

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Clearwater, Florida 33763

Dear Mr. Gailey,

Many years ago, we were surrounded at Bastogne, Belgium with only a small amount of ammunition remaining to defend ourselves. Patrick Henry's declaration was my choice then. If the muckrakers shilling for Clinton are successful in their task to completely destroy our judicial system, most likely at the age of 73 I will be forced to make that choice a second time!

6. WJ

Sincerely Yours,
[REDACTED]

Encl.: 1

Mr. Brian Lamb, C-Span

August 11, 1998

On April 11, at 10:50 your guest from the Handgun Control, Inc. completely misstated the historic facts concerning the purpose of the Second Amendment. His statement is contradicted by the Senate subcommittee report, "The Right to Keep and Bear Arms" dated February 1982. The report affirmed that the citizens right to bear arms is a protected right. His misstatements are also contradicted by the anti-federalist papers published by the University of Michigan and others. Perhaps in future discussions of the Second Amendment, you could have a copy of the report available as an arbitration tool.

The anti-federalist were responsible for the Bill of Rights Amendment to the Constitution. They would not ratify the Constitution without assurances the Constitution would be amended. On booknotes, perhaps you could review the life of George Mason. George Washington may have been the father of our country, but his neighbor, George Mason, was the grandfather!

Sincerely yours,
[REDACTED]

Mr. David Broder and Mr. Tim Russert,

Your April 3, 1998 article, "America needs a present president", as your usual practice, argues the orthodox federalist doctrine. You wrote, "Thomas Jefferson created the first popular-based party to combat Alexander Hamilton's and John Adams' Federalist-." Jefferson was not the founder of the Democratic-Republican party. He became the de facto head of the Democratic-Republican party. Jefferson was philosophically opposed to political parties. To be more precise, Hamilton founded the Federalist party to combat George Mason's republican doctrine first stated in 1775. George Mason's republican doctrine was based upon the political philosophy of John Locke. The federalist party, like a snake changing its skin, has assumed many party labels since its founding. It is presently personified by the democratic party with all of its patronage. To wit: the government labor union officials, the teachers union officials, the trade associations of the trial lawyers, organizations exploiting "women's" issues to promote the federalist agenda, but refuse to take a position on a case that jeopardized their party patronage. The most egregious, of the benefactors, is the ninety per cent of the working press that spew the political propaganda sired by the white house. The Federalist party doctrine has become so pervasive in our society that even members of the over the hill gang become federalist when they receive their monthly government stipend.

My education, even though I had three semesters of great books, contained little finite information characterizing the anti-federalist movement. All I remember is the Federalist, supported in time by the Federalist Papers, were the good guys. However, in fact, it was the anti-federalist such as, George Mason and Richard Henry Lee that demanded a Bill of Rights be amended to the Constitution. The Federalist would have relegated the Bill of Rights to state constitutions. The anti-federalist also demanded the Bill of Rights contain, which it does, the explicit right for each citizens to bear arms. The anti-federalist feared the central government's control of the state militias not an invasion by a foreign power.

Actual articles, written by of the anti-federalist, have been recently reprinted by the University of Michigan as well as other publishers. It is unfortunate the articles are largely ignored by our educational hierarchy. There is only one powerful political party in the United States. It is the old Federalist Party! I wish I could hear comments by the Federalist Hamilton explaining the propriety of the actions of a political party that within days of being elected discharged every U. S. Attorney in the United States? Especially since the newly appointed attorneys appear to prosecute opponents of the administration more diligently than members of the controlling political party. Representative McDermott being a case in point. Or criticizing Linda Tripp's taping of a conversation while applauding the cleverness of President Kennedy's secret taping of a cabinet meeting.

I heard such "enlightened" statements from our fourth estate as: Clinton's ratings are soaring; for the good of the country the investigation should end; Star, like other prosecutors should bend to the will of the society. I even heard one comment claiming that Lewinsky would be a martyr if she were to be indicted. I haven't heard such claptrap from the left since the Rosenbergs were executed. Both of you gentlemen are visible icons in the press. Pretend our country is still a republic. Instead of asserting that Clinton is politically immune from impeachment, citing a 67% rating from a misunderstood popularity poll. Are you advocating majority rule without minority consent? Why don't you examine the question. "How can 33% of the population be represented by a process that is going to decide guilt or innocence of a president on a dubious poll number?"

I addressed this letter to both Mr. Russert and Mr. Broder. After the Jonesboro tragedy, the first question Mr. Russert ask was, should gun control be expedited. Never mind that no local official in Jonesboro suggested additional gun control legislation. Why do most public forms, advocating government control of rifles, restrict their argument to the hunting aspect of weapons possession? The anti-federalist did not enact the right to bear arms amendment to protect hunting rights.* They argued that a disarmed populace has no defense against an unrestrained government (in modern times a political party; such as the Russian Communist Party, The German National Workers Socialist Party).

Empowering representatives of the states to elect a president was superseded by political party members. We, in effect, no longer elect an independent chief executive, but a chief executive officer who is the active head of a political party. The party payoff extends not only to elected officials, but as we have witnessed in recent weeks, the party machine serves many patrons, supra. It is quite apparent the federalist party has every intention of inflicting its will, without regard to the constitution, upon the minority. Such as, campaign "reform", banning the ownership of guns; legislatively denying aid to the Contras; tobacco taxes on one quarter of the population; excess taxes, in part as a sales tax in the guise of a corporate income tax. Of the eighty five anti federalist published papers, none foresaw the devastating consequence of a powerful political party upon representative government. If they had foreseen sixty years of control of the "peoples house" by a single political party, I am sure, the anti-federalist would have confirmed the Articles of Confederation and adjourned.

Perhaps, you should reserve accolades for Judge Wright until the Court of Appeals decides the case. Like it did in the Ollie North litigation. Or have you forgotten? As insurance, in the event the muckrakers assaulting Ken Star as shills for Clinton succeed completely in their task to destroy the judicial system, I am going to respect Patrick Henry's judicious reasoning and send a thirty five dollar check for membership to the National Rifle Association!

Sincerely yours [REDACTED]

April 10th 1998

"The great objective (second amendment) is that every man be armed. . . . Everyone who is able have a gun." Patrick Henry. The Right To Keep and Bear Arms. Report of the subcommittee on the Constitution of the committee on the judiciary United States Senate, 97th Congress, February 1982. The report affirmed the citizens right to bear arms is a protected right.