

In Defence of the Constitution of the United States.

The honorable Representatives.

Respect is earned not granted with a position of office. I respect the position of office, but not the person unless they fill that position respectfully.

Political office is a Representative position, not a leadership position. If a representative refuses to represent the people in support of the constitutional laws, the people have a right and obligation to remove that person from office. We the People are the government of the United States and we have the right and obligation to sustain and defend the Constitutional law of this land.

The Constitution of the United States is the “Supreme Law” of this land.

Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution reads: This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. This is what is known as the “Supremacy Clause.” It declares that only those laws and treaties made in pursuance of (i.e., in accordance with) the Constitution “shall be the supreme law of the land.” This clause draws a clear line between constitutional and unconstitutional laws. Only constitutional laws (i.e., those that are in pursuance of the Constitution) are the supreme law of the land, as opposed to unconstitutional laws (i.e., those that are not in pursuance of the Constitution), which are not the supreme law of the land.

Keep in mind any laws you choose to make that are in violation of the supreme law of the Constitution of the United States are invalid, and as such the people nor other elected representatives of government positions are obligated to abide by them.

The bill SB 978 is completely unconstitutional. I need not address any particular parts of the bill. The bill has been passively disguised as seemingly harmless, with an amendment to follow which is 44 pages of the worst violation of our Second Amendment rights I have ever seen. The Second Amendment states: “...the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.” This bill would be a total infringement!

There is a communist takeover in progress here in America through the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) which has been underway since the early 1900's. For good insight on how this has come about see “The President Makers” by Don Fotheringham available at <https://www.freedomfirstsociety.org/>. Another great well documented resource on communism in America is “The Naked Communist” by: Cleon Skousen available at Amazon Kindle.

The United Nations is behind this push to disarm American citizens, as they are doing the same throughout the world.

MOSAIC 03.30:2015(E)V1.0

4.2 UN Programme of Action

In the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UN Programme of Action), all UN Member States commit

themselves

a) “To adopt and implement, in the States that have not already done so, the necessary legislative or other measures to establish as criminal offences under their domestic law the illegal [...] possession, stockpiling and trade of small arms and light weapons within their areas of jurisdiction, in order to ensure that those engaged in such activities can be prosecuted under appropriate national penal codes” (part II, paragraph 3);
(See attachment 1 for more on this document)

From The New American: “According to the text of the latest draft of the agreement, the PoA will serve as an “international instrument to enable states to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner” the small arms and light weapons that are the target of the scheme.

In practice, this means that the governments of member nations (including the United States) should create a massive, all-inclusive database of all parties that manufacture, own, sell, trade, or transfer arms and ammunition.”

The program states “To assist member states in the implementation of the disarmament and stockpiling of the prohibited small weapons and light arms in the hands of anyone other than approved government entities, the PoA places the enforcement of the provisions “into the operational activities of United Nations peacekeeping missions.”

In other words, should the Congress and the president fail to begin seizing and stockpiling privately owned weapons “in a timely manner,” then the UN will deploy blue-helmeted peacekeeping troops to assist in the operation.”

(See attachment 2 for full article)

Do we really want foreign troops on our land taking away the only defense we have left against communist takeover!!!

The communists cannot be trusted, they lie, or cheat to get what they want!

From The Daily Signal: “To Promote Gun Control the UN Changes the Rules”.

(See attachment 3 for full article)

And I would add the UN is run by communists, the US and Israel are the only 2 countries involved who voted against this PoA movement.

There are some representatives who knowingly are pursuing the agenda of this takeover, they have connections and the financial support of George Soros, Michael Bloomberg, and others within the CFR. Others are mere pawns in the game blindly following the so called progressive, or civil justice movements, not knowing the real forces behind the overthrow of our constitution and republic, and blinded to the devastating results a socialization of America would have on their freedoms.

We are a Republic for a reason. In our republic the Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Law of the land. We are not a democracy; majority ruled democracies always turn into tyrannical forms of communism where the laws can be changed at any time by the ruling elitists. Democratic majority rule has always failed. We see examples of this failure all over the world.

I am calling upon every representative of this Committee to vote against this bill SB 978 as it is an out right violation of our Constitution and places in jeopardy the freedoms of every american within this State of Oregon and this Nation.

Should you choose in favor of this bill We the People of this Constitutional Republic of America are obligated to remove you from office, by vote or whatever means necessary, out of defense for our freedoms, our families and our freedom of religion.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Smith

Monday, 02 July 2018

U.S. Promises "Full Implementation" of UN Gun-control Agreement

Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#)

Tweet

Share

Like 4.8K

June 29

marked the end of the Third Review Conference (RevCon) of the United Nations' Programme of Action (PoA) on Small Arms and Light Weapons. Delegates at the conference, including representatives of the United States, worked on producing updates to the global gun-control agreement.



According to the text of the latest draft of the agreement, the PoA will serve as an "international instrument to enable states to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner" the small arms and light weapons that are the target of the scheme.

In practice, this means that the governments of member nations (including the United States) should create a massive, all-inclusive database of all parties that manufacture, own, sell, trade, or transfer arms and ammunition.

If recent history is a reliable indicator of how such data would be used, after the catalog is complete, Congress could, hypothetically, pass a law (or the president would issue an executive order) compelling "voluntary" surrender of whatever privately-owned weapons, ammo, parts, and components (including reloading equipment) the UN deems "illicit." If, after a statutorily set window, citizens don't turn in these now-illicit items to their local law enforcement, then officers will be sent to remind violators of their responsibility under the law to disarm.

The delegates — including those from the United States — present at the PoA planning meeting have agreed to begin developing domestic legal frameworks that will provide for the "proper management of small arms and light weapons stockpiles."

To assist member states in the implementation of the disarmament and stockpiling of the prohibited small weapons and light arms in the hands of anyone other than approved government entities, the PoA places the enforcement of the provisions "into the operational activities of United Nations peacekeeping missions."

In other words, should the Congress and the president fail to begin seizing and stockpiling privately owned weapons "in a timely manner," then the UN will deploy blue-helmeted

peacekeeping troops to assist in the operation.

Regarding the implementation of the PoA at the national level, the **final draft of the report** of the latest RevCon lists six points to which all member states agreed to advance within their respective domestic governments. Here are those six commitments, taken directly from the document:

1. To establish or strengthen national laws, regulations and administrative procedures in support of the full and effective implementation of the Programme of Action.
2. To strengthen coordinated national approaches for the implementation of the Programme of Action, including, as appropriate, the establishment or designation of national coordination agencies or bodies involving relevant government agencies, including those responsible for law enforcement, border control and export and import licensing.
3. To promote the full participation and representation of women in mechanisms relating to the implementation of the Programme of Action and to encourage strong cooperation with civil society, parliamentarians, industry and the private sector.
4. To establish or designate a national point of contact to act as a liaison between States on matters relating to the implementation of the Programme of Action; and to share and update this information regularly; and to provide the point of contact with the necessary means to carry out its role.
5. To encourage the development and implementation of national action plans or other national policies in support of the implementation of the Programme of Action by making better use of existing information to improve the measurement of progress and to coordinate the development and implementation of such plans or policies, as appropriate, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, including those from civil society and industry, with those relevant to target 16.4 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and to the relevant United Nations resolution on women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.
6. To significantly reduce the illicit flows of small arms and light weapons, as appropriate, through illicit weapons recovery and voluntary surrender programmes.

Anyone with even the most cursory constitutional education will be able to identify several significant problems present in this list of commitments, a list to which the United States has agreed.

First, in order to legally comply with the goal of "full and effective implementation of the Programme of Action," the Second Amendment to the Constitution would have to be repealed. That critical provision of the Bill of Rights explicitly forbids the federal government from infringing whatsoever on the right of the people to keep and bear arms. The Programme of Action, on the other hand, requires that member states do all they can to not only infringe on the right to keep and bear certain arms the UN doesn't approve of, but on the right to buy, sell, and trade them (and the ammunition that makes them effectual), too.

Second, the agreement would require the repeal of the 10th Amendment, as it would place state governments, as well as state and local law enforcement, subject to federal and international agencies tasked with licensing weapons and controlling international borders. Placing the state governments and their resources at the mercy of the federal and international governing bodies would turn the Constitution upside down and would violate the anti-commandeering principle which holds that the federal government cannot coerce states into participating in federal programs.

Third, the appointment of a "liaison" between the federal government and the United Nations would be an extra-constitutional act that would result in the endowment of an unelected person with the "necessary means to carry out" the Programme of Action in the United States. One wonders how liberally the globocrats and the homegrown gun-grabbers would define the phrase "necessary means" in order to accomplish their shared goal of seizing weapons and ammunition from civilians.

Could this liaison call upon the General Assembly or the Security Council to send UN "peacekeepers" into the territory of one of the sovereign states of the American union charged with assisting law enforcement with the mandated registration and eventual seizure of all light weapons? While this seems far-fetched, is it really outside the realm of possibility for some future date?

Next, the Programme of Action calls for the domestic implementation of some system capable of using "existing information to improve the measurement of progress" of the full implementation of the Programme of Action, including disarmament and the control of all sale, purchase, and trade of disapproved firearms.

How, do you imagine, would the progress of implementation be measured? By means of a compulsory national firearm registration? By means of tracking the manufacture and sale of ammunition from factory to end-user? Yes.

If you doubt it, consider this paragraph from the PoA agreement: "To take advantage of the opportunities that new technologies, when available, can offer for enhanced small arms and light weapons stockpile management and security, including through improved marking and record-keeping, and for the destruction of surplus small arms and light weapons that have been designated for destruction."

Finally, there are many, many more patently unconstitutional provisions of the UN's Programme of Action and the United States, in order to protect the Second Amendment, must refuse to negotiate with those who would see Americans disarmed and vulnerable to rule by the global plutocrats.

Right now, that seems unlikely though, as the "Working Paper Submitted by the United States" declares that "Implementation [of the PoA] must remain priority #1" and that "the United States continues to support full implementation of the PoA at the global, regional, and national levels."

Perhaps Americans who oppose eventual disarmament by the UN and the participation of our government in that betrayal should contact President Trump and encourage him to get the United States out of the UN.



Please review our [Comment Policy](#) before posting a comment



To Promote Gun Control, the UN Changes the Rules

Ted Bromund / July 10, 2018

In the last two weeks of June, the United Nations held another review conference on its efforts to counter what it considers illicit dealing in small arms. The U.S. played the game well. But unfortunately, you can't beat a cheater.

In theory, this U.N. program might be a modestly useful way to promote cooperation against the illicit international trade in small arms.

In practice, as even the world body has agreed, it does nothing very useful, mostly because most nations at the U.N. are too incompetent, or too ill-willed, to follow through on their commitments.

In 2001, the U.N. began what it calls the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat, and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Participants mercifully abbreviate this program as the PoA.

The real point of the PoA isn't to do useful things, which is why I've called for the U.S. to quit it. The program exists to virtue-signal, to provide funds for the nongovernmental organizations that cluster around it, and to allow U.N. delegations to spend a pleasant week or two in New York City every couple of years.

As one delegation put it, the point of the PoA is to keep the party going.

And, by the by, it's there to serve as a melting pot for every bad, ill-informed, and impractical idea that anyone has about firearms. Those behind it hope that the U.N. program someday will be accepted as the basis for how to implement any treaty that mentions small arms. In other words, they hope to use it as a way to lever all their bad ideas into legally binding form.

Although the U.S. has participated in the PoA since 2001, it has done so on the basis of strict red lines set out by John Bolton, then serving as a State Department undersecretary and now President Donald Trump's national security adviser.

One of these red lines was that ammunition was to be kept out of the U.N. program on small arms. Participants discussed ammunition in 2001, and agreed that trying to number, trace, and record bullets—which is what we do with firearms—was wildly impractical.

But that didn't stop the activists. By 2018, as I warned in May, the demand to include ammunition in the program was front and center. And by the end of the third review conference, on June 29, the activists had won a partial victory. Here's how.

The PoA usually has been conducted on the basis of consensus. That means that, normally, participants don't hold votes. Instead, negotiations continue until everyone agrees—or, at least, until no one disagrees—with the final “outcome document.”

By the early hours of June 30, the U.S. delegation was still refusing to bow to the will of the overwhelming majority and allow any substantial mention of ammunition. U.S. negotiators were willing, as I foreshadowed in May, to acknowledge the existence of a U.N. General Assembly process on surplus ammunition stockpiles, but that was all.

So the process, by U.S. request, went to votes on the two paragraphs in question. The U.S. and Israel voted against both times, and 62 (and then 63) other nations—from the Third World and Latin America—voted in favor. The U.S. and Israeli objections should have killed the paragraphs, but didn't.

Instead, the PoA, under its French chairman, simply kept the paragraphs in. Madagascar then called for a vote on the entire outcome document, which was adopted. And that was that.

This procedure was wrong in at least three ways. First, the review conference's authority expired at midnight June 29, but final votes were not taken until June 30. Second, it appears that the chairman never called the conference back into formal session. And third, of course, the paragraphs on ammunition should have been knocked out by the U.S. objection.

The paragraphs themselves are not unbearably toxic. They acknowledge the U.N. General Assembly surplus ammunition process, and that nations applying the PoA to ammunition may proceed on that basis. The problem, now that “ammunition” has been recognized as being in any way part of the program, is that the next PoA meeting will crack the door open a little wider.

I can promise that including ammunition in this way—or in any other—will have absolutely no impact on the illicit trade in small arms. The inevitable plea offered as the reason for including ammunition is that guns don't work without it.

But it's just as true that ammo doesn't work without guns, and guns are a lot easier to number and trace. Since most PoA members can't even manage to do that, the idea that they'll be able to cope with tracing ammo beggars belief.

The nations that wanted ammunition in the program are celebrating now. But in time, this minor win will look a lot less shiny.

The U.S. has shown, first of all, that it is prepared to push for votes, even if it knows it will lose, which gives us leverage. Most nations—as shown by the fact that only 63 nations voted against us—are not comfortable with contested votes in a process that's supposed to be based on consensus.

But as far as the PoA goes, this should be the breaking point. The U.S. does almost all the real, hard work of running traces on firearms, providing technical expertise, and giving aid to upgrade foreign record-keeping. Without us, the program may exist in theory, but it will not exist in practice.

The quid pro quo for America was that the PoA respected our red lines. But if we are going to do most of the work and get no respect for it, there is no reason for us to participate.

We also believed that the program was based on consensus, and that, if we showed up, we could at least keep bad things out of it. As that has turned out to be false, there is no reason for us to show up in the future.

All of this has a bad and familiar ring to it. Back in 2013, the U.S. participated in negotiation of the Arms Trade Treaty on the basis of consensus. But when push came to shove, the U.S. ended up supporting adoption of the treaty on the basis of majority rule.

That was a bad precedent to set, even if the PoA unfolded more or less independently. The biggest lesson we have learned is that promises of a consensus-based outcome in the U.N. are meaningless. Those promises provide no protection for U.S. interests.

The U.S. delegation to the review conference did a superb job. They could not have been any more stout. The U.N. simply changed the voting rules midstream. There is no way for the U.S. to recover from this, as every other nation (bar perhaps Israel) will proceed on the basis that ammunition is now in the PoA.

The only thing to do is to announce formally to U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres at the General Assembly next fall, and to the incoming program chairman, that the U.S. is quitting the PoA and will give it no further notice.

There is no point in trying to negotiate with a bunch of cheaters, especially when their idea of cooperation is making you do all the work.

Seventeen years ago, John Bolton set the red lines for U.S. participation in this U.N. program against small arms. One of those red lines now has been crossed. It's time for Bolton, as national security adviser, to enforce that line by taking the U.S. out of the program.

In Defence of the Constitution of the United States.

The honorable Representatives.

Respect is earned not granted with a position of office. I respect the position of office, but not the person unless they fill that position respectfully.

Political office is a Representative position, not a leadership position. If a representative refuses to represent the people in support of the constitutional laws, the people have a right and obligation to remove that person from office. We the People are the government of the United States and we have the right and obligation to sustain and defend the Constitutional law of this land.

The Constitution of the United States is the “Supreme Law” of this land.

Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution reads: This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. This is what is known as the “Supremacy Clause.” It declares that only those laws and treaties made in pursuance of (i.e., in accordance with) the Constitution “shall be the supreme law of the land.” This clause draws a clear line between constitutional and unconstitutional laws. Only constitutional laws (i.e., those that are in pursuance of the Constitution) are the supreme law of the land, as opposed to unconstitutional laws (i.e., those that are not in pursuance of the Constitution), which are not the supreme law of the land.

Keep in mind any laws you choose to make that are in violation of the supreme law of the Constitution of the United States are invalid, and as such the people nor other elected representatives of government positions are obligated to abide by them.

The bill SB 978 is completely unconstitutional. I need not address any particular parts of the bill. The bill has been passively disguised as seemingly harmless, with an amendment to follow which is 44 pages of the worst violation of our Second Amendment rights I have ever seen. The Second Amendment states: “...the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.” This bill would be a total infringement!

There is a communist takeover in progress here in America through the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) which has been underway since the early 1900's. For good insight on how this has come about see “The President Makers” by Don Fotheringham available at <https://www.freedomfirstsociety.org/>. Another great well documented resource on communism in America is “The Naked Communist” by: Cleon Skousen available at Amazon Kindle.

The United Nations is behind this push to disarm American citizens, as they are doing the same throughout the world.

MOSAIC 03.30:2015(E)V1.0

4.2 UN Programme of Action

In the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UN Programme of Action), all UN Member States commit

themselves

a) “To adopt and implement, in the States that have not already done so, the necessary legislative or other measures to establish as criminal offences under their domestic law the illegal [...] possession, stockpiling and trade of small arms and light weapons within their areas of jurisdiction, in order to ensure that those engaged in such activities can be prosecuted under appropriate national penal codes” (part II, paragraph 3);
(See attachment 1 for more on this document)

From The New American: “According to the text of the latest draft of the agreement, the PoA will serve as an “international instrument to enable states to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner” the small arms and light weapons that are the target of the scheme.

In practice, this means that the governments of member nations (including the United States) should create a massive, all-inclusive database of all parties that manufacture, own, sell, trade, or transfer arms and ammunition.”

The program states “To assist member states in the implementation of the disarmament and stockpiling of the prohibited small weapons and light arms in the hands of anyone other than approved government entities, the PoA places the enforcement of the provisions “into the operational activities of United Nations peacekeeping missions.”

In other words, should the Congress and the president fail to begin seizing and stockpiling privately owned weapons “in a timely manner,” then the UN will deploy blue-helmeted peacekeeping troops to assist in the operation.”

(See attachment 2 for full article)

Do we really want foreign troops on our land taking away the only defense we have left against communist takeover!!!

The communists cannot be trusted, they lie, or cheat to get what they want!

From The Daily Signal: “To Promote Gun Control the UN Changes the Rules”.

(See attachment 3 for full article)

And I would add the UN is run by communists, the US and Israel are the only 2 countries involved who voted against this PoA movement.

There are some representatives who knowingly are pursuing the agenda of this takeover, they have connections and the financial support of George Soros, Michael Bloomberg, and others within the CFR. Others are mere pawns in the game blindly following the so called progressive, or civil justice movements, not knowing the real forces behind the overthrow of our constitution and republic, and blinded to the devastating results a socialization of America would have on their freedoms.

We are a Republic for a reason. In our republic the Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Law of the land. We are not a democracy; majority ruled democracies always turn into tyrannical forms of communism where the laws can be changed at any time by the ruling elitists. Democratic majority rule has always failed. We see examples of this failure all over the world.

I am calling upon every representative of this Committee to vote against this bill SB 978 as it is an out right violation of our Constitution and places in jeopardy the freedoms of every american within this State of Oregon and this Nation.

Should you choose in favor of this bill We the People of this Constitutional Republic of America are obligated to remove you from office, by vote or whatever means necessary, out of defense for our freedoms, our families and our freedom of religion.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Smith

 [UN Small Arms MOSAIC-03.30-2015EV1.0.pdf](#)

 [New American U.S. Promises Full Implementation of UN Gun-control Agreement.pdf](#)

 [Daily Signal To Promote Gun Control, the UN Changes the Rules - The Daily Signal.pdf](#)