



*The Weimar Republic's well-intentioned gun registry became a tool for evil*

## How the Nazis Used Gun Control

By Stephen P. Halbrook

National Review - December 2, 2013

The perennial gun-control debate in America did not begin here. The same arguments for and against were made in the 1920s in the chaos of Germany's Weimar Republic, which opted for gun registration. Law-abiding persons complied with the law, but the Communists and Nazis committing acts of political violence did not.

In 1931, Weimar authorities discovered plans for a Nazi takeover in which Jews would be denied food and persons refusing to surrender their guns within 24 hours would be executed. They were written by Werner Best, a future Gestapo official. In reaction to such threats, the government authorized the registration of all firearms and the confiscation thereof, if required for "public safety." The interior minister warned that the records must not fall into the hands of any extremist group.

In 1933, the ultimate extremist group, led by Adolf Hitler, seized power and used the records to identify, disarm, and attack political opponents and Jews. Constitutional rights were suspended, and mass searches for and seizures of guns and dissident publications ensued. Police revoked gun licenses of Social Democrats and others who were not "politically reliable."

During the five years of repression that followed, society was "cleansed" by the National Socialist regime. Undesirables were placed in camps where labor made them "free," and normal rights of citizenship were taken from Jews. The Gestapo banned independent gun clubs and arrested their leaders. Gestapo counsel Werner Best issued a directive to the police forbidding issuance of firearm permits to Jews.

In 1938, Hitler signed a new Gun Control Act. Now that many "enemies of the state" had been removed from society, some restrictions could be slightly liberalized, especially for Nazi Party members. But Jews were prohibited from working in the firearms industry, and .22 caliber hollow-point ammunition was banned.

The time had come to launch a decisive blow to the Jewish community, to render it defenseless so that its "ill-gotten" property could be redistributed as an entitlement to the German "Volk." The German Jews were ordered to surrender all their weapons, and the police had the records on all who had registered them. Even those who gave up their weapons voluntarily were turned over to the Gestapo.

This took place in the weeks before what became known as the Night of the Broken Glass, or Kristallnacht, occurred in November 1938. That the Jews were disarmed before it, minimizing any risk of resistance, is the strongest evidence that the pogrom was planned in advance. An incident was needed to justify unleashing the attack.

That incident would be the shooting of a German diplomat in Paris by a teenage Polish Jew. Hitler directed propaganda minister Josef Goebbels to orchestrate the Night of the Broken Glass. This massive operation, allegedly conducted as a search for weapons, entailed the ransacking of homes and businesses, and the arson of synagogues. SS chief Heinrich Himmler decreed that 20 years be served in a concentration camp by any Jew possessing a firearm. Rusty revolvers and bayonets from the Great War were confiscated from Jewish veterans who had served with distinction. Twenty thousand Jewish men were thrown into concentration camps and had to pay ransoms to get released.

The U.S. media covered the above events. And when France fell to Nazi invasion in 1940, the New York Times reported that the French were deprived of rights such as free speech and firearm possession just as the Germans had been. Frenchmen who failed to surrender their firearms within 24 hours were subject to the death penalty.

No wonder that in 1941, just days before the Pearl Harbor attack, Congress reaffirmed Second Amendment rights and prohibited gun registration. In 1968, bills to register guns were debated, with opponents recalling the Nazi experience and supporters denying that the Nazis ever used registration records to confiscate guns. The bills were defeated, as every such proposal has been ever since, including recent "universal background check" bills.

As in Weimar Germany, some well-meaning people today advocate severe restrictions, including bans and registration, on gun ownership by law-abiding persons. Such proponents are in no sense "Nazis," any more than were the Weimar officials who promoted similar restrictions. And it would be a travesty to compare today's situation to the horrors of Nazi Germany.

**Still, as history teaches, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.**

<https://www.nationalreview.com/2013/12/how-nazis-used-gun-control-stephen-p-halbrook/>



# SO WHAT EXACTLY DOES HISTORY SHOW ABOUT GUN CONFISCATION?

The World Is Utterly Unprepared For What's About To Happen! Step One Has Been Complete, Step Two is Now Underway

*By Lisa Haven*

For years, secretly and behind closed doors, the United Nations has been gearing up for gun confiscation in the event of an economic collapse or disaster by hiring “disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration” officers who will be trained to seize guns from the civilian population. Not only that, but laws are being shoved through Congress that specifically restrict certain firearms, armor, ammo and the like. The Obama administration made it clear that their agenda was to disarm American patriots, just like Hitler, Stalin, Pot, and Mao did. We are headed for disaster:

“The most foolish mistake we could possibly make would be to allow the subject races to possess arms. History shows that all conquerors who have allowed their subject races to carry arms have prepared their own downfall by so doing. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that the supply of arms to the underdogs is a sine qua non for the overthrow of any sovereignty.” – Adolf Hitler

“To conquer a nation, first disarm its citizens.” — Adolf Hitler

“All political power comes from the barrel of a gun. The communist party must command all the guns, that way, no guns can ever be used to command the party.” – Mao Tse Tung

“If I could have banned them all – ‘Mr. and Mrs. America turn in your guns’ – I would have!” – Diane Feinstein

“We’re bending the law as far as we can to ban an entirely new class of guns.” – Rahm Emmanuel, senior advisor to Bill Clinton

“If the personal freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution inhibit the government’s ability to govern the people, we should look to limit those guarantees.” – President Bill Clinton, August 12, 1993

“We know that other countries, in response to one mass shooting, have been able to craft laws that almost eliminate mass shootings. Friends of ours, allies of ours — Great Britain, Australia, countries like ours. So we know there are ways to prevent it”. President Obama

“I don’t believe people should to be able to own guns.” – Barack Obama

## SO WHAT EXACTLY DOES HISTORY SHOW ABOUT GUN CONFISCATION?

1. In 1911 in Turkey guns were restricted and as a result one and a half million Armenians were unable to defend themselves and were ethnically cleaned by the government.
2. In 1929 the former Soviet Union established gun control and as a result Stalin’s government killed 40 million Soviets.
3. Hitler in Nazi Germany established his version of Gun control in 1938 where millions of Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, mentally ill, disabled, and eventually some of the “brown shirts” who worked for the government were killed.
4. In 1935 Communist China established gun control and 50 million political dissidents were arrested and killed.
5. In 1964 to 1981 Guatemala established gun control and 100,000 were killed.
6. In 1970 Uganda established gun control and from 1970-1979 300,000 Christians were killed by the dictatorial government.
7. In 1975-1977 Cambodia gun restriction laws prevented people from defending themselves against the tyrannical government who arrested and killed one million people.
8. In 1994 Rwanda disarmed the Tutsi people and being unable to defend themselves one million were executed.

**Therefore 70 million people died due to gun control!**

<http://themillenniumreport.com/2018/02/so-what-exactly-does-history-show-about-gun-confiscation/>



## Beto O'Rourke says he expects Americans to surrender their guns

by: CBS News Posted: Oct 25, 2019 / 06:58 PM EDT / Updated: Oct 25, 2019 / 06:58 PM EDT

Beto O'Rourke dismissed criticisms of his sweeping gun control proposal, telling CBS News in an interview Thursday night that he expects gun owners will go along with his plan to institute a "mandatory buyback" of high-powered rifles.

"If we're able to pass mandatory buybacks and I'm able to sign that into law, then I fully expect our fellow Americans to turn in their AR-15s and their AK-47s," the former Texas congressman said.

O'Rourke's "mandatory buyback" plan, which would force gun owners to surrender high-powered rifles like the AR-15 and the AK-47, has been criticized as impractical by other candidates in the race. South Bend Mayor Pete Buttigieg, for example, has said that O'Rourke's plan amounts to "confiscation."

Buttigieg and O'Rourke sparred over their gun views at the most recent Democratic debate earlier this month. Buttigieg, who backs more traditional gun control measures like universal background checks, dismissed O'Rourke's idea as a "purity test" and a "shiny object." In a jab back at Buttigieg, O'Rourke said that Democrats should not base their opinions on polling and what consultants say.

"I don't need lessons from you on courage — political or personal," Buttigieg, who was deployed to Afghanistan during his time in the Navy Reserve, responded.

When asked by CBS News about the gun activists who stood up for Buttigieg after the exchange, including former Congresswoman Gabby Giffords — who was shot in the head in 2011 — and Parkland shooting survivor David Hogg, O'Rourke praised the activists for their work before firing back at the South Bend mayor.

"You're bringing up a criticism that was made by the mayor of South Bend, Indiana, that trying to get AR-15s and AK-47s, weapons of war, off the streets, is pursuing a 'shiny object,'" O'Rourke told CBS News. "For me, for those who have experienced gun violence from these military style weapons, I think that's a slap in the face."

"It denies the experience that so many Americans have had, and the fear that so many live under that they, too, will be the victims of gun violence from one of these instruments of terror. So, regardless of the politics of this or how it polls or what other candidates are saying, I'm going to pursue the right thing because it's the right thing to do."

O'Rourke also said that the plan could be paid for with new taxes on the gun industry.

"I think that a mandatory buyback can be financed with a surcharge that would be paid by gun manufacturers," O'Rourke said. "Those who are making the AR-15s and AK-47s and continue to sell them into our communities despite the terror that they've inspired and the lives that they've taken. I think this is the right way to fund a mandatory buyback without imposing any new taxes on our fellow Americans."

And O'Rourke said that anyone who refuses to go along with his mandatory buyback, should it become law, will face "consequences."

"For anyone who does not [turn in their weapon] and is caught in possession or seen in possession of one of these weapons of war, one of these instruments of terror, that weapon will be taken from them and they will be fined, and if they should persist in continuing to use and to buy these weapons, then there will be other consequences in the criminal code."

<https://www.cbs17.com/news/beto-orourke-says-he-expects-americans-to-surrender-their-guns/>





## If Confiscating 'Assault Weapons' Is a Gimmick, So Is Banning Them

Beto O'Rourke's scheme would be an ineffectual attempt to enforce arbitrary distinctions.

Jacob Sullum | 10.23.2019 12:01 AM

Beto O'Rourke is taking flak from other Democratic presidential contenders for supporting mass confiscation of military-style rifles, a proposal several of them view as an impractical campaign gimmick. Although they are right about that, all the Democratic candidates are guilty of magical thinking on this issue, because they support an "assault weapon" ban that cannot reasonably be expected to have a measurable impact on gun violence.

"Hell, yes, we're going to take your AR-15," O'Rourke declared during last month's Democratic presidential debate. The former Texas congressman, whose campaign immediately started selling T-shirts emblazoned with that threat, clearly thinks it will appeal to Democratic primary voters.

But O'Rourke has not given much thought to how he would translate his slogan into reality. During last week's Democratic debate, CNN's Anderson Cooper asked O'Rourke how he would confiscate 16 million or so guns, since "you don't even know who has those weapons."

O'Rourke's response: "I expect my fellow Americans to follow the law." He repeated that line the next day, when CNN's Alisyn Camerota pressed him to explain how he would "get assault weapons away from people who don't want to give them up."

Camerota was incredulous. "You expect mass shooters to follow the law?" she asked. "Our fellow Americans will follow the law," he insisted. "Yes."

The experience of states that have mandated registration of "assault weapons" suggests otherwise. A year after New Jersey banned the possession of unregistered "assault weapons," a grand total of 18 had been surrendered or confiscated, out of an estimated 100,000 to 300,000 guns covered by the law.

California, New York, and Connecticut met with similar success when they required registration of "assault weapons" owned before those states banned them: Only a small minority of the targeted guns, ranging from 2 percent to 15 percent, were actually registered. Since O'Rourke wants to confiscate "assault weapons," and not merely register them, he can expect even wider defiance.

While Camerota was appropriately skeptical of O'Rourke's mandatory buyback plan, she nodded in agreement as he described the guns he wants to seize as "materially different" from handguns and hunting rifles because they fire at "a terrifying rate." O'Rourke also thinks so-called assault weapons are uniquely suitable for mass shootings because they fire "high-impact, high-velocity round[s]."

Neither of those claims is true. The characteristics that distinguish "assault weapons" from other guns—features like pistol grips, threaded barrels, barrel shrouds, and folding or adjustable stocks—have nothing to do with rate of fire, caliber, ammunition capacity, or muzzle velocity.

If you remove those prohibited features, you are left with a gun that is equally capable of quickly killing lots of people. Even former Vice President Joe Biden, who joins the other Democratic candidates in supporting a new federal law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of "assault weapons," concedes that the 1994 ban, which expired in 2004, had no impact on the lethal capacity of legal firearms.

Biden notes that gun manufacturers could comply with that law by "making minor modifications to their products—modifications that leave them just as deadly." That is equally true of the new, supposedly improved "assault weapon" ban proposed by Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), who also wrote the 1994 law.

Nor do "assault weapons" figure prominently in gun violence. In 2017, according to the FBI, all rifles combined—only a subset of which would qualify as "assault weapons"—accounted for just 5 percent of guns used in homicides where the type of firearm was specified, while handguns accounted for 89 percent. Even mass shooters prefer handguns.

The Democratic presidential candidates, including the ones who criticize O'Rourke's confiscation scheme as impractical, nevertheless insist that banning this arbitrary category of firearms "would be huge," as South Bend, Indiana, Mayor Pete Buttigieg put it last week. That belief is no less a fantasy than O'Rourke's dream that Americans, including would-be mass shooters, will happily turn in the guns he thinks they should not have.

# Beto O'Rourke on his gun confiscation plan: 'No, it's not voluntary'

by Ellie Bufkin | September 13, 2019 11:22 AM

In a Friday morning interview, Beto O'Rourke doubled down on his desire to ban semi-automatic rifles in America.

Speaking of his proposed change of law, O'Rourke rejected the notion that Americans could decide not to give up their guns. "It's not voluntary. ... It is mandatory," O'Rourke said of his proposal. "It will be the law. You will be required to comply with the law."

The 2020 Democrat said that he did not believe the law would mean that federal agents would be coming to people's homes to confiscate their rifles because he expected Americans to follow the law if it came to pass.

"As with many of our laws, we don't go door to door searching people's homes to see if they are, in fact, breaking the law," he said. "We expect people to comply with the law."

He cited recent conversations with gun owners that led him to believe that those who would be unwilling to hand over their rifles were the "far outlier." "Most Americans are going to comply with the law," he said.

"I'm going to work with ... law enforcement to make sure that we implement this in the most effective way possible," O'Rourke said when asked how he would deal with people who did not willingly surrender their firearms.

The type of ban and enforcement envisioned by O'Rourke may not be possible without changes to the Second Amendment to the Constitution. The House of Representatives passed a series of bills earlier this year that address background checks, red flag laws, and gun-free zones. They currently await a vote in the Republican-controlled Senate.

<https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/beto-orourke-on-his-gun-confiscation-plan-no-its-not-voluntary-its-mandatory>

## O'Rourke to gun owners: 'Hell yes, we're going to take your AR-15, your AK-47'

by Zachary Halaschak | September 12, 2019 09:24 PM

Beto O'Rourke, a fierce advocate of gun control, was cheered for saying that if he is elected president, he would take action to remove weapons from gun owners in America.

While some candidates have suggested voluntary buybacks for owners of those types of guns, O'Rourke, 46, has gone further and voiced his support for mandatory gun buybacks for owners of AR-15s and AK-47s. During Thursday's debate, O'Rourke was asked if he was proposing taking away those guns and responded, "I am, if it's a weapon that was designed to kill people on a battlefield.

"If the high-impact, high-velocity round when it hits your body shreds everything inside of your body because it was designed to do that ... Hell yes, we're going to take your AR-15, your AK-47, we're not going to allow it to be used on fellow Americans anymore," the former Texas congressman said as the audience broke into raucous cheering.

On Thursday before the debate, O'Rourke called on credit card companies to stop doing business with companies that sell assault weapons and processing transactions involving them.

<https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/orourke-to-gun-owners-hell-yes-were-going-to-take-your-ar-15-your-ak-47>