

[CLICK HERE FOR ADVERTISEMENT RATES](#)

California Gun Seizure Edict a Naked Power Grab that Ignores True Danger

0 0 0 32

by David Codrea , December 31, 2015



With a new edict that will do nothing to make Californians safer, the Opposite Day “progressive” governor evidently believes the famous motto should be “Tread on Me.” (Jerry Brown/Facebook)

“Gun-safety legislation going into effect in California next week will allow authorities to seize a person’s weapons for 21 days if a judge determines there’s potential for violence,” [Fox Nation](#) informs readers in a summary post of an article from [The Washington Times](#). Curiously, that story calls it “Gun control legislation,” making it fair to ask who directed such an editorial change and why.

Because, as always, what the gun-grabbers are doing has nothing to do with safety, and everything to do with conditioning the public into accepting citizen disarmament as a solution to violence. Of course it’s about control.

[The bill itself](#), signed into law by Gov. Jerry Brown in Sept. 2014 and scheduled to go in effect on Jan. 1, 2016, is posted on the California Legislature website, along with votes, history, analyses and the like. For the average person, a more digestible explanation of what it does is presented by the [Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence](#) – just keep in mind, if you get your information from them, they’re a group that actively undermines the right to keep and bear arms.

Basically, it allows family members or police to go to court and obtain a Gun Violence Restraining Order. The big emotional hook used to drag a critical mass of the voting public on board was the Isla Vista shooting incident, where a nutbag privileged kid who’d been in therapy since childhood racked up multiple victims he went after with a knife, a car and a gun.

Naturally, no new knife or car laws were introduced.

And naturally, there were plenty of prior indicators the kid was screwed up, including police being contacted by his alarmed parents. Deputies working for Sheriff Bill Brown (yeah, [that Bill Brown](#) for those of you who have followed WarOnGuns for a while) talked to him and didn’t do anything.

Here’s the thing: California already has Welfare and Institutions Code [Section 5150](#), which allows an officer to get a person confined if suspected of having a mental disorder that makes him or a danger to himself and others. And the gun used was registered, meaning they got the call and had a record of it – if they cared to look. There’s a chance the murders would never have happened had authorities used existing tools.

But they didn’t, the powder keg was allowed to blow up in a very public way, and the explosion was exploited by the blood dancers for all they could squeeze out of it to create another “gun law.”

But wait—am I saying let psychos have guns? Don’t we want to make sure they’re harmless?

Does anybody see anything in this absurd affront to liberty that will do that?

I have a saying I’ve been using for some time, [a truism, actually](#):

Anyone who can’t be trusted with a gun can’t be trusted without a custodian.

Remember that the largest mass murder in our country’s history was ostensibly (that is, according to the official story), enabled with box cutters, the second largest with some fuel oil and fertilizer, and the one after that with a dollar’s worth of gas and a match. And no, sorry, I just brought those up to make a point, not to start a debate on alternative theories

Back to the point I’m trying to make: So they take his guns away but leave him to stalk among us, and that somehow makes everybody safer? That will do nothing about access to other means of mayhem, plus, it’s not like bad guys can’t get guns if they want them. If some maniac is too dangerous to have on the loose with a gun, he’s too dangerous to have on the loose, period. And no, you don’t need to wait until he starts piling up bodies to act.

There's nothing wrong, if bizarrely inappropriate and frightening behavior warrants, in intervening and observing, and if appropriate, segregating someone from those he would harm. But justice demands before depriving any citizen of liberty, he must be afforded full due process. And by that I don't mean just taking the word of some anti-gun metrosexual urban shrink, but ensuring *equivalent protections* of a full jury trial.

And when do we let him out?

When he's demonstrated to be no longer a danger. If an animal attacked a human, would you open the cage and set it loose just because an arbitrary time sentence had been served?

When it has been determined someone convicted under full due process no longer needs a "custodian."

When he can be trusted with a gun.

Categories: [2nd amendment](#), [All](#)

Tags: [California](#), [gun control](#), [gun seizure](#), [Jerry Brown](#)

About Author



[David Codrea](#)

David Codrea blogs at The War on Guns: Notes from the Resistance (WarOnGuns.com), and is a field editor/columnist for GUNS Magazine. Named "Journalist of the Year" in 2011 by the Second Amendment Foundation for his groundbreaking work on the "Fast and Furious" ATF "gunwalking" scandal, he is a frequent event speaker and guest on national radio and television programs.