WHICH BECAME CRITICAL IN MY BUILD PLAN. A FIREARM IS A TOOL FOR ME. MY PLAN WAS TO DESIGN AND BUILD THE PERFECT TOOL FOR THE JOB, SO I WAS VERY PARTICULAR IN MY SELECTIONS. I WANTED A HIGHEST PERFORMING, SELECT-FIRE, SHORT-BARRELED, FULLY AMBIDEXTRIOUS, EXTREMELY SMOOTH OPERATING RIFLE. NOW, DURING THE MONTHS OF ALL MY RESEARCH, I SAW IN VARIOUS INTERNET FORUMS AND CONVERSATIONS WITH PEOPLE THE MENTIONING OF REGISTRATION AND TAX STAMP REQUIREMENTS FOR SHORT-BARRELED RIFLES (SBR'S). I GOT TO THINKING, WAIT A MINUTE, I THOUGHT THE SECOND AMENDMENT SAID "SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED," YET THERE'S ALL THESE

GUN CONTROL LAWS, AND MANY PEOPLE SAY THESE LAWS ARE ALL UNCONSTITUTIONAL, AND OTHERS SAY THEY ARE. IT DIDN'T MAKE SENSE TO ME SO I RESEARCHED MORE. I LOOKED AT THE CONSTITUTION AND AT THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT (NFA) AND GUN CONTROL ACT (GCA) STATUTES TO TRY TO UNDERSTAND HOW CONGRESS CAN ENACT THESE LAWS AND BE LEGITIMATE - CONSTITUTIONAL. WHAT I DETERMINED IS THAT UNDER THE COMMERCE CLAUSE, CONGRESS CAN REGULATE FIREARMS THAT ARE COMMERCIALY PRODUCED AND THE LICENSED IMPORTERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND DEALERS OF THEM, I FIGURED THE ATF CAN ONLY REQUIRE ME TO REGISTER A "FIREARM" THAT A LICENSED MANUFACTURER MADE BECAUSE IT'S PART OF COMMERCE. I FIGURED, WELL THEN, I'LL MAKE MY OWN GUN, AND THE GOVERNMENT WILL NOT HAVE ANY JURISDICTION OVER IT OR ME TO REQUIRE REGISTRATION AND TAXES. I SAW IN THE DEFINITION FOR THE WORD "FIREARM" THAT A FRAME OR RECIEVER IS CONSIDERED A FIREARM TOO. THIS IS WHEN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 80% LOWER COMES INTO PLAY. THE ATF SAID ON THEIR WEBSITE, AT LEAST WHEN I LAST READ IT, THAT AN 80% LOWER IS NOT CONSIDERED A "FIREARM" BECAUSE OF THE STATE OF BEING 80% COMPLETE IN ITS MACHINING. THE SITE SAID, BECAUSE OF THAT, BECAUSE IT REQUIRES ADVANCED MACHINING SKILLS TO COMPLETE THE MANUFACTURING PROCESS, AND AS LONG AS YOU COMPLETE IT YOURSELF, FOR YOUR OWN PERSONAL USE, AND REMAINS IN YOUR POSSESSION, THERE ARE NO REGULATIONS. I READ THAT AND TOLD MYSELF, THAT MEANS I CAN BUILD MY RIFLE HOW EVER I WANT. AND SO I DID. I ORDERED A REALLY NICE BILLET RECIEVER SET WITH AN 80% MATCHED LOWER, AND DRILL JIGS, AND MILLING BITS, AND WENT TO A RELATIVES TO USE HIS MILLING MACHINE TO FINISH THE LOWER. AT FIRST, I ONLY HAD BOUGHT AND INSTALLED A FULL-AUTO FIRE CONTROL GROUP (TRIGGER) AND SAFETY SELECTOR. LATER ON, I GOT AN M-16 STYLE BOLT CARRIER AND THEN MADE A DROP-IN-AUTO SERE (DIAS). THE SERE WAS AN EXPERIMENT TO SEE IF PLASTIC WOULD HOLD UP TO FULL-AUTO FIRE. I CARVED THE DIAS OUT OF A BLOCK OF WHAT I BELIEVE TO BE A BLOCK OF NYLON PLASTIC. I LOOKED AT A PICTURE OFF THE INTERNET AND EYEBALLED IT. TO GET IT TO FIT AND FUNCTION RIGHT. IT WORKED BUT NOT GOOD BECAUSE I DIDN'T MAKE IT TO ANY SPECIFICATION. IT WAS JUST A TEST TO SEE

IF PLASTIC WOULD HOLD UP BECAUSE I HAVE 3-D PRINTER FILES FOR THE DIAS AND WOULD LATER TRY TO PRINT SOME OUT. I BOUGHT A 10.5 INCH BARREL FOR MAIN USE AND AN 18 INCH BARREL THAT I INSTALLED IN A SECOND UPPER RECEIVER WITH A SCOPE AND BIPOD FOR LONG RANGE TARGET ENGAGEMENTS. BECAUSE THE 80% LOWER ISN'T A FIREARM YET, THE COMPANY THAT MANUFACTURED IT IS NOT REQUIRED TO SERIALIZE IT. SINCE THERE'S NO SERIAL NUMBER, IT CAN'T BE REGISTERED. YOU, AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN, AND NOT A LICENSED MANUFACTURER, ARE NOT REQUIRED TO SERIALIZE, ~~REGISTER~~ REGISTER, AND PAY TAXES ON FIREARMS THAT YOU MAKE FOR YOURSELF. I'LL EXPLAIN IT FURTHER ON IN THIS ARTICLE. JUST SO YOU KNOW, A DIAS OR ANY OTHER TYPE OF SERE IS A "MACHINEGUN" AS WELL IN THE STATUTORY DEFINITION. A LICENSED MANUFACTURER IS REQUIRED TO SERIALIZE AND REGISTER THEM, HOWEVER, AN AMENDMENT TO THE GCA IN 1986 TOLD LICENSED MANUFACTURERS, IMPORTERS, AND DEALERS THAT THEY COULD NO LONGER MAKE, IMPORT, OR DEAL MACHINEGUNS UNLESS IT IS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT. BUT I MADE MY OWN MACHINEGUN, BECAUSE I CAN, AND SO CAN YOU. NOW, I SHALL BREAK DOWN THE LAW, THE CONSTITUTION, AND HOW AND WHO THE LAWS APPLY TO. HOPEFULLY YOU, THE READER, WILL ALSO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE PRINCIPLE OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM AND LIBERTY. THE FOLLOWING IS AN EXCEAPT, MODIFIED SLIGHTLY FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS EXAMINATION, FROM ONE OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS I HAVE PREPARED FOR MY CASE.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

I SOUGHT TO EXERCISE MY SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS AND TO DO THIS, I PURCHASED ALL THE PARTS NECESSARY TO BUILD AN AR-15 RIFLE. I DESIRED TO EXERCISE RIGHTS, RATHER THAN PRIVILEGES. RIGHTS THAT ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED FROM INFRINGEMENT, RATHER THAN PRIVILEGES, THAT CAN BE REGULATED. TO DO THIS, I CHOSE NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN COMMERCE BY NOT PURCHASING A RIFLE FROM A LICENSED FIREARMS DEALER OR ONE THAT WAS MADE BY A LICENSED MANUFACTURER THAT WOULD HAVE TRAVELED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE. FIREARMS THAT ARE PRODUCED IN AND THAT ARE TRAVELING IN INTER OR INTRA-STATE COMMERCE ARE REGULATED AND CONSUMMERS

OF SUCH FIREARMS ARE HELD TO THE REGULATIONS THAT COVER THEM. PRODUCING GOODS FOR AND SELLING THEM TO THE PUBLIC IS A PRIVILEGE THAT CAN BE AND IS REGULATED BY CONGRESS AND THE STATES. CONSUMERS PARTICIPATE IN THIS COMMERCE WHEN PURCHASING GOODS AND IN SOME CASES ARE REQUIRED TO REGISTER AND PAY TAXES ON THE TRANSFER OF POSSESSION OF THOSE GOODS, ALL OF WHICH IS A PRIVILEGE AND IS REACHED BY CONGRESS' AUTHORITY. UNLESS EXPLICITLY EXPRESSED BY THE SUPREME LAW, ANYTHING OUTSIDE OF THIS FALLS OUTSIDE OF PRIVILEGE AND IS A RIGHT, AND IN SOME CASES IS EXPLICITLY PROTECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND ITS AMENDMENTS, LIKE THE SECOND AMENDMENT. BY MACHINING AND BUILDING MY OWN RIFLE, I EXERCISED MY RIGHTS INSTEAD OF PRIVILEGES AND BECAUSE CONGRESS LACKS AUTHORITY TO REGULATE OR PROHIBIT WHAT I DO PRIVATELY AND MY PERSONAL RIGHTS, THERE IS NO JURISDICTION TO CHARGE, PROSECUTE, AND IMPRISON ME FOR DOING NOTHING. I AM CHARGED FOR A VICTIMLESS CRIME, BY LAWS AND REGULATIONS THAT ONLY APPLY TO COMMERCE AND BUSINESSES. MY DETENTION ~~AND~~ IS UNLAWFUL AND PROSECUTION IS A GROSS VIOLATION OF MY FIFTH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS RIGHTS. THE FOLLOWING EXPLANATION WILL SHOW HOW CONGRESS IS WITHOUT JURISDICTION TO REQUIRE ME (OR YOU, READER), A PRIVATE CITIZEN, TO REGISTER MY PRIVATE PROPERTY AND IS WITHOUT POWER TO PROHIBIT ME, OR YOU, FROM MAKING AND POSSESSING ARMS THAT I MAKE MYSELF FOR PERSONAL USE AS OPPOSED TO COMMERCIAL SALE AND USE. SINCE DUE PROCESS HAS NEVER TAKEN PLACE TO DEPRIVE ME OF MY RIGHTS, THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT INTERFERE WITH MY EXERCISING OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO REGULATE

CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO REGULATE FIREARMS STARTS WITH AND IS LIMITED BY ARTICLE 1, SEC. 8, CLAUSE 3 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION - THE COMMERCE CLAUSE. CONGRESS HAS THE POWER TO LAY AND COLLECT TAXES TO REGULATE COMMERCE BETWEEN THE STATES. COMMERCE ~~IS~~ IS COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES, PEOPLE AND BUSINESSES PRODUCING GOODS AND PROVIDING SERVICES ON A LARGE SCALE TO THE CONSUMER PUBLIC. THE PURPOSE OF THE COMMERCE CLAUSE WAS TO CREATE AN AREA OF FREE TRADE AMONG THE STATES AND FOREIGN STATES, FAIR AND EQUAL, FREE FROM

INTERFERENCE. SEE WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP v. TULLY, 466 US 388, 402-403, 80 LED 2D 388, 104 S. CT. 1856 (1984); MISSOURI ex rel. BARRETT v. KANSAS NATURAL GAS CO., 256 US 308, 68 LED 1030, 44 S. CT. 544; PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION v. ATLEBORO STEAM & ELECTRIC CO., 273 US 89, 71 LED 533, 47 S. CT. 294; MICHIGAN-WISCONSIN P.L. CO. v. CALVERT, 98 LED 583, 347 US 157; GRANHOLM v. HEALD, 161 LED 2D 796, 544 US 460.

CONGRESS IS WITHOUT POWER TO REGULATE OR PROHIBIT PRIVATE ACTIVITIES

THE GUN CONTROL ACT (GCA) AND NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT (NFA) WERE ENACTED UNDER THE COMMERCE CLAUSE AUTHORITY AND THE SUPREME COURT HAS RULED THEM CONSTITUTIONAL UNDER THE SAME. IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED AND UNDERSTOOD THAT CONGRESS HAS NO GENERAL POLICE POWERS. CONGRESS DOES NOT HAVE THE POLICE POWER TO TELL ME, OR YOU, I CAN'T MAKE, KEEP OR POSSESS, AND IF I WANTED TO, SELL A FIREARM I MAKE FOR MYSELF. IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL TO ENFORCE AN EXCISE TAX ON THE DOING OF BUSINESS WHEN YOU AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN ARE NOT ENGAGED IN BUSINESS? IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL TO ENFORCE LAWS REGULATING LICENSED BUSINESSES ENGAGED IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES ON A PRIVATE CITIZEN WHO IS NOT ENGAGED IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES? IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL TO SUBJECT A PRIVATE CITIZEN EXERCISING HIS PROTECTED AND UNALIENABLE RIGHTS TO LAWS REGULATING THE PRIVILEGE OF PARTICIPATING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE WHEN HE IS NOT ENGAGING IN OR CONDUCTING ANY SUCH ACTIVITIES? I THINK NOT. AT THE MOST, ONLY STATES HAVE POLICE POWER TO TELL THEIR CITIZENS THEY CAN'T MAKE SOMETHING, BUT WHEN IT COMES TO ARMS, NOT EVEN THE STATES CAN INTERFERE. ARTICLE VI, CLAUSE 2, "THIS CONSTITUTION... SHALL BE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND; AND THE JUDGES IN EVERY STATE SHALL BE BOUND THEREBY, ANYTHING IN THE CONSTITUTIONS OR LAWS OF ANY STATE TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING." ARTICLE V SAYS THE AMENDMENTS "SHALL BE VALID TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, AS PART OF THIS CONSTITUTION." STATES CANNOT INTERFERE WITH PERSONAL RIGHTS BUT CAN REGULATE PRIVILEGES LIKE ~~THE~~ BUSINESS AND COMMERCE. IF THE ACTS REACH PRIVATE ACTIVITIES AND PRIVATE

PROPERTY, THEN THEY ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE THE POWER FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT EXIST. IF THE NFA IS AN EXCISE TAX ON THE DOING OF BUSINESS, AS WAS RULED BY THE SUPREME COURT IN SONZINSKI, 81 LED 722, 300 US 506, THEN IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO ENFORCE THE LAW ON PRIVATE CITIZENS NOT ENGAGING IN BUSINESS. THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH IS ENFORCING TAX LAWS CONTRARY THE INTENT OF THE LAW AND OF CONGRESS. AS WILL BE EXPLAINED ~~LATER~~ MORE LATER, CONGRESS HAS A BOUNDRY THAT ITS REACH CAN'T CROSS AND IT LIES BETWEEN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES THAT DO SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND ACTIVITIES THAT DON'T. MY ACTIVITIES WERE NOT EVEN COMMERCIAL AND WERE PURELY INTERSTATE. IN MUGLER V. KANSAS, 31 LED 205, 123 US 623, (1887), QUOTING JUSTICE McLEAN FROM THE LICENSE CASES, 46 US 5 HOW. SOLI, [12: 256], SUPREME COURT:

"A STATE REGULATES ITS DOMESTIC COMMERCE, CONTRACTS, TRANSMISSIONS OF ESTATES, REAL AND PERSONAL, AND ACTS UPON ~~MATTERS~~ INTERNAL MATTERS WHICH RELATE TO ITS MORAL AND POLITICAL WELLFARÆ. OVER THESE SUBJECTS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NO POWER..." MR. JUSTICE WOODBURY OBSERVED: "HOW CAN THEY (THE STATES) BE SOVEREIGN WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE SPHERES, WITHOUT POWER TO REGULATE ALL THEIR INTERNAL COMMERCE, AS WELL AS POLICE, AND DIRECT HOW, WHEN AND WHERE IT SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ARTICLES INTIMATELY CONNECTED EITHER WITH PUBLIC MORALS OR PUBLIC SAFETY OR PUBLIC PROSPERITY?" MR. JUSTICE GRIER, IN STILL MORE EMPHATIC LANGUAGE SAID: "THE TRUE QUESTION PRESENTED BY THESE CASES, AND ONE WHICH I AM NOT DISPOSED TO EVADE, IS WHETHER THE STATES HAVE A RIGHT TO PROHIBIT THE SALE AND CONSUMPTION OF AN ARTICLE OF COMMERCE WHICH THEY BELIEVE TO BE PERNICIOUS IN ITS EFFECTS, AND THE CAUSE OF DISEASE, PAUPERISM, AND CRIME... WITHOUT ATTEMPTING TO DEFINE WHAT ARE THE PECULIAR SUBJECTS OF THIS POWER, IT MAY SAFELY BE AFFIRMED, THAT EVERY LAW FOR THE RESTRAINT OR PUNISHMENT OF CRIME, FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE PUBLIC PEACE, HEALTH, AND MORALS MUST COME WITHIN THIS CATEGORY.... THE POLICE POWER, WHICH IS EXCLUSIVELY IN THE STATES IS ALONE COMPETENT

TO THE CORRECTION OF THESE EVILS..." (EMPHASIS ADDED)

SO FAR IN THIS CASE, WE SEE THE SUPREME COURT TALKING ABOUT THE STATES NEEDING POLICE POWER TO DEAL WITH THE MAKING OF ALCOHOL FOR COMMERCIAL SALE TO TRY REDUCING THE EVIL EFFECTS OF ALCOHOL ON SOCIETY. THIS CASE DEALS WITH THE STATE OF KANSAS PUTTING A PROHIBITION ON THE COMMERCIAL MAKING AND SALES OF ALCOHOL. THE SUPREME COURT CONTINUED IN THIS CASE:

"...THESE CASES REST UPON THE ACKNOWLEDGED RIGHT OF THE STATES OF THE UNION TO CONTROL PURELY INTERNAL AFFAIRS, AND IN DOING SO, TO PROTECT THE HEALTH, MORALS, AND SAFETY OF THEIR PEOPLE BY REGULATIONS THAT DO NOT INTERFERE WITH THE EXECUTION OF THE POWERS OF THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT, OR VIOLATE RIGHTS SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. THE POWER TO ESTABLISH SUCH REGULATIONS, AS WAS SAID IN GIBBONS V. OGDEN, 22 U.S. 9 WHEAT. 203 [6:71], REACHES EVERYTHING WITHIN THE TERRITORY OF A STATE NOT SURRENDERED TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT..."

THE GCA AND NFA SPECIFICALLY TAX AND REGULATE PEOPLE WHO SPECIFICALLY AND INTENTIONALLY ENGAGE IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE. OUTSIDE OF PEOPLE WHO WANT TO MANUFACTURE AND SELL FIREARMS TO CUSTOMERS OUTSIDE OF A STATE OF ORIGIN, CONGRESS HAS NO POWER BECAUSE IT'S A "PURELY INTERNAL AFFAIR," AND EVEN THEN THE STATES HAVE TO BE WEARY OF INTERFERING WITH ITS CITIZEN'S PERSONAL RIGHTS. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NO POWER OVER OUR PRIVATE ACTIVITIES AND EVEN IF OUR ACTIVITIES WERE COMMERCIAL IN NATURE AND THEY TAKE PLACE ONLY WITHIN YOUR STATE'S BOUNDRIES, THEN THEY CAN'T SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND CONGRESS CAN'T INTERFERE. THE SUPREME COURT CONTINUED:

"... IT IS, HOWEVER, CONTENDED, THAT, ALTHOUGH THE STATE MAY PROHIBIT THE MANUFACTURE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS FOR SALE OR BARTER WITHIN HER LIMITS, FOR GENERAL USE AS A BEVERAGE, NO CONVENTION OR LEGISLATURE HAS THE RIGHT, UNDER OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT, TO PROHIBIT ANY CITIZEN FROM MANUFACTURING FOR HIS OWN USE, OR FOR EXPORT, OR STORAGE, ANY ARTICLE

OF FOOD OR DRINK NOT ENDANGERING OR AFFECTING THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS. THE ARGUMENT MADE IN SUPPORT OF THE FIRST BRANCH OF THIS PROPOSITION, BRIEFLY STATED, IS THAT IN THE IMPLIED COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE CITIZEN, CERTAIN RIGHTS ARE RESERVED BY THE LATTER, WHICH ARE GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION PROTECTING PERSONS AGAINST BEING DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, AND WITH WHICH THE STATE CANNOT INTERFERE; THAT AMONG THOSE RIGHTS IS THAT OF MANUFACTURING FOR ONE'S USE EITHER FOOD OR DRINK; ... OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT, BASED UPON THE INDIVIDUALITY AND INTELLIGENCE OF THE CITIZEN, DOES NOT CLAIM TO CONTROL HIM, EXCEPT AS TO HIS CONDUCT TO OTHERS, LEAVING HIM THE SOLE JUDGE AS TO ALL THAT ONLY AFFECTS HIMSELF..."

ALTHOUGH THIS CASE IS ABOUT ALCOHOL, WE CAN SUBSTITUTE "ARMS" IN AND THE CONCEPT REMAINS THE SAME. I MADE MY RIFLE FOR ~~MY~~ MY OWN USE AND THIS MAKING AND POSSESSION DID NO "ENDANGERING OR AFFECTING THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS." MY RIGHTS TO MAKE, KEEP, AND BEAR ARMS ARE RIGHTS RESERVED BY ME AND YOU. I HAVE NEVER YELDED THOSE RIGHTS TO ANY GOVERNMENT. OUR RIGHTS ARE NOT GRANTED TO US BY ANY FEDERAL OR STATE CONSTITUTIONS. OUR RIGHTS DO NOT EXIST AS A CREATURE OF ANY STATUTE. OUR RIGHTS ARE NATURAL, PERSONAL, AND UNALIENABLE, NO GOVERNMENT CAN INTERFERE. IF THE SUPREME COURT SAYS A MAN HAS A RIGHT TO MANUFACTURE ALCOHOL FOR HIS OWN USE AND NOT EVEN A STATE WITH ITS POLICE POWERS CAN INTERFERE. AND WITH NO AMENDMENT PROTECTING THAT RIGHT, THEN CERTAINLY, WITH THE SECOND AMENDMENT EXISTING, NO STATE OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS CAN INTERFERE WITH OUR MAKING, KEEPING, BEARING, OR EVEN OCCASIONALLY SELLING ARMS. THE SUPREME COURT CONTINUED:

"... THE RIGHT TO MANUFACTURE DRINK FOR ONE'S PERSONAL USE IS SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT SUCH MANUFACTURE DOES NOT ENDANGER OR AFFECT THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS. IF SUCH MANUFACTURE DOES PREJUDICIALLY AFFECT THE RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF THE COMMUNITY, IT FOLLOWS, FROM THE VERY PREMISES STATED, THAT SOCIETY HAS THE POWER TO PROTECT ITSELF, BY LEGISLATION,

AGAINST THE INJURIOUS CONSEQUENCES OF THAT BUSINESS, AS SAID IN *MUNN V. ILLINOIS*, 94 U.S. 124 [24: 83], WHILE POWER DOES NOT EXIST WITH THE WHOLE PEOPLE TO CONTROL RIGHTS THAT ARE PURELY AND EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE, GOVERNMENT MAY REQUIRE 'EACH CITIZEN TO SO CONDUCT HIMSELF, AND SO USE HIS PROPERTY, AS NOT UNNECESSARILY TO INJURE ANOTHER...'

WHEN I MADE MY MACHINEGUN, I EXERCISED MY "PURELY AND EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE" RIGHTS AND DID SO WITH NO INTENTION TO HARM ANY OTHER CITIZENS. IN FACT, FROM THE DAY I BUILT THE RIFLE UNTIL THE DAY I WAS ARRESTED, OVER A YEAR AND A HALF, NO ONE WAS EVER INJURED OR HAD THEIR PERSONAL RIGHTS INFRINGED UPON. IN FACT, ONE OF THE REASONS I BUILT THE RIFLE WITH THE CAPABILITIES MINE HAS WAS TO PROTECT AND DEFEND ANY AND ALL CITIZENS OF AMERICA AND THEIR RIGHTS, FREEDOM, AND LIBERTY, NOT TO ENDANGER OR UNNECESSARILY INJURE ANOTHER. I WAS ALWAYS CAREFUL NOT TO INFRINGE UPON OR HARM OTHERS. THE SUPREME COURT FURTHER SAID IN *MUGLER*:

"... IT DOES NOT FOLLOW THAT EVERY STATUTE ENACTED OSTENSIBLY FOR THE PROMOTION OF THESE ENDS IS TO BE ACCEPTED AS A LEGITIMATE EXERTION OF THE POLICE POWERS OF THE STATE. THERE ARE, OF NECESSITY, LIMITS BEYOND WHICH LEGISLATION CANNOT RIGHTFULLY GO. WHILE EVERY ~~POSSIBILITY~~ POSSIBLE PRESUMPTION IS TO BE INDULGED IN FAVOR OF THE VALIDITY OF A STATUTE, *SINKING FUND CASES*, 99 U.S. 718 [25: 50], THE COURTS MUST OBEY THE CONSTITUTION RATHER THAN THE LAW-MAKING DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT, AND MUST, UPON THEIR OWN RESPONSIBILITY, DETERMINE WHETHER, IN ANY PARTICULAR CASE, THESE LIMITS HAVE BEEN PASSED. 'TO WHAT PURPOSE' IT WAS SAID IN *MARBURY V. MADISON*, 5 U.S. 1 CRANCH, 137, 167 [2: 60, 70], 'ARE POWERS LIMITED, AND TO WHAT PURPOSE IS THAT LIMITATION COMMITTED TO WRITING, IF THESE LIMITS MAY, AT ANY TIME, BE PASSED BY THOSE INTENDED TO BE RESTRAINED? THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN A GOVERNMENT WITH LIMITED AND UNLIMITED POWERS IS ABOLISHED, IF THOSE LIMITS DO NOT CONFINE THE PERSONS ON WHOM THEY ARE IMPOSED, AND IF ACTS PROHIBITED AND ACTS ALLOWED ARE OF EQUAL OBLIGATION.' THE COURTS ARE

NOT BOUND BY MERE FORMS, NOR ARE THEY TO BE MISLED BY MERE PRETENSES. THEY ARE AT LIBERTY - INDEED, ARE UNDER SOLEMN DUTY - TO LOOK AT THE SUBSTANCE OF THINGS, WHENEVER THEY ENTER UPON THE INQUIRY WHETHER THE LEGISLATURE HAS TRANSCENDED THE LIMITS OF ITS AUTHORITY. IF, THEREFORE, A STATUTE PURPORTING TO HAVE BEEN ENACTED TO PROTECT ~~THE~~ THE PUBLIC HEALTH, THE PUBLIC MORALS, OR THE PUBLIC SAFETY, HAS NO REAL OR SUBSTANTIAL RELATION TO THOSE OBJECTS, OR IS A PALPABLE INVASION OF RIGHTS SECURED BY THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW, IT IS THE DUTY OF THE COURTS TO SO ADJUDGE, AND THEREBY GIVE EFFECT TO THE CONSTITUTION." (EMPHASIS ADDED TO ALL QUOTATIONS FROM MUGLER)

MY CASE IS AN "ANY PARTICULAR CASE" AND THE COURTS SHOULD LOOK AT THE "SUBSTANCE OF THINGS." THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS, EVEN A MACHINEGUN, IS "SECURED BY THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW" AND THE COURTS SHOULD "SO ADJUDGE AND GIVE EFFECT TO THE CONSTITUTION" AND OUR/MINE LIBERTY. IT'S NOT UP TO THE COURTS, EVEN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO DECIDE WHICH ARMS WE CITIZENS CAN AND CANNOT HAVE. THAT MATTER WAS DECIDED BY THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION AND BILL OF RIGHTS, AND THEY SAID TO THE FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS, THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED. "ARMS" IS ANY WEAPON. ON TOP OF THAT, THERE IS NO DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO THE JUDICIAL BRANCH, TO INTERPRET THE SUPREME LAW AND TELL US WE ONLY HAVE THE RIGHT TO KEEP CERTAIN FIREARMS AND THAT THE SECOND AMENDMENT ONLY PROTECTS FIREARMS THE COURT SAYS IT PROTECTS. THE COURTS AND SOME MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WOULD CONTEND THAT - WELL, THE FIRST AMENDMENT IS NOT ABSOLUTE BECAUSE SOME SPEECH IS HARMFUL, LIKE: LIBEL, SLANDER, DEFAMATION OF CHARACTER. I AGREE ON THAT POINT, HOWEVER, UNLIKE SOME SPEECH ACTUALLY PRODUCING AN INJURED PARTY/VICTIM, HOW DOES ME MAKING AND KEEPING A MACHINEGUN PRODUCE AN INJURED PARTY? HOW HAVE I INFLICTED HARM ON SOMEONE? AND WHAT DELEGATED POWER DOES ANY BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAVE TO IGNORE THE SECOND AMENDMENT'S INSTRUCTION? THE PURPOSE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS/WAS TO MANAGE THE SEVERAL STATE GOVERNMENTS.

THE JOB OF THE STATE GOVERNMENTS IS TO MANAGE THEIR CITIZENS. THAT IS WHY WE HAVE THE TENTH AMENDMENT AND WHY ONLY THE STATES HAVE POLICE POWERS. TO UNDERSTAND THIS BETTER, YOU HAVE TO UNDERSTAND HISTORY. THE COLONISTS USED TO ASK - WHO ARE THEY (BRITISH PARLIAMENT), 3,000 MILES AWAY, TO TELL US HOW TO LIVE OUR LIVES. WHO ARE THEY, 3,000 MILES AWAY, TO THINK THEY KNOW BEST HOW TO MANAGE US, THE FOUNDING FATHERS DESIGNED THE NEW CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, WITH THE PAST ISSUES IN MIND, GIVING SPECIFIC POWERS AND LIMITATIONS SO THAT THE CITIZENS OF THE UNION WOULD NOT EVER HAVE TO DEAL WITH SUCH TYRRANNY AGAIN. APPARENTLY THAT WASN'T ENOUGH THOUGH.

INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COMMERCE

THE COMMERCE CLAUSE ALLOWS CONGRESS TO REGULATE FIREARMS BECAUSE THERE ARE COMPANIES WHO MANUFACTURE AND SELL FIREARMS ACROSS THE NATION CREATING A COMMERCE STREAM AND NATIONAL MARKETS, WHICH CONGRESS CAN LEGISLATE TO REGULATE. THERE IS NO DISPUTE OF THAT FACT FOR THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT CONGRESS' INTENT AND PURPOSE FOR THE GUN CONTROL ACT (18 USC §921 et seq.) AND THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT (26 USC §5801 et seq.) IS - TO REGULATE COMMERCE AND CRIME INVOLVING COMMERCE.

IT IS WELL SETTLED THAT CONGRESS CAN REGULATE INTRASTATE ACTIVITIES. IN MICHIGAN-WISCONSIN P.L. CO. V. CALVERT, 347 US 157, 98 LED 583, THE SUPREME COURT REFERENCED MEMPHIS NATURAL GAS CO. V. STONE, 335 US 80, 87, SAYING "IT IS NOW WELL SETTLED THAT TAX IMPOSED ON A LOCAL ACTIVITY RELATED TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE IS VALID IF, AND ONLY IF, THE LOCAL ACTIVITY IS NOT SUCH AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE INTERSTATE PROCESS, THE FLOW OF COMMERCE, THAT IT CANNOT REALISTICALLY BE SEPERATED FROM IT." SEE ALSO UNITED STATES V. LOPEZ, 514 US 549 AND GONZALES V. RAICH, 545 US 1, 16-17. MY LOCAL ACTIVITIES OF MAKING MY OWN AND POSSESSING MY MACHINEGUN, NOT EVEN BEING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN NATURE, ARE NOT "SUCH AN INTEGRAL PART" OF ANY FLOW OF ANY COMMERCE STREAM, THEREFORE NO IMPOSITION OF TAX (IMPOSED BY THE NFA) CAN BE VALID. ANY UNITED STATES V. HENRY, 688 F.3d 637 (9TH CIR. 2012) AND GONZALES V. RAICH ARGUMENTS OR REASONINGS FOR REACHING MY PRIVATE ACTIVITIES ARE

FORECLOSED. THE ANALYSIS BY THE SUPREME COURT HAS EXTENDED CONGRESS' REACH WITH THE COMMERCE CLAUSE TO BUSINESSES THAT ONLY OPERATE WITHIN A SINGLE STATE'S BORDERS AND HAVE NO OUTSIDE CONTACTS, HOWEVER, ONLY BUSINESSES AND COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES MAY BE REACHED. THE SUPREME COURT IN RAICH SAID CONGRESS MAY REGULATE: 1) THE CHANNELS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, 2) THE INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND PERSONS OR THINGS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND 3) ACTIVITIES THAT SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE. ALL THREE OF THESE THINGS ARE ASPECTS OF A BUSINESS OR COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE. THE COURT IN LOPEZ, REFERENCING RAICH, SAID: CONGRESS, UNDER THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION'S COMMERCE CLAUSE, ART 1, § 8, CL 3, MAY REGULATE THREE BROAD AREAS OF ACTIVITIES: (1) THE USE OF THE CHANNELS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, (2) THE PROTECTION OF THE INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, OR PERSONS OR THINGS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE, EVEN THOUGH THE THREAT MAY COME FROM INTRASTATE ACTIVITIES, AND (3) THOSE ACTIVITIES THAT SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE; WHERE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTS INTERSTATE COMMERCE, CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION REGULATING THAT ACTIVITY WILL BE SUSTAINED, (EMPHASIS ADDED), ALL OF WHICH I HAD NO PART IN. NO CHANNELS WERE USED, NO PERSONS OR THINGS (A FIREARM) TRAVELED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE, NO INSTRUMENTALITIES WERE UTILIZED, NO THREATS WERE MADE TO THOSE THINGS, AND I WAS NOT ENGAGED IN ANY ECONOMIC ACTIVITY. SO HOW COULD CONGRESS POSSIBLY HAVE JURISDICTION OVER MY PRIVATE MAKING AND POSSESSION OF MY FIREARM FOR PERSONAL USE, AND UNDER WHAT DELEGATED POWER? THE SUPREME COURT SAID THEY "WOULD NOT PILE INFERENCE UPON INFERENCE IN A MANNER THAT WOULD BID FAIR TO CONVERT CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY UNDER THE COMMERCE CLAUSE TO A GENERAL POLICE POWER OF THE SORT RETAINED BY THE STATES..." FURTHER, THE SUPREME COURT SAID IN LOPEZ:

" BUT EVEN THE MODERN ERA PRECEDENTS WHICH HAVE EXPANDED CONGRESSIONAL POWER UNDER THE COMMERCE CLAUSE CONFIRM THAT THIS POWER IS SUBJECT TO OUTER LIMITS. IN JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL, THE COURT WARNED THAT THE SCOPE OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE POWER MUST BE CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF OUR DUAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT AND MAY

NOT BE EXTENDED SO AS TO EMBRACE EFFECTS UPON INTERSTATE COMMERCE SO INDIRECT AND REMOTE THAT TO EMBRACE THEM, IN VIEW OF OUR COMPLEX SOCIETY, WOULD EFFECTUALLY OBLITERATE THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN WHAT IS NATIONAL AND WHAT IS LOCAL AND CREATE A COMPLETELY CENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT." 301 US, at 37, 81 LED 893, 57 S. CT. 615: SEE ALSO DARBY, *supra*, at 119-120, 85 LED 609, 61 S. CT. 451, 132 ALR 1430 (CONGRESS MAY REGULATE INTRASTATE ACTIVITY THAT HAS A "SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT" ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE); WICKARD, *supra*, at 125, 121, 87 LED 122, 63 S. CT. 82 (CONGRESS MAY REGULATE ACTIVITY THAT "EXERTS A SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE"). (EMPHASIS ADDED)

THE "JUDICIALLY ENFORCEABLE OUTER LIMITS" MENTIONED ABOVE ARE ESTABLISHED IN BETWEEN INTRASTATE ~~AND~~ COMMERCE ACTIVITIES THAT DO ACTUALLY SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND INTRASTATE COMMERCE ACTIVITIES THAT DO NOT SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE. THE SUPREME COURT SAID "ACTIVITIES THAT ARE BEYOND THE REACH OF CONGRESS UNDER THE COMMERCE POWER ARE THOSE WHICH ARE COMPLETELY WITHIN A PARTICULAR STATE, WHICH DO NOT AFFECT OTHER STATES, AND WITH WHICH IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO INTERFERE FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXECUTING SOME OF THE GENERAL POWERS OF THE GOVERNMENT." *KATZENBACH V. M'CLUNG*, 13 LED 2D 290, 379 US 294. CONGRESS' POWER ENDS AT "SUBSTANTIAL EFFECTS" ON COMMERCE AND THE ACTIVITY HAS TO BE COMMERCIAL. THEN, BEYOND THAT HORIZON ARE ACTIVITIES THAT HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH COMMERCE THAT ARE PERSONAL AND PRIVATE. IF THE SUPREME COURT SAYS THEY WILL NOT PILE UP INFERENCES TO GAIN CAUSE TO EXTEND THE REACH OF CONGRESS, THEN NEITHER SHOULD THE LOWER COURTS OR THE GOVERNMENT.

THE SUPREME COURT HAS RULED THAT THE SECOND AMENDMENT DOES NOT MAKE THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ANY ARMS ABSOLUTE AND I ONLY AGREE THAT IN CERTAIN CASES, GOVERNMENT CAN REGULATE FIREARMS AND THE PEOPLES' RIGHTS; LIKE FIREARMS THAT ARE COMMERCIALY MADE, PEOPLE LICENSED AND ENGAGED IN BUSINESS, PEOPLE CONVICTED OF VIOLENT CRIMES, MENTALLY ILL, AND MINORS. BUT, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STILL DOES NOT HAVE POLICE POWERS TO DEPRIVE RIGHTS BY

ACTS OF CONGRESS. I AGREE THAT THE CONSTITUTION PERMITS SOME REGULATION OF FIREARMS, BUT ONLY WHEN THEY ARE TRAVELING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND THE BUSINESSSES THAT MANUFACTURE, IMPORT, AND DEAL THEM BECAUSE ANY FURTHER REGULATORY OR PROHIBITIVE SCHEME WOULD EXTEND THE REACH OF JURISDICTION ACROSS THE BOUNDRY INTO THE "SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED" TERRITORY OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT WHILE POSSIBLY, SIMULTANEOUSLY VIOLATING THE TENTH AMENDMENT. CONGRESS DOES NOT HAVE GENERAL POLICE POWER DELEGATED TO IT, ONLY POWER TO REGULATE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY. MY ACTIVITIES WERE NON-ECONOMIC, NON-COMMERCIAL, AND PRIVATE, TWO STEPS BEYOND THE BOUNDRY AND OVER THE HORIZON. THAT SAME GOES FOR ANYONE ELSE WHO MAKES THEIR OWN MACHINEGUN OR ANY OTHER TYPE OF FIREARM. SO, UNDER WHAT POWER DOES CONGRESS HAVE TO TELL ME I CANNOT MAKE MY OWN MACHINEGUN? UNDER WHAT POWER DOES CONGRESS HAVE TO TELL ME I MUST REGISTER MY PRIVATE PROPERTY AND PAY TAXES ON THOSE NON-COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES? UNDER WHAT POWER CAN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ENFORCE LAW ON CITIZENS FOR THEIR PRIVATE ACTIVITIES WHEN THE LAW IS MEANT FOR BUSINESSES? IS THIS NOT TYRANNY? IF WE DO NOT AVAIL OURSELVES TO THE LAW, HOW CAN WE BE BOUND TO IT?

MERRIAM-WEBSTERS DICTIONARY OF LAW (2014) DEFINES "INFRINGE" AS: "TO ENCROACH UPON IN A WAY THAT VIOLATES LAW OR THE RIGHTS OF ANOTHER." ENCROACH IS DEFINED AS: "TO ENTER GRADUALLY OR STEALTHILY UPON ANOTHER'S PROPERTY OR RIGHTS." CONGRESS MIGHT BE ABUSING ITS COMMERCE CLAUSE POWER TO SIDESTEP AND GO AROUND THE SECOND AMENDMENT'S INSTRUCTION THAT RIGHTS SECURED ARE NOT TO BE INFRINGED OR ENCROACHED UPON. UTILIZING THE COMMERCE POWER TO REGULATE FIREARMS AND ~~THE~~ THEN APPLY §922(O) AS A POLICE POWER, OR THE EXECUTIVE ENFORCING IT AS IF IT WERE A POLICE POWER IS ENTERING "GRADUALLY OR STEALTHILY," AND CONSTITUTES A USURPATION OF POWER. RIGHT NOW, THE GOVERNMENT WISHES TO PROSECUTE ME UNDER ACTS INTENDING TO TAX AND REGULATE BUSINESSES AND COMMERCE, AND ARE TREATING THEIR PROVISIONS AS POLICE POWERS, WHICH ONLY THE STATES HAVE.

THE PURPOSE OF THE GUN CONTROL ACT (18 USC §§ 921 et seq.)

CONGRESS MADE A DECLARATION IN SECTION 101 OF THE GUN CONTROL

ACT OF 1968, PUBLIC LAW 90-618, WHICH PROVIDES :

"THE CONGRESS HEREBY DECLARES THAT THE PURPOSE OF THIS TITLE IS TO PROVIDE SUPPORT TO FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS IN THEIR FIGHT AGAINST CRIME AND VIOLENCE, AND IT IS NOT THE PURPOSE OF THIS TITLE TO PLACE ANY UNDUE OR UNNECESSARY FEDERAL RESTRICTIONS OR BURDENS ON LAW ABIDING CITIZENS WITH RESPECT TO THE ACQUISITION, POSSESSION, OR USE OF FIREARMS APPROPRIATE TO THE PURPOSE OF HUNTING, TRAPSHOOTING, TARGET SHOOTING, PERSONAL PROTECTION, OR ANY OTHER LAWFUL ACTIVITY, AND THAT THIS TITLE IS NOT INTENDED TO DISCOURAGE OR ELIMINATE THE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OR USE OF FIREARMS BY LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS FOR LAWFUL PURPOSES, OR PROVIDE FOR THE IMPOSITION ~~OF~~ BY FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF ANY PROCEDURES OR REQUIREMENTS OTHER THAN THOSE REASONABLY NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT AND EFFECTUATE THE PROVISIONS OF THIS TITLE."

SO THERE YOU HAVE IT, CONGRESS SAID THE ACT DOES NOT "ELIMINATE ~~OF~~ THE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP" OF FIREARMS AND I PRIVATELY MADE, OWNED, AND USED MY MACHINEGUN FOR LAWFUL PURPOSES, YET THE GOVERNMENT IS TRYING TO TELL US THAT §922 (O) ELIMINATED THE PRIVATE POSSESSION OF MACHINEGUNS MADE AFTER 1986, EVEN THOUGH CONGRESS SAID OTHERWISE. DID CONGRESS ELIMINATE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP WITH §922 (O), OR DID THEY ONLY TELL LICENSED MANUFACTURERS, DEALERS, AND IMPORTERS THAT THEY COULD NO LONGER MANUFACTURE, IMPORT, AND DEAL MACHINEGUNS UNLESS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT? I MADE A DECLARATION TO THE COURT ~~EXPLAINING~~ EXPLAINING MY LAWFUL INTENTIONS FOR MAKING AND USING MY RIFLE, WHICH ARE IN KEEPING WITH EXACTLY WHAT CONGRESS DECLARED THE GUN CONTROL ACT WAS NOT INTENDED TO INTERFERE WITH. I AM A LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN HAVING NEVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY CRIME AND WAS USING MY FIREARM FOR LAWFUL PURPOSES, MAINLY FOR TARGET SHOOTING AND PERSONAL PROTECTION. MY ACQUISITION OF MY RIFLE WAS NOT THROUGH COMMERCE AS I MADE IT MYSELF AND MY OWNERSHIP OF ~~THE~~ MY PROPERTY WAS PRIVATE. SECTION 922(O) AS THE GOVERNMENT IS

TRYING TO APPLY IT - AS A POLICE POWER - ELIMINATES MY PRIVATE OWNERSHIP, WHICH IS EXACTLY WHAT CONGRESS CANNOT DO AND DECLARED IT WAS NOT INTENDING TO DO. "STATUTES CRIMINALIZING THE POSSESSION, TRANSFER, AND MAKING OF MACHINEGUNS ARE MERELY MALUM PROHIBITUM LAWS. IN CONTRAST TO RAPE, MURDER, AND ROBBERY, SUCH GUN RELATED ACTIVITIES ARE NOT INHERENTLY BAD; THEY ARE ONLY TECHNICALLY OR ARTIFICIALLY ILLEGAL. COURTS, HOWEVER, MUST DEFER TO CONGRESS WHEN IT LEGISLATES PURSUANT TO ITS ENUMERATED POWERS." ARDIN, 19 F.3d at 186 n. 25, (EMPHASIS ADDED).

WELL, COURTS MUST DEFER TO CONGRESS AND CONGRESS SAID THEY ARE NOT ELIMINATING PRIVATE POSSESSION OF FIREARMS, THAT INCLUDES MACHINEGUNS AND ANY OTHER TYPE OF FIREARM. IF THE COURTS DETERMINE THAT §922(O) IS NOT A STATUTE ENACTED AND ENFORCED UNDER A POLICE POWER, THEN IT MUST BE A COMMERCE POWER, BUT HOW CAN IT BE APPLIED TO ME, OR ANYONE, WHEN WE DIDN'T/IF WE DON'T PARTICIPATE IN COMMERCE? WHEN I SAY "PARTICIPATE IN COMMERCE," JUST TO CLARIFY, I'M TALKING ABOUT BUYING FIREARMS AS A WHOLE GUNS, NOT PARTS OR MATERIALS, BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THE LAW COVERS.

THERE ARE MANY CASES THAT ALSO SAY WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THE ACT IS. "PRINCIPAL PURPOSE OF THE ~~THE~~ GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968, 18 USC §921 et seq., IS TO CURB CRIME BY KEEPING FIREARMS OUT OF THE HANDS OF THOSE NOT LEGALLY ENTITLED TO POSSESS THEM BECAUSE OF AGE, CRIMINAL BACKGROUND, OR INCOMPETENCY AND TO CHANNEL COMMERCE IN FIREARMS THROUGH FEDERALLY LICENSED IMPORTERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND DEALERS IN AN ATTEMPT TO HALT MAIL-ORDER AND INTERSTATE TRAFFIC IN FIREARMS." HUDDLESTON v. UNITED STATES (1974) 415 US 814, 39 L ED 2d 782, 94 S. CT. 1262.

"~~PRINCIPLE~~ PRINCIPAL PURPOSE OF 18 USC §922 WAS TO MAKE IT POSSIBLE TO KEEP FIREARMS OUT OF THE HANDS OF THOSE NOT LEGALLY ENTITLED TO POSSESS THEM BECAUSE OF AGE, CRIMINAL BACKGROUND OR INCOMPETENCY." BARRETT v. UNITED STATES (1976) 423 US 212, 46 L Ed 2d 450, 96 S. CT. 498. "PURPOSE OF CONGRESS IN ENACTING GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968, 18 USC §§921 et seq., IS TO ELIMINATE FIREARMS FROM THE HANDS OF CRIMINALS WHILE INTERFERING AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE WITH LAW ABIDING CITIZENS." UNITED STATES

v. WEATHERFORD (1972, CA7 Ill) 471 F.2d 47, cert den (1973) 411 US 972,
 36 L Ed 2d 695, 93 S. Ct. 2144. "IN ENACTING GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968,
 CONGRESS INTENDED TO REGULATE ALL BUSINESSES ENGAGED IN IMPORTING,
 DEALING, AND MANUFACTURING FIREARMS CONCERNING INTERSTATE AS WELL AS
~~INTER~~ INTRASTATE TRANSACTIONS SO AS TO ASSIST STATES EFFECTIVELY TO
 REGULATE FIREARMS TRAFFIC WITHIN THEIR BORDERS." UNITED STATES v.
 PETTRUCI (1973, CA9 Cal) 486 F.2d 329, cert den (1974) 416 US 937,
 40 L Ed 2d 287, 94 S. Ct. 1937, (EMPHASIS ADDED). I WAS NOT A
 BUSINESS, NOR WAS I ENGAGED IN ANY COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS, NOR
 WAS I PARTICIPATING IN COMMERCE BY THE PURCHASE (A TRANSACTION) OF
 A FIREARM FROM ANY BUSINESS WHERE IT WOULD BE COVERED BY THE
 ACTS. I AM NOT "UNDER" THESE LAWS AND NEITHER ARE YOU IF YOU
 MAKE YOUR OWN FIREARMS, LIKE I DID. "GUN CONTROL ACT, 18 USC
 § 921 et seq., WAS INTENDED TO BE BROAD MEASURE TO CORRECT WIDESPREAD
 ABUSES IN TRAFFIC IN FIREARMS." UNITED STATES v. SWINTON (1975, CA10 Kan)
 529 F.2d 1255, 33 ALR Fed 937, cert den (1976) 424 US 918, 47 L Ed 2d
 324, 96 S. Ct. 1121. "18 USC § 922 IS INTENDED TO DRY UP SUPPLY OF 'CRIME
 GUNS' COMPLETELY FOR FELON." UNITED STATES v. HADDAD (1977, CA9 Cal)
 558 F.2d 968. "PURPOSE OF GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968 IS TO LIMIT
 POSSESSION OF FIREARMS TO THOSE PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE AND LAW
 ABIDING." BARKER v. UNITED STATES (1978, CA10 Kan) 579 F.2d 1219,
 "PURPOSE OF 18 USC § 922(h) IS TO ELIMINATE SUPPLY OF FIREARMS AVAILABLE
 TO FELONS THROUGH INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE." UNITED STATES v.
 RIVERA (1979, DC Conn) 467 F Supp 37. "PURPOSE OF ~~THE~~ GUN CONTROL ACT
 OF 1968 IS TO STRENGTHEN FEDERAL~~LY~~ CONTROLS OVER INTERSTATE AND
 FOREIGN COMMERCE IN FIREARMS AND TO ASSIST STATES EFFECTIVELY TO
 REGULATE FIREARMS WITHIN THEIR BORDERS." UNITED STATES v. BUSIC
 (1/5/78, CA3) 22 Cr L 2443. "FEDERAL REGULATION OF INTRASTATE SALES
 OF FIREARMS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE UNCONSTITUTIONAL USURPATION OF STATE
 POWERS, SINCE THE TRANSACTIONS ENCOMPASSED THEREIN INVOLVE LICENSED
 DEALERS WHOSE GENERAL INVOLVEMENT WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE IS
 SUBSTANTIAL." UNITED STATES v. CRANDALL (1972, CA1 Me) 453 F.2d
 1216 (EMPHASIS ADDED). ~~THE~~ "SUBSECTION OF 18 USC § 922, AS AMENDED,
 WHICH CRIMINALIZES CERTAIN ACTIVITIES 'AFFECTING COMMERCE' ARE
 JURISDICTIONAL WORDS OF ART, AND SUBSECTION REACHES ONLY THOSE
 FIREARMS THAT TRAVEL IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE." UNITED STATES v.

WALLACE (1989, CAS Tex) 889 F.2d 580 (EMPHASIS ADDED). UPON READING THE ENTRE ACT, THE INTENT OF CONGRESS, AND CASES INVOLVING THE G.C.A., ONE CAN DETERMINE THAT IT PERTAINS TO PEOPLE AND BUSINESSES ENGAGED IN COMMERCE AND APPLIES ONLY TO FIREARMS THAT TRAVEL IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE BETWEEN THOSE LICENSED MANUFACTURERS AND IMPORTERS, AND THE DEALERS OF THEIR FIREARMS. OTHERWISE, CONGRESS IS WITHOUT JURISDICTION. FIREARMS IN PRIVATE POSSESSION ARE NO LONGER PRODUCTS FLOATING DOWN THE COMMERCE STREAM.

THE GOVERNMENT MAY CONTEND, AND MANY OTHER PEOPLE, THAT EVEN MAKING A ONE-TIME SALE OF A RIFLE (YOUR PRIVATE PROPERTY) CONSTITUTES COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY. HOWEVER, A DEALER IS WHO THE LAW APPLIES TO AND IS DEFINED IN THE STATUTES AND CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, AND ONE-TIME, OR PERIODICAL SALES, OF PRIVATE PROPERTY DOES NOT MAKE US A DEALER AS DEFINED, THUS IT DOESN'T SATISFY THE ELEMENTS OF ANY CRIME. THE TERM "TRANSFER" IN THE G.C.A. AND N.F.A. ONLY APPLIES TO DEALERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND IMPORTERS WHO "TRANSFER" POSSESSION OF THEIR "BUSINESS INVENTORIES" IN INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COMMERCE AND ARE LICENSED UNDER THE LAW TO DO SO. "UNDER FEDERAL LAW, INDIVIDUALS MAY NOT DEAL IN FIREARMS WITHOUT FIRST RECEIVING A LICENSE. INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT LICENSES MAY MAKE PERIODIC SALES OF FIREARMS FROM THEIR PERSONAL COLLECTIONS, ALTHOUGH THEY MAY NOT ENGAGE IN THE REGULAR COURSE OF BUSINESS OF DEALING FIREARMS FOR PROFIT. WHEN A PURCHASER BUYS A FIREARM FROM A LAWFULLY LICENSED DEALER, BOTH ~~ARE~~ THE DEALER AND THE BUYER MUST RECORD THE TRANSACTION WITH A BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES FORM 4473, A TRANSACTION RECORD FORM THAT DEALERS ARE REQUIRED BY LAW TO KEEP... FEDERAL LAW (THE G.C.A. AND N.F.A.) REQUIRES LICENSED DEALERS TO MAINTAIN 'ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION' RECORD BOOKS, WHICH ARE ALSO USED TO RECORD INFORMATION ABOUT TRANSACTIONS." UNITED STATES V. SHIPLEY (2013, CAS) 546 Fed. Appx. 450, (EMPHASIS ADDED). AS YOU CAN READ IN THAT CASE, THE ONLY TIME TRANSACTIONS HAVE TO BE RECORDED IS WHEN SOMEONE BUYS A GUN FROM A LICENSED DEALER AND THE RECORDS OF SUCH MUST BE KEPT BY THE DEALER. THE LAW DOESN'T, AND CANNOT, SAY THAT PRIVATE CITIZENS HAVE TO DO RECORDS OF TRANSFERS, BECAUSE CONGRESS IS

WITHOUT CONSTITUTIONAL DELEGATION OF POWER TO WRITE SUCH LAW AND ONLY CONGRESS WRITES THE LAW. UNDER THE LAW, LICENSED MANUFACTURERS AND LICENSED IMPORTERS ARE REQUIRED TO SERIALIZE THEIR MANUFACTURED AND IMPORTED FIREARMS. SINCE I AM NOT A LICENSED MANUFACTURER OR IMPORTER, I WAS NOT REQUIRED BY LAW TO SERIALIZE MY AR-15 WHEN I MADE IT. ONLY LICENSED DEALERS AND PURCHASERS ARE REQUIRED TO RECORD THEIR TRANSACTIONS/TRANSFERS, BUT I AM NOT ~~A~~ LICENSED SO I WAS/AM NOT REQUIRED TO RECORD ANY TRANSACTIONS NOR COULD I SINCE MY RIFLE IS NOT ~~SERIALIZED~~ SERIALIZED AND BECAUSE I WAS PART OF MY PERSONAL COLLECTION. IF I WANTED TO SELL MY RIFLE, IT WOULD NOT BE TRANSFERING FROM A "BUSINESS INVENTORY" INTO A PRIVATE COLLECTION. 18 U.S.C. §923(C) - LICENSING - SAYS:

"UPON FILING OF A PROPER APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF THE PRESCRIBED FEE, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SHALL ISSUE TO A QUALIFIED APPLICANT THE APPROPRIATE LICENSE WHICH, SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHAPTER [CHAPTER 44 - FIREARMS, §§921 et seq.] AND OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF LAW [THE N.F.A.] SHALL ENTITLE THE LICENSEE TO TRANSPORT, SHIP, AND RECIEVE FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION COVERED BY SUCH LICENSE IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE DURING THE PERIOD STATED IN THE LICENSE." (EMPHASIS ADDED).

A PERSON ONLY BECOMES SUBJECT TO THE LAWS AFTER THEY GET THE LICENSE OR WHEN ENGAGING IN BUSINESS WITHOUT ONE. DO YOU SEE HOW THE STATUTE SAYS THERE ARE FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION "COVERED" BY THE LICENSE? "COVERED" FIREARMS ARE THOSE MADE AND IMPORTED BY LICENSED MANUFACTURERS AND LICENSED IMPORTERS, AND THEN DEALT BY THE LICENSED DEALERS. THESE "COVERED" FIREARMS ARE THE ONES REQUIRED TO BE SERIALIZED, AND REGISTERED IF THEY ARE OF THE TYPE DEFINED IN 26 USC §5845(a). IF THERE ARE "COVERED" FIREARMS, THERE MUST BE FIREARMS NOT COVERED. THOSE WOULD BE ONES YOU MAKE YOURSELF. WHEN §922(c) IS READ TO THE CONTEXT OF THE ENTIRE ACT AS IT SHOULD BE, IT TELLS THE LICENSED DEALERS, IMPORTERS, AND MANUFACTURERS THAT THEY CANNOT MAKE, DEAL, AND IMPORT MACHINEGUNS UNLESS IT IS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT AND THAT THEY - THE LICENSEES - AND ALL OTHER PERSONS CANNOT POSSESS ANY MACHINEGUN THAT WAS MADE FOR THE GOVERNMENT AFTER 1986 UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY LAW TO DO SO. MY RIFLE WAS NOT MADE BY A LICENSED MANUFACTURER

FOR THE GOVERNMENT SO THERE IS NOT ANY VIOLATION IN THAT WAY. I AM NOT A LICENSED MANUFACTURER WHO HAD MADE A MACHINEGUN NOT FOR THE GOVERNMENT, WHICH WOULD HAVE VIOLATED THE LAW BECAUSE ONLY LICENSED MANUFACTURERS CAN MAKE MACHINEGUNS FOR THE GOVERNMENT, NOT FOR THE CIVILIAN MARKET. §922(O) TELLS ONLY LICENSED DEALERS THAT THEY CANNOT TRANSFER MACHINEGUNS MADE AFTER 1986 TO CIVILIANS, ONLY TO THE GOVERNMENT. I AM NOT A LICENSED DEALER SO I CAN'T VIOLATE THAT LAW IF I WANT TO SELL MY PRIVATE PROPERTY TO SOMEONE.

THE PURPOSE OF THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT (26 USC §§ 5801 et seq.)

IN ENACTING THE N.F.A., CONGRESS "SOUGHT TO REGULATE THE SALE, TRANSFER, AND LICENSE OF MACHINEGUNS, SAWED-OFF SHOT GUNS, SAWED-OFF RIFLES, AND OTHER FIREARMS, OTHER THAN PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS, WHICH MAY BE CONCEALED ON THE PERSON, AND SILENCERS." H.R. REP. NO. 75-2457, at 1 (1938). "AS I UNDERSTAND, THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE BILL IS TO STOP GANGSTERS FROM GETTING HOLD OF MACHINEGUNS." STATEMENT OF REP. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR., 78 Cong. Rec. 11,400 (1934). "WHEN CONGRESS PASSED THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT [IN JUNE 1934] IMPOSING A TAX ON DEALERS IN FIREARMS AND ON THE TRAFFIC OF FIREARMS, THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF CONGRESS WAS WITHOUT QUESTION DIRECTED AT THE DILLINGERS, MA BARKERS, AND GANGSTERS WHO WERE PLAGUING THE COUNTRY WITH CRIMES OF VIOLENCE." MCKEE & CO. v. FIRST NAT. BANK OF SAN DIEGO, 265 F. Supp. 1 (C.D. Cal. 1967). "THE NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT AROSE FROM A MOTIVE TO PREVENT RACKETEERS, BANK ROBBERS, AND DESPERADOES FROM OBTAINING SAWED-OFF SHOTGUNS AND MACHINEGUNS TO RUN WILD IN CRIME AND TO ENABLE THE GOVERNMENT TO TRACE OWNERSHIP." UNITED STATES v. ADAMS, 11 F. Supp. 216, 218 (C.D. Fla. 1935). AT THE TIME IN THOSE DAYS, ONLY BLACKSMITHS AND MANUFACTURING COMPANIES WERE ABLE TO MAKE GUNS BECAUSE THE LIMITED TECHNOLOGY OF THE TIME AND KNOWLEDGE. THE AVERAGE CITIZENS DIDN'T HAVE THE MEANS AND EAZE TO MAKE ADVANCED WEAPONRY AT HOME LIKE WE DO TODAY. WHEN YOU BEGIN READING THE ACT AT THE BEGINING IN SECTION 5801, IT SAYS: "ON 1ST ENGAGING IN BUSINESS... EVERY IMPORTER, MANUFACTURER, AND DEALER IN FIREARMS SHALL PAY A SPECIAL (OCCUPATIONAL) TAX FOR EACH PLACE OF BUSINESS..." AND THEN YOU MOVE TO THE NEXT SECTION, 5802, AND IT SAYS: "ON FIRST ENGAGING IN BUSINESS... EACH IMPORTER, MANUFACTURER, AND DEALER IN FIREARMS SHALL REGISTER..."

IN WHICH SUCH BUSINESS IS TO BE CARRIED ON... EACH LOCATION... WHERE HE WILL CONDUCT SUCH BUSINESS." WHEN A PERSON REGISTERS HIS BUSINESS, HE SHALL RECEIVE "THE APPROPRIATE LICENSE WHICH, SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHAPTER AND OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF LAW, SHALL ENTITLE THE LICENSEE TO..." MANUFACTURE, IMPORT, AND DEAL FIREARMS. THE APPROPRIATE LICENSE BEING A CLASS 1, 2, OR 3 UNDER C.F.R. §479.32(b). THEN AFTER §5802, THE PROCEEDING SECTIONS ARE WHAT A PERSON ENGAGING IN BUSINESS AND LICENSED TO DO SO MUST OBEY. THIS IS THE CONTEXT THAT MUST BE APPLIED. AT THE TIME THE N.F.A. WAS WRITTEN, THERE WERE ONLY BUSINESSES MANUFACTURING MACHINEGUNS AND THE LAW ONLY ADDRESSES THEM, REQUIRING SERIAL NUMBERS FOR REGISTRATIONS AND TRACING PURPOSES, AND TO AID TAXATION OF THE MANUFACTURING AND DEALING TRANSACTIONS THAT CONSTITUTE THE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES THAT CONGRESS HAS JURISDICTION TO TAX AND REGULATE. WHAT PEOPLE DO PRIVATELY AND NON-COMMERCIALLY DOES NOT GIVE ~~B~~ CONGRESS COMMERCE CLAUSE JURISDICTION, OR POLICE POWER JURISDICTION, OR "NECESSARY AND PROPER" CLAUSE JURISDICTION.

CONTEXT

ONE SHOULD NOT READ A SINGLE SUBSECTION OF A SECTION OF AN ACT AND ATTEMPT TO APPLY IT IN ALL CASES, ACTIVITIES, OR CONDUCT AS MANY FEDERAL AGENTS AND THE COURTS DO IN PROSECUTING CITIZENS. "IN EXPOUNDING A STATUTE, WE ARE NOT... GUIDED BY A SINGLE SENTENCE OR MEMBER OF A SENTENCE, BUT LOOK TO THE PROVISION OF THE WHOLE LAW, AND ITS OBJECT AND POLICY." *PILOT LIFE INS. CO. v. DEDEAUX*, 481 US 41, 51, 95 L Ed 39, 107 S. Ct. 1549 (1987). "IN SO CONCLUDING WE DO NOTHING MORE OF COURSE, THAN FOLLOW THE CARDINAL RULE THAT A STATUTE IS TO BE READ AS A WHOLE, SEE *MASSACHUSETTS v. MORASH*, 490 US 107, 115, 104 L Ed 2d 98, 109 S. Ct. 1668 (1989), SINCE MEANING OF STATUTORY LANGUAGE, PLAIN OR NOT, DEPEND ON CONTEXT. SEE e.g. *SHELL OIL CO. v. IOWA DEPT. OF REVENUE*, 488 US 19, 26, 102 L Ed 2d 186, 109 S. Ct. 278 (1988). 'WORDS ARE NOT PEBBLES IN ALIEN JUXTAPOSITION; THEY HAVE ONLY A COMMUNAL EXISTENCE; AND NOT ONLY DOES THE MEANING OF EACH INTERPENETRATE THE OTHER, BUT ALL IN THEIR AGGREGATE TAKE THEIR PURPORT FROM THE

SETTING IN WHICH THEY ARE USED...¹ NLRB V. FEDERBUSH CO., 121 F.2d 954, 957 (CA2 1941) (L. HAND, J.) (QUOTED IN SHELL OIL, *Supra* at 25, n6).² KING V. ST. VINCENT'S HOSPITAL, 502 US 215, (EMPHASIS ADDED). THOSE WERE ALL SUPREME COURT CASE CITATIONS. WHEN A SUBSECTION LIKE §922(o) OR §5861(d) ARE READ OUT OF CONTEXT, THE GOVERNMENT CAN AND DOES MISCONSTRUE THEIR APPLICATION, APPLY POLICE POWERS NOT DELEGATED, AND VIOLATE A CITIZEN'S SECOND, FOURTH, AND FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AS WELL AS THE STATES' TENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

CONCLUSION

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS THERE HANDS TIED WHEN IT COMES TO THE SECOND AMENDMENT AND PRIVATELY OWNED FIREARMS. IF YOU MAKE YOUR OWN FIREARM, YOU CAN MAKE IT HOWEVER YOU WANT AND YOU DO NOT HAVE TO REGISTER IT OR GET THE TAX STAMP. FOR A FEW YEARS I'VE ARGUED WITH PEOPLE WHO SAID I CANT DO WHAT I DID AND I'VE ALWAYS SAID - OKAY, SHOW ME THE LAW. BUT NO ONE EVER HAS. IN THIS PAPER, I ~~HE~~ HAVE SHOWN YOU MOST OF THE LAW. THERE IS STILL MUCH MORE IN THE G.C.A. AND N.F.A., AND IN THE CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS PARTS 478 & 479, THAT COULD HELP EXPLAIN MY POSITION. EVERYTHING I DID WAS LEGAL. I HIDE NOTHING, NOR DID I HAVE TO TRY TO SNEAK AROUND TRYING TO BUY PARTS. MOST EVERYTHING WAS ORDERED AND SHIPPED RIGHT TO MY APARTMENT DOOR AND THE REST WAS BOUGHT OVER THE COUNTER AT MY FAVORITE LOCAL SHOP. NO TRICKS, NO SMOOTH MOVES. I DID IT BECAUSE I COULD DO IT. GO TO A DEALER AND TRY TO BUY AN SBR OR A SUPPRESSOR WITHOUT REGISTRATION AND TAX STAMP, YOU WONT BE ABLE TO BECAUSE YOU CAN'T. A DEALER CANNOT TRANSFER A REGISTERED FIREARM TO YOU WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH ALL THE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. BUT YOU COULD MAKE YOUR OWN AT HOME IF YOU GOT THE SKILLS AND ACCESS TO MACHINING EQUIPMENT, OR MAYBE SOMEONE TO HELP YOU. DON'T BE FOOLED BY THE ATF OR ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT OR LAW ~~ENFORCE~~ ENFORCEMENT. THEY DON'T STUDY ALL THE LAW, ESPECIALLY THE SUPREME LAW, TO WHICH THEY SWEAR AN OATH TO SUPPORT AND DEFEND. THEY DON'T WANT EVERYONE RUNNING AROUND WITH MACHINEGUNS, SBR'S, AND SUPPRESSORS THEY MADE AT HOME.