

# Glad Someone Finally Said “Enough”

As much as I appreciate sheriffs who refuse to enforce the latest blatant violation of the Constitution — so-called “red flag” legislation — I wonder where their courage to not do the wrong thing has been hiding until now.

Unconstitutional gun legislation — which includes every “law” concerning guns — has been enforced by those in these same offices since 1934. This newest violation isn’t worse than the others. This is an arbitrary, theatrical line-in-the-sand.

If they have ever arrested someone for carrying a concealed firearm without a license, or insisted a gun shop needs permission from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives before selling guns, then they’ve broken the law, which applies to their job by enforcing legislation that was illegal to impose or enforce.

If they would help arrest someone for mailing a gun, after selling it through an advertisement on the internet, to someone in another state who lacks the “proper license,” they have violated the Constitution in the exact same way they now say they won’t do.

If they would arrest someone for possessing or selling a fully automatic firearm without the government paperwork, they’re willing to violate the Constitution. As they are if they’d enforce the rules against shotguns with barrels declared “too short” or against safety equipment like suppressors (incorrectly called “silencers”).

How can anyone take these scofflaws at their word?

Even the Supreme Court ironically recognized the right to ignore unconstitutional “laws” — which they declared to not be laws at all — in the same ruling in which they unconstitutionally decided they have the final say on what the Constitution means: the *Marbury v. Madison* ruling in 1803.

Neither the Supreme Court nor anyone else associated with the federal government has the right to decide what the Constitution means.

The same is true of state officials deciding what the state constitution allows them to do to the people. This would make no sense. You can’t let someone decide how the rules that limit their job’s power will be applied or what they mean. It’s like letting the accused murderer dictate how his trial will be carried out and what evidence to allow.

Speaking of trials, the federal government won’t allow the Second Amendment to be used as an argument in favor of the accused when there is a “gun offense” in question — yet it is the only relevant factor.

I'm glad someone stood up and said "Enough!"

I'd be more impressed if they'd be consistent and stop breaking the law entirely.