

Stephen Gutowski (00:03.034)

All right. Welcome, ladies and gentlemen, to another episode of the Weekly Reload Podcast. I'm your host, Stephen Gutowski. I'm also a CNN contributor and the founder of thereload.com where you can head over and sign up for our free newsletter today. You want to keep up to date with what's going on with guns in America. You can of course also buy a membership. You want to support the reporting that we do and get exclusive access to hundreds of pieces of analysis and stories that you won't find anywhere else.

In addition, we have a sponsorship this week from The Dispatch that I'll tell you a little bit more about them at the end of the show. They're a great publication where they focus on hard news reporting as well. I think if you like The Reload, you'll probably like The Dispatch as well. And we'll get more details on that at the end of the show. Another person you might like, another publication you might enjoy if you like The Reload is Bearing Arms. We have Cam Edwards, who is the editor of Bearing Arms with us today.

to discuss the Hunter Biden verdict and his exclusive interview with the new head of the NRA, Doug Hamlin. Welcome to the show, Cam. Appreciate you coming on.

Cam Edwards (01:09.539)

Absolutely, Steve. Always love getting a chance to spend some time with you, man.

Stephen Gutowski (01:13.498)

Yes, me too. You know, we've gone back and forth on the shows over the years and I always one of my favorite episodes whenever you're on is just sort of a you're very knowledgeable about this stuff. Obviously you write about it as much as I do, probably more actually. I think probably content production wise, you probably writing about it even more. But and and you just and of course your show is is one of the best as far as covering gun news from a from a pro gun pro to a perspective.

And we always appreciate having your voice on our show as well. So let's start with Hunter, right? We had the verdict come down, actually, ironically, given our topic today, it came down in the middle of your interview with the NRA's Doug Hamlin. What do you make of that guilty verdict?

Cam Edwards (02:02.147)

You know, it's interesting. I mean, I was talking to a lot of folks before the verdict came down who said I was going to get acquitted. There's no way you can get a fair trial in Delaware. You know, everybody knows the Bidens. And I kept telling people, take a step back here. You know, the criminal justice system, 97 % of felony cases in this country end up with a guilty verdict or a guilty plea. Right. That's just the odds. So if you're just playing the odds, Hunter Biden, unless he got a plea deal, was

likely to be convicted. I was, you know, I, we couldn't watch the trial unless you were there in the courtroom. But I was following CNN's coverage, MSCE's coverage, Town Hall's coverage. And, you know, I think Abby Lowell, Hunter Biden's attorney, did a pretty good job of pointing out that there was no direct evidence that Hunter Biden was using drugs during the time period in which he had purchased that firearm.

Problem for Abbie Lowell is that there was a mountain of circumstantial evidence that Hunter Biden was in fact abusing drugs, including Hunter Biden's own words, right? Prosecution was very effective in using the audio book of Hunter Biden's memoir. So the jury got to hear Hunter Biden in his own voice talking about, well, you know, I left this California rehab in early September and I was clean for about two weeks. He talked about when he...

went to the East Coast, he went there in early October in the hopes of getting clean, not staying clean. There were the text messages that he sent to Hallie Biden one the day after the gun was purchased, where he said he was waiting for a drug dealer named Mookie. One the day after that, where Hallie Biden asked him where he was, and he said, well, I'm sleeping on a car smoking crack. And Lowell's excuse was, well, look, he didn't want to hang out with Hallie Biden. He didn't want to be around her. He was looking for an excuse so that he didn't have to be with her. But even if that's the case, Stephen,

what were the excuses he offered? I can't see you right now because I'm waiting to get drugs or I can't see you right now because I'm doing drugs. Now, if you're trying to show that your client was not using or abusing drugs at that time period, I don't know that there's an easy way to get around those texts, but it wasn't an explanation that was likely to jibe with the jurors, right? So I think it was...

Stephen Gutowski (04:14.618)

Right.

Cam Edwards (04:18.499)

Hunter Biden was in a difficult position, especially because the judge had ruled beforehand, you can't raise a second amendment argument at trial. If you want to do that, you got to raise it on appeal. So he couldn't challenge the underlying statute of the law. In his own words, I think his own words were probably more fatal to his case than Hallie Biden's testimony, than the testimony of his ex -girlfriend. I certainly don't think it was a wise decision for the Biden defense team to put his daughter on the stand. That

And if you're going to put your daughter on the stand to testify in your defense, you better show up as well. And I think that hurt. The jury got to hear from Hunter Biden through his memoir, but Hunter Biden refused to take the stand. It's always a dangerous thing for a defendant to do, right? Because you open yourself up to cross -examination. But if they put his daughter on the stand to sort of gather sympathy, to talk about her dad and his struggle with addiction,

without having the courage to put Biden himself up there. I certainly don't think it helped the case. So I wasn't surprised that the verdict came down as guilty. When we knew that we, when we heard that the verdict had been reached, you know, after just a few hours of deliberations, I thought, well, that's not a good sign. That's not a good sign for Hunter Biden. You know,

Stephen Gutowski (05:37.914)

Yeah. Yeah, absolutely. And I agree too on the facts of this case seemed pretty stark in terms of, you know, just establishing that, that Hunter likely, was addicted to drugs during the period he bought and possessed that gun and knew it. And, and I thought that, you know, the defense it is, you know, it's interesting because it is a viable defense often in situations like this.

to say that you weren't addicted at the time because that's what the statute seems to require. So you could have been addicted previously or after the fact, but the prosecution generally has to show that you were addicted when you were buying the gun or filling out the background check form. Because his three crimes were all basically the same crime.

I mean, one is lying on the form, lying to the dealer, and then one is possessing the gun. But it all comes back to whether or not he was addicted to drugs during that period. And it's just always seemed like a hard lift to get to this idea that he wasn't addicted for that brief period where he had this gun that he was addicted before and he was addicted after, but not during these two weeks, really.

especially given what you just laid out there, the text messages. There was residue, I think they found cocaine residue as well on the pouch that he held the gun in. So, you know...

Cam Edwards (07:10.627)

Yeah, on the pouch.

Right. Hallie Biden had said that she found cocaine remnant, remnants of crack cocaine in his truck and his daughter had said that the truck was clean when she dropped it off a couple of days earlier. That was particularly, I mean, if there was testimony outside of Hunter Biden's own text messages and memoirs that were really damaging this campaign or to his case, that was probably it. Right. The fact that Hallie Biden said, yeah, I saw what I, what drug paraphernalia, she didn't say what it was. She described remnants of crack cocaine. And then his daughter had said, well, I cleaned out the truck. It was clean when I dropped it off.

Stephen Gutowski (07:18.906)
Right.

Cam Edwards (07:43.875)

You know, Abby Lowell's contention was maybe Hallie Biden. Maybe that was Hallie's crack. Hallie Biden got thrown under the Biden bus, by the way, during that trial, but which I'm guessing is going to make Thanksgiving a little awkward there going forward. But again, as you say, there was just there was so much to overcome. Right. And so I think maybe Hunter Biden and Abby Lowell were hoping that there would be a juror or two. They only needed one who would say, look, I think the statute is wrong.

Stephen Gutowski (08:01.722)
Yeah.

Cam Edwards (08:10.787)

the face of it. I can't vote to convict this guy and possibly send him to prison when he seems to have gotten his life together. It was kind of a kitchen sink strategy, but it wasn't really coherent. I'm not sure what the whole point was about trying to raise questions about the gun sale itself and maybe the Form 4473 had been altered in some way. Like that just didn't make any sense at all to me as a defense. And so, you know, maybe Abbe little dealt the best hand that he could play.

or where I played the best game that he was dealt, but it just, as you say, the bar was really high and I'm not unsurprised by the verse.

Stephen Gutowski (08:52.026)

Yeah, as far as the facts of the case go, right? We'll get into sort of the, the, the, the, the constitutional implications of this law to begin with of these charges. But, you know, the other side of it too, I wanted to, you mentioned the memoir there a couple of times, and I do think that was pretty big, evidence in the case. It was also something that Hunter himself mentioned in the failed plea, the failed plea deal hearing that it's what brought on.

You know, the investigation into, into his drug use while he owned this gun. And, you know, it does seem like, cause there's a, there's always a discussion before you even get to the constitutionality of these, these charges of this underlying law about his prosecution. Cause every, you know, he's the president's son. This is all surrounded by a lot of politics in either direction. And, you know, the Hunter Biden lawyers have suggested this is sort of a political.

prosecution of sorts, or that the special prosecutor bowed to pressure from former president Trump or other Republicans and so forth. And then on the other side, you have a lot of Republicans and Trump saying that he's getting special treatment, that that plea was a sweetheart deal, all that stuff. And you go back to and look at the facts of how often does this charge get brought the way it was as a standalone charge. And it is fairly rare.

you know, we've talked, I've talked to, experts who study this, this type of crime. And, you know, I think you get about 200 of these types of convictions per year in the country, which is not a lot, compared to how, you know, felon possession laws, you get a far more of those convictions each year. but at the same time, you know, beyond even the politics of it, this is a unique case because you have the defendant.

incriminating himself in this book that he did a media tour about. And so it's almost like what are prosecutors supposed to do in that situation? At least that's how it seemed to me. I don't know what your thoughts on that whole aspect of it.

Cam Edwards (10:56.355)
Right.

Cam Edwards (11:00.707)

No, I actually I agree with you because and it wasn't just the memoir. I mean, it was the very high profile nature that we learned about years later, by the way, right? It's not like we learned about Hunter Biden buying a gun and Hallie Biden thrown in a dumpster contemporaneously. We didn't learn about that for a couple of years until after it happened. But

when it came out in the press, remember, Steven, we also had Politico reporting at the time that the Secret Service had inserted itself into the case. Secret Service to this day denies that they did so.

Stephen Gutowski (11:13.53)
Right.

Stephen Gutowski (11:25.466)
Mm -hmm.

Cam Edwards (11:28.963)
But I think Politico still stands by their report. They haven't taken it off their website. So there was there was some outside attention, you know, and some outside factors that I think elevated this case, even beyond the fact that we're talking about Hunter Biden, the president's son. And as you say, if you're a prosecutor, what do you do with that information? Right. Do you say, well, it's going to look bad if I, you know, charge this guy, they're going to accuse me of playing politics. Either way, you're going to get accused of playing politics. If you charge him, you're going to get accused. If you say,

too long has passed, he's turned his life around, you're gonna get accused of playing politics. So at that point, if you're a prosecutor, you gotta do your job, which is prosecute. And I think that was, they erred on the side of caution in terms of charging him. I think he can make a case that maybe they would have been more amenable to a plea agreement after the first plea agreement fell apart, obviously. Maybe they would have been more amenable to reaching some sort of plea deal before trial if we weren't talking about Hunter Biden.

Stephen Gutowski (12:01.114)
Right.

Cam Edwards (12:25.603)
And certainly there are some pretty high profile people who are out there who at least, you know, seem to talk a lot about smoking pot on occasion and possessing firearms. Joe Rogan, perhaps, you know, Joe Rogan hasn't faced any federal prosecution, but I think it's, you know, I've heard Joe talk about smoking pot. I know that Joe has talked about shooting guns. So, you know, I think that there is a maybe a small case to be made that the politics played a role.

Stephen Gutowski (12:36.954)
Sure.

Cam Edwards (12:54.755)
But I think again, that case could have been made no matter what the charging decision was, right? And so maybe it's not just that politics played a role, maybe it's just that this is inherently political because we are talking about the son of the sitting president. And how do you take politics out of that equation?

Stephen Gutowski (12:59.034)
Yeah, that's a good point.

Stephen Gutowski (13:09.114)
Right. Yeah. I mean, it's hard to imagine we'd be talking about this conviction. I mean, if he gotten off for second amendment grounds, we might be talking about it like, like a number of the cases that they're out there like Daniel's, which, and we'll get into the second amendment argument here, but, but yeah, it's hard to imagine that even on this show, we would be talking about, just somebody being convicted of, of, being a drug user and, and owning fire, you know, possessing firearms. If it wasn't Hunter Biden.

So it is hard to, you can't really separate politics completely from the situation, but at the same time, the facts of the cases just went over or were pretty strong. I mean, this is, it's illegal to do what he did. And, so he, he was convicted. That's the jury was unanimous on that, that question. And I don't think there's any particular reason that they shouldn't have come to that conclusion. Now there is here where we'll get to the second amendment stuff right now, because the,

The next question is, is the law, the underlying law, is that constitutional? What do you make of the second amendment case here? Cause he, he did, you know, there's been some interesting stuff with this, you know, the judge, like you mentioned, the judge said you can't use that, the, the way that they had initially argued this, which was a facial challenge to the law. The Hunter Biden's lawyers tried to claim that the underlying law, that prohibits people from being addicted to drugs or drug users.

and possessing firearms that it is unconstitutional on its face, that there's no constitutional application of this law possible because of the Second Amendment. And that didn't work, right? That's what failed at both the district judge level and then also at the appellate court level when they reviewed that argument. However, since then, Hunter's lawyers have filed an as applied challenge, which just says,

not that the whole law is unconstitutional necessarily in all applications, like there may be some constitutional applications of this law, but as it's applied to Hunter Biden, in this case where there's no accusations of violent behavior, there's no accusation that he used the gun to commit any sort of other crimes, he doesn't have a criminal record to this point.

Stephen Gutowski (15:23.802)

and that this is a nonviolent offense, just that he's a drug user. And there aren't even accusations that he was intoxicated while he was buying or handling the firearm, right? So under those circumstances, they're saying the second amendment protects his right to have that gun and that the law is unconstitutional. Where do you think that's gonna head? What do you make of that argument?

Cam Edwards (15:47.011)

I think it's a good argument. I mean, I have read US versus Daniels, both the usurpation from Merrick Garland as well as the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals decision that found that as applied to Patrick Darnell Daniels, Section 922 G3 is also unconstitutional. And the Fifth Circuit's decision basically said, if you look at the national tradition of gun ownership in this country, especially dating back to 1791,

There were no laws that said, hey, if you use an intoxicating substance, you can't own a firearm. You can't keep and bear arms. But you did have, they found long -standing statutes, long -standing traditions against possessing a firearm, actively possessing a firearm while you are intoxicated, right? So that was where the Fifth Circuit came down. That if this is a law that says, hey, if you're drunk, if you're high, you can't hold onto a gun, that's a crime, that's okay.

But telling people you can't possess a firearm, you can't own a firearm because you use drugs or because you drink, that's a no -go. And I think that that is a fair reading. You know, if you want to take a very textual approach to the Second Amendment and to what laws were on the books in 1791, I think that that's accurate. I wonder though, Stephen, when this gets out into the real world here.

You know, I think a majority of Americans would agree. If you possess a medical marijuana card, you should be able to own a gun. Even if the federal government says marijuana is still schedule one, I think you'd find majority support for Americans believing that those folks should be able to own a firearm. I suspect it probably is a 50 -50 proposition if you're talking about recreational use of marijuana. And then I suspect when we get into harder drugs like cocaine, methamphetamine, fentanyl, you probably don't have a majority of Americans who agree.

that those individuals who are using those drugs or who are addicted to those drugs should be able to purchase a firearm and exercise their second -movement rights. Again, I'm very libertarian in my viewpoints, and even I struggle with that idea of, okay, someone is a known meth addict, right? They are struggling, maybe they're not even struggling, maybe they're just fine being a meth addict. Does that automatically make them dangerous enough to prohibit them from possessing a firearm?

Stephen Gutowski (17:50.394)

Yeah.

Cam Edwards (18:11.811)

And I don't know that that's an easy case. I think that we kind of see this split in the second amendment groups, right? Where you've got organizations like FPC who've said, hey, we're defending Hunter Biden. If he wants to rely on us for help, just give us a call. We'll do it. And then you got the NRA saying, well, you know, Hunter Biden broke the law and this is what happens when you break the law, essentially. So I think that even in 2A world, I think we're more...

We're less reluctant to talk about it than the gun control groups, but I don't know that there is a consensus within Second Amendment communities as to, okay, if Section 922G3 is unconstitutional, well, what does a constitutional law look like?

Stephen Gutowski (18:56.058)

Yeah, I think that's a really accurate breakdown of where things seem to be right now. I mean, the gun control groups don't want to talk about this at all, which makes a lot of sense. I mean, one of the things President Joe Biden did just in a feat of amazing optics is that right after his son was convicted on these gun crime charges, he went and spoke at every town's national conference, didn't mention the conviction. And then,

left that conference to go and comfort his son, which just is kind of remarkable. And yeah, you haven't seen them talk about it all. And then yeah, there's this sort of split. And I think it does go back to what you're mentioning here of the people probably are much more comfortable with marijuana users being able to own guns. And you mentioned Joe Rogan earlier. I don't think.

Most people are outraged that he's not being arrested and thrown in jail for that. There may be some, but I don't think it's a common feeling. However, there does seem to be, I think in America and in, to be honest, the judicial system as well, a split on marijuana. And I think even within the Biden administration, right, because they've tried to sort of lessen the criminal punishments for marijuana use at the federal level.

Cam Edwards (19:55.619)

Right?

Stephen Gutowski (20:20.73)

in what they can do from an administrator standpoint. Now it hasn't, they haven't taken it out of this category where you can't own guns and smoke weed, but right. So they haven't, they haven't moved that far. Yeah, but they have, they have tried to move it down the schedule list, I believe. So this punishments are less severe for just marijuana possession at the federal level now than they used to be. But.

Cam Edwards (20:29.411)

Right, they're still trying to put Patrick Daniels behind bars for 46 months. I think that was what he was sentenced to for using marijuana and owning guns.

Stephen Gutowski (20:50.458)

there's a very different opinion for harder drugs like what Hunter Biden was using, crack cocaine, things that people perceive as addictive, much more addictive than something like marijuana. And I think you've seen that dichotomy in federal courts as well, where marijuana users have fared a bit better in these challenges like Daniel's than other users of harder drugs. And one in particular,

And sort of the reasoning I think you see, which is not a totally off the wall concept, at least from my view, is sort of summed up well, I think, in this opinion from *United States v. Grubb*, which I have here, where the judge in this case, who's a Trump appointee, but...

He ruled the court finds that section 922 G3 does not violate second amendment on its face and therefore denies the motion to dismiss. In arriving at this conclusion, the court finds that section 922 G3 implicates conduct protected by the second amendment. However, second, the court concludes that section 922 G3 is consistent with the tradition of regulation of possession of firearms by criminals. And he got...

to this idea through the concept that people who are addicted to hard drugs are similar in nature to people with mental illnesses who don't have the necessary self-control for gun ownership. That's kind of where you see a lot of these cases where they've upheld this prohibition come down. There's similar reasoning across those.

And I do wonder whether the Supreme Court wouldn't ultimately go that way as well, even though there doesn't seem to be as much of a historical tradition as you noted with some of these other cases. There just weren't drug bans at the founding in the way that we have them now.

Cam Edwards (22:56.355)

Right. And I mean, Liz, I think that that is an out. My problem with that, though, is if you're gonna say, all right, well, listen, if you're addicted to illegal drugs, then you've obviously demonstrated a lack of self-control. Okay, you can say the same thing about obese people. Not every one of them, right? There might be some obese people who have a medical condition. There might be some people who are obese because they really like to eat and they can't control themselves. What about people who can't stop smoking?

They've clearly shown that they're in the grips of an addiction to nicotine, which is a legal drug, but at that point you're talking about the addiction, right? You're not talking about what you're addicted to, but it is the addiction that indicates a lack of self-control. And that, I think, opens up the door to a lot of really, really bad decisions coming down the line, right? Because I think it's fair to say that maybe most of us...

lack self-control in at least one aspect of our lives. For me, it's cookies. Not crack cocaine. But you know, when my wife makes brownies, I'm eating as many brownies as I can stuff into my craw, as you can tell by my chipmunk cheeks here. So, you know, that to me.

Stephen Gutowski (23:57.25)

You

Stephen Gutowski (24:06.394)

Yeah.

I guess that's where the conflict comes though is like, you know, being addicted to tobacco or cookies or overeating or what have you. Obviously people perceive that as not leading to the kind of potentially violent behavior that being addicted to hard drugs does, right? That I get, you know, just to play the devil's advocate here.

Cam Edwards (24:27.491)

And you can make the case though that being addicted to harder drugs doesn't necessarily make you violent. Maybe if you're on, you know, PCP, but I would be more concerned honestly with property crimes associated with, you know, drug use. I mean, one of the fascinating things to me was the fact that Hunter Biden was apparently getting like a \$50,000 a month allowance because he was withdrawing \$50,000 a month from his ATM. Most drug addicts don't have \$50,000 at their disposal every month, right?

Stephen Gutowski (24:32.758)

Hmm.

Cam Edwards (24:56.835)

So, you know, most people who are addicted to drugs, I won't say most, but many of them ultimately turn to theft so they can, you know, pawn those items, they can sell those items to get money for drugs. Maybe some of them turn to carjackings, maybe some of them turn to armed robberies, but I don't necessarily think that just a simple drug addiction indicates that that person has a productivity towards violence or even violent criminal behavior.

Stephen Gutowski (25:25.146)

Right. And so you don't see this as like a dangerousness analog. That's just because somebody is a user of harder drugs does not necessarily mean that they are dangerous in the way that perhaps somebody convicted of violent crimes are.

Cam Edwards (25:41.827)

Yeah, I mean, if they're if they're if the court were to adopt a dangerous standard, I think it should be an individualized finding of dangerousness. I don't think it should be a categorical approach that well, if you meet this, you know, if you check this box, then automatically you're dangerous. Because again, we've seen how that's been abused throughout U.S. history, right? Well, if you're Native American, you're too dangerous to own a gun. If you are a freed black in the deep south.

before the Civil War, right after the Civil War, mm -mm, too dangerous to own a gun. If you're Catholic, right, I don't like those categorical approaches. We are talking about an individual right. And so to me, if you're gonna strip an individual of that right, there should be an individualized finding of dangerousness. This is why Cam is not responsible enough. This is why Cam is so dangerous that he has lost his Second Amendment rights beyond Cam's Catholic, Native American, or, you know,

cam smokes crack. None of which, by the way, is true. I am not Catholic. I am only 1/64th Native American and I don't smoke crack.

Stephen Gutowski (26:38.842)

I didn't know those things about Cam. Breaking news.

Stephen Gutowski (26:46.682)

Yes. Well, it's good to clear that up, but yeah. And obviously in this case, Hunter is not accused of any sort of specific dangerous behavior in terms of threatening people or, or carrying out violent acts as part of his, his drug addiction. So it sounds like you would, you would think that his second amendment argument should succeed. Now I'm wondering, do you think it will succeed?

Cam Edwards (27:11.843)

Well, that is a different question. And I hate to hedge my bets, but as you and I are talking, we don't have the Supreme Court's decision in Rahimi yet. We might get that by the time this is released. We might not. But by the end of the month, we'll know what the Supreme Court has to say in Rahimi. And I think that's going to give us a much better idea of how far this particular court is willing to go.

We know that Justice Amy Coney Barrett has talked about a dangerous test, a dangerousness test in the past. It seemed like there was some interest in that during the oral arguments in Rahimi. But, you know, it's very possible that you could find a situation where, let's say, Justice Kavanaugh, Chief Justice Roberts, and Justice Sotomayor, Justice Jackson, and Justice Kagan come together and say, you know what, yeah, we think the law is fine as it is.

Stephen Gutowski (27:43.066)

and cancer.

Cam Edwards (28:06.947)

And here's why. That would not completely shock me. Yeah, yeah, the status quo is okay versus, you know, let's delve down and, you know, talk about the individual circumstances of these defendants before we take away their second amendment rights. In fact, this may be one of those cases where we do get a sort of weird lineup. We're seeing a little bit of that. We had a case today where you had a unanimous

Stephen Gutowski (28:10.522)

I think that categorical versus individual finding of dangerousness would be a really key distinction.

Cam Edwards (28:37.411)

decision, but you had, I think, like seven or eight different concurring opinions. So, you know, there are some interesting bedfellows that are showing up on the court here. And in Rahimi, could we be one of those cases where we see maybe not the usual suspects align on this case? I would say before Rahimi, but you're just knowing what we know now. I don't think this is a libertarian court.

Stephen Gutowski (29:03.386)
Yeah.

Cam Edwards (29:04.515)

You know, this is, I think, a corporate, a conservative majority and one that I think has a pretty good understanding of the right to keep and bear arms and one that is fairly congruent with what most second amendment advocates believe. But I don't expect the court to come out and say, hey, you know, if you're shooting a heroin in a public park and you got a, you're openly carrying a firearm at your right, you know, no, no, no problem. No conflict with the law whatsoever. I don't think that's going to happen.

I think we're likely to see some narrow decisions. I think the court has kind of shown us that it's willing to take baby steps at times. So this could honestly be an issue that gets fleshed out over the next decade or with multiple cases and each one sort of adds another piece to the puzzle for the Supreme Court.

Stephen Gutowski (29:50.714)

Yeah, I think that's a really good summation of what's likely to happen. And yeah, I guess the takeaway here is look for what the Supreme Court does in *Rahimi* before you try to decide what they're gonna do with what they might do in a potential USB Biden case. And that makes a lot of sense. So, hmm. Yes, the entrails, we'll have to examine those.

Cam Edwards (30:11.395)

Yeah, they're brewing the tea right now, so we need to wait and see what the tea leaves look like after they've been steeped a little bit.

That's right. The ox has not yet been gored.

Stephen Gutowski (30:20.89)

At a later date. Yes. All right. So the other thing I wanted to get to, as I mentioned at the top of the show, is your interview with Doug Hamlin. You had this wide ranging interview that he granted with you over at On Cam and Company over at Bearing Arms. People should absolutely go and listen to the whole thing. I think you covered a number of topics and were able to get him.

to give some pretty decent detail on a few things here as the new head of the NRA, the new CEO and executive vice president, the first one to be voted on by the board since Wayne LaPierre back in the 90s, right? And so what, can you just give us your top line takeaway from that interview? What was the biggest thing you think he said?

Cam Edwards (31:12.195)

Well, first, I think the fact that he even did the interview is worth acknowledging, because since really even before 2019, I think he probably go back to 2017, 2018, Wayne LaPierre was rarely seen doing interviews. He would show up for CPAC and show up for the inter-annual meeting, but he didn't really want to do a lot of sit down interviews, which I think frankly is...

Stephen Gutowski (31:34.01)

I think the last big one was like 2012, right? Like the David Gregory one where David Gregory broke DC law, pulled out that 30 round magazine. That's like the last big interview I remember Wayne LaPierre doing with any sort of major outlet.

Cam Edwards (31:42.947)

Yeah.

Cam Edwards (31:46.531)

Right, I mean by the time Parkland in 2018, Dana Lash is the spokesperson for the NRA and was named the spokesperson because Wayne didn't want to do those types of interviews. So when CNN held its meeting at Town Hall, I guess it was after Parkland, it was Dana who was there, it wasn't Wayne. So I'll give Doug Hamlin credit for simply showing up and sitting down and doing this interview. It is nice to see the executive vice president of the NRA who's

not afraid to sit down for an interview.

You know, I guess you could argue this was going to be a friendly interview. I wanted to be fair. I wanted to be tough. I have made it clear that I would like to see the NRA survive. I want to see the NRA strong. I think the second amendment community is better off with a strong NRA. That doesn't mean that I'm going to, you know, parrot NRA talking points or agree with everything that was said. And in fact, Doug and I actually got into it a little bit talking about the Hunter Biden case. Cause as you say, the verdict came down in the middle of our interview. And so I asked him,

what's your take? And he said, well, you know, we believe that the right to keep your arms is the right of law abiding citizens. I'm paraphrasing a bit here and Hunter Biden broke the law. And so I kind of pushed back a little bit and, you know, we talked again about the fact that this law applies to all unlawful drug use, even marijuana that's been legalized medicinally or recreationally in particular states. I brought up.

a hypothetical example of a cancer patient who might be going back on chemotherapy and would like to have a gummy to relieve her nausea. Coincidentally, my wife is getting ready to go back on chemotherapy. And, you know, this is something that we've that she and I have talked about over the years. So this is an issue that that matters to me. And I, I'll be honest, I thought that it was a wishy washy response from Doug Hamlin. But the nice thing, the thing that I did appreciate about is after I

kind of gave him that additional information. He said, well, you know what? I hadn't really thought about it from that perspective. And I hope that he does think about it from that perspective. So, you know.

Stephen Gutowski (33:48.186)

He seemed open to the idea that maybe the law should be changed, even if they, yeah, he wasn't coming out and saying they're putting together a campaign to change the law. So.

Cam Edwards (33:58.499)

Right. But at least just willing to, okay, that was something I didn't think about. So let me think about that and maybe we can talk about this in the future. And maybe I get the brush off and nothing changes, but I think the most important thing, like I said, for me was the fact that he was willing to have these conversations. And he knows that there's a great deal of skepticism out there, even after the reform slate.

was elected, even after Doug Hamlin was elected, there are a lot of people who say, I'm not going to give the NRA any money until every board member who backed Wayne LaPierre is gone, or I'm not going to give the NRA any money until they say, you know, no more gun control laws, we're working to repeal the NFA. You know, it's going to be a process to reform the board, as you know, just the structure of how these elections are held, only a third of the board is up for election every year. So,

The next step, I think for those folks who want to see this reform continue, is to find a larger slate of reform candidates, right? This year it was four, maybe five. Next year it should be 15 or 20, or 25. And then you'll be able to make even bigger changes. But, Doug Hamlin talked about some of the steps that have been taken. They've named a compliance officer, they've named an auditor. He made the point of saying these are positions that don't report to him.

So it's not like the EVP can cover up what they say. I think that Hamlin may have been a little constrained in what he could talk about because we do have the second civil trial coming up in New York next month. And...

Stephen Gutowski (35:35.13)

Yeah, speaking of which, the NRA had made it a request along with all the other defendants in the case to basically have the verdict put aside by the judge, the jury's verdict, and that was denied. So they are going to go through with this second half of this trial.

Cam Edwards (35:51.107)

Okay, yeah, I mean, unless they can reach some sort of settlement agreement beforehand, but right now with that doesn't, you know, we don't have any news of that happening. So there may have been some areas that Hamlin didn't

really feel comfortable, you know, talking about, but I will say there were no preconditions for this conversation. I reached out to Nick Perrine at the NRA, ILA, right after you spoke with Doug Hamlin at the NRA board meeting, as a matter of fact, and in a...

Stephen Gutowski (35:54.17)
Right.

Stephen Gutowski (35:58.394)
Not yet.

Cam Edwards (36:18.307)
fit of jealousy. I was like, Hey, Nick, I want to talk to Doug too. And, and so it was a few weeks before, you know, things settle. Well, you know, I'm pretty good at monopolizing people's time, but they again, there were no conditions attached to it. It wasn't sure you can talk to Doug, but you got to keep it happy talk. You know, we don't want to hear anything negative about the inter - There was nothing like that. And I thought that was very good. You know, this is a new position for Doug Hamlin. He, I,

Stephen Gutowski (36:21.978)
Well, you got a longer interview.

Stephen Gutowski (36:44.378)
Hmm.

Cam Edwards (36:47.971)
made it pretty clear that even, you know, two or three months ago, I don't think this was on his radar of being EVP. But, you know, this was sort of kind of thrust on him and he thought, OK, who else would it be? And I think the answer was Charles Cotton. And I don't think that was acceptable to the reformers. So, you know, I would have loved to have been able to ask him some some questions that I don't think I would have gotten a good answer to. Like what happens?

Stephen Gutowski (36:54.778)
Mm -hmm.

Cam Edwards (37:18.243)
to those staffers that were part of the old guard who are still around. Andrew Rulonundum, for example, is back as public affairs director at NRAILA, I believe. So he was the acting EVP, he was the executive director of general operations named by Wayne. I kind of thought that he would have been...

Stephen Gutowski (37:30.554)
That is, I did not know that, interesting.

Cam Edwards (37:41.859)
quietly or not so quietly pushed aside after the reformers, but apparently Andrew is around. There are going to be some other folks who, you know, maybe we're working with the old guard who are still inside that building. But at the same time, you've got folks like Joe DeBurgles, who's been renamed head of general operations. The HR director who was rumored to be, I don't even know if rumored is the right word, but alleged to be sort of a flack for Bill Brewer.

was replaced, by Hamlin in the past couple of weeks. So there's still a lot of, yeah. And that's one of the other questions that I would have loved to have asked, but I knew I wasn't going to get an answer because of the trial coming up. And I thought that would have been an unfair to ask Doug Hamlin a question that I knew he couldn't answer, because of the legal considerations. So I didn't ask about Bill Brewer, but that's obviously one of the questions I think NRA members have, you know, there are the, the NRAs,

Stephen Gutowski (38:15.066)
Although Bill Brewer is still there.

Cam Edwards (38:39.843)

biggest expense, I think, and you would know better than me, are legal fees these days. And the bulk of that money is going towards Bill Brewer, right?

Stephen Gutowski (38:46.074)

Yeah, the largest single line item, yeah. Mm -hmm, that's correct, yes. It's still the largest single line item, and that's for the combined NRA entity. The NRA has six different legal entities, or six or seven different legal entities, and yeah, and it's like 50 million a year, so it's a lot of money.

Cam Edwards (39:10.243)

Yeah, and so I think that's a, that, you know, that is one of the elephants in the room here is what happens after the trial. You know, Doug Hamlin said he thinks the NRA has hit bottom. He did say, and this might be the most important information that he would want out there. He did say that in May they met their, they actually exceeded their revenue goals for the month for the first time, he said in several years. And it sounded like a lot of the memberships really kicked up.

between May 20th and May 31st, which is when the board meeting was held. So that's actually a pretty good sign. If you wanna see some sort of sign that NRA members are returning home, that would be it. But I think the NRA still has a way to go. I think that there are a number of issues that still need to be addressed and hopefully will be able to be addressed in the months ahead.

Stephen Gutowski (39:44.218)

Hmm, interesting.

Cam Edwards (40:04.515)

And I get the sense that I asked Doug Hamlin if he sees himself as a transitional figure or a long -term EVP, and he said, you know, that's not up to me. He said, this is an elected position. He said, I got elected to this position for one year by the board. He said, we'll see where things stand a year from now. And I thought that was a pretty, I actually liked that answer from him because ultimately it is not up to the EVP. At least it shouldn't be. For too long, it was up to the EVP.

So I think he is saying a lot of the right things. It seems like he's taking a lot of the right steps. But I want to see where we are three months from now and what other changes have been made. Maybe four months from now, depending on when this trial wraps up in New York, because this is a process and it's not completed yet.

Stephen Gutowski (40:52.09)

Yeah, it does feel like this is more reform than revolution at the NRA, if that makes sense, right? Like, because you had, as you spoke about earlier, I'm sure there are plenty of people out there who would want to see, you know, everyone associated with Laine LaPierre and the NRA's past and the corruption that happened there to be wiped out and a whole new board or a whole new leadership team put in. And that's not what they're doing. They're what they're...

you know, they only elected like five reformers, right, to the NRA board. But that led to, you know, a majority of the board siding with the reformers on these sort of, I don't know, compromise candidates, if you want to call them that, where they're trying to institute reform by, but also not completely gutting the organization in the process. Is that, I mean, is that how you feel about it when you say,

Because earlier you said, I'm sure some people will look at it as an easy interview for him to do or whatever. But I think you're absolutely right in this general point that this is a complete departure from how the NRA had been treating media, where they wouldn't do even pro -gun media like Kam and company if you had any criticism of them whatsoever.

criticism of the scandal and you have been somebody who's spoken out publicly, including at board meetings about what was going on and criticizing the misuse of NRA funds. So the fact that he did your show at all, the fact that he talked to me at the board meeting briefly, immediately after he was elected, these are signs that they're changing things, but it's not that kind of total.

total renewal or total change of guard at the NRA. It's much more of a cooperative process than something like that, I think.

Cam Edwards (42:55.683)

I think you're right. But again, I think some of that is just the way it has to be, right? Because you can't replace the entire board. You just can't. The entire board could resign, but you can't vote out the entire board in one fell swoop. The elections aren't structured that way. And, you know, and I fell into this trap too, Stephen, of saying the, you know, the, there was a slate of four or maybe five reform candidates and all of whom were elected. That doesn't mean that everybody else is not a reformer.

I think that there is room for them to become and to show themselves as reformers, right? And I suspect that we're more likely to see that. And even some of these existing board members who in the past may have sided with the old guard may not realize, okay, the writing's on the wall, the old guard's not in power anymore. And so if we wanna move forward as an organization, I'm gonna hitch my wagon to the reformers. It's possible that we see that. So yeah, I...

I think you're right. This is not a revolution for the NRA. But it is, I think that the reformers are real, at least the ones that have been put in place for now. Like I said, I think there is more work to be done, but I can't disagree or find a lot of fault with the actions that have been taken by the reformers to date. You know what I mean? Again, they didn't win the office of president, but I don't...

There weren't, I mean, the reformers that I talked to, they weren't, you know, wailing and gnashing their teeth over the election of Bob Barr. The response that I got was kind of what you mentioned, that they were hoping for some sort of continuity. Barr's been on the board, he's been around. Again, he knows his way in front of a camera. So he's somebody that, you know, the membership is comfortable with, the staff is comfortable with, and can do media appearances.

But at the same time, you've got those reformers in place within the EBP, first vice president, second vice president, who can again, sort of guide that ship going forward. Again, in theory, it sounds great. I do think we need to give them a little bit of time to see how this works out in practice. And, you know, if we see these reforms falling short, then I think we can call them out. But at some point,

Cam Edwards (45:18.083)

you know, if you want to support the NRA and if you do want to see the NRA succeed, at some point, gun owners are going to have to make that personalized decision, that individualized decision of, okay, they've now done enough that I can write them a \$25 check. Maybe in the past it would have been \$100, but I'm going to start with 25. Or maybe I'm going to start with five. I'm going to start with 10, right? Maybe I'll just renew my membership, but I'm not going to cut them any extra checks. But I think that at some point, before everything has completely been, you know, turned around,

gun owners and NRA members are going to have to show the group some love because otherwise I think these reform efforts could very well stall out and and you know Doug says the NRA's hit rock bottom but I think rock bottom for the NRA is it doesn't exist not because it's been wiped out by a judge but because it doesn't have the money to continue and I don't know that the NRA is in such a strong position that Doug Hamlin or anybody else could say that that possibility is entirely off the table in the future.

Stephen Gutowski (46:16.026)

Yeah. Yeah. And I mean, I think your voice on this is, is important for people to hear because you have been one of the, the most vocal, pro -gun people who in media that's, that's been, you know, questioning the, what the NRA has been doing with, with its money. and, and so it's interesting to hear, especially after you spent this and it was like, it was a pretty long interview, honestly. Right. I mean, it was.

Cam Edwards (46:42.147)

Close to 40 minutes, yeah.

Stephen Gutowski (46:43.194)

Yeah. So he didn't just give you five minutes or whatever. You know, I got two questions with him. You got 40 minutes. That's pretty solid. That's there you go. So, you know, it's something where he was committed. He didn't try to say, I'm not going to answer that question or storm off when you were talking to him. And so I just think that that's it's important to hear both from him in.

Cam Edwards (46:50.211)

Doug Hamill spoke to me longer than Joe Biden spoke to every town. How about that?

Stephen Gutowski (47:12.474)

him answering some of the questions you asked and then also your perspective on it because you, like I said, you've been one of these people who have been a prominent member of those who've really tried to hold the NRA accountable for the malfeasance that was going on. And so, you know, I think people do want to hear what you think of all this.

Cam Edwards (47:34.755)

I mean, that is kind of my take is that I'm cautiously optimistic. I mean, personally, I have not sat down and wrote the NRAO checks since I talked to Doug Hamlin, but I've thought about it. I am more inclined to do it than my wife is. I'll tell you that. We've had not quite an argument, but we've had a discussion about it. And I think I probably will in the near future start to show the NRA some financial support. I have not given them any money since 2019, but I want to...

Stephen Gutowski (47:37.978)

Hmm. Yeah.

Cam Edwards (48:04.259)

I want to support the organization. And they did take the right, they took some good first steps. So I think that those first steps should be rewarded on their own.

Stephen Gutowski (48:10.198)

But you want to, you want to wait and see a little bit. Okay. But you want to, when, when do you think you're going to, what, what is it that would push you over the line to start giving again at this point? Yeah.

Cam Edwards (48:22.435)

I'll probably just got to, you know, pare down some of my most medical bills, honestly. It's not really a...

Stephen Gutowski (48:26.874)

Fair, but let's say let's say someone's in the position to give And what should they look for now if they're if they share the same concerns that you've had in the past You know, they've they think okay. This is interesting first steps. We're getting something. We're seeing a change in media We're just we're seeing some actual reforms implemented or at least that's what they're saying. We've seen these people elected We're seeing a change in media approach from and he even said he would do

Cam Edwards (48:38.083)

Mm -hmm.

Stephen Gutowski (48:56.186)

mainstream media appearances too in the future. So we'll see if he lives up to that and how those go. But what should somebody who's wants to see reform and then wants to support the NRA again, if they do reform, what should they look for next to try and make that decision?

Cam Edwards (49:15.523)

You know, again, I think I would not expect to see more major changes before the trial in New York. But after that trial takes place and after it's done, I think that, again, the transparency and the accountability. So there's a guy named Bob Minsinger who was named as the compliance officer for the NRA. And...

I actually, after I got done talking with Doug, I emailed Nick and said, hey, I'd like to talk with Bob. And NRA's

response was, check back after the trial. So that's one of the things that I'm hoping to do is after this trial is done and people maybe feel like they can talk a little bit more without Letitia James, you know, trying to depose everybody or using what they say out of context in court. I want to kind of explore this transparency and accountability and talk with the compliance officer and the auditor about what that looks like.

right? Because I think it's hard for us to tell right now. You know, another positive signs of fact that they knew were there for this. They kept the elections of officers open. There was a motion to close those elections that the voters or the NRA members would not be able to know what happened. And that motion failed. So when we see more signs like that,

I would actually, I'll tell you what, I don't know if it's gonna happen. I didn't mention this to Doug Hamill or anything, but you know, the entering board meetings take place quarterly, right? I would love to start seeing those live streamed for entering members. And maybe you've got to enter your entering membership number and your ID to get access to that. But that would be a sign of this openness and accountability. We're all meeting in Fairfax. It's not part of the annual meetings, but if you want to see what's happening outside of executive session, here's the link, log in, and you can watch what's going on.

I would love to see and maybe the.

Stephen Gutowski (51:09.114)

or even just publicize these more, right? Because they just kind of treat them like they're almost secret, or they have.

Cam Edwards (51:15.235)

Right, exactly. And that's the thing. I think we need to get away from that. This is a membership -based organization. Wayne and Chris always used to say, Chris Cox always used to say, you know, the NRA has nothing without its members. And I think that you can lean into that. I think a reformed NRA can really lean hard into the fact that it is nothing without its members. And if you need members to be as strong as possible, then you need to give people a reason to join. And they need to feel that ownership.

And I think that was part of the problem with the NRA the last few years is it didn't feel like there was ownership. It was Wayne's show, it was Wayne's World. There wasn't even room for Garth in Wayne's World. So I think that that's something that I'm looking for. Not just ways for me to give the NRA money by showing up at Friends of NRA dinners or responding to direct mail. I'd actually like to see less reliance on direct mail. But again,

specific actions that can be taken that shows those in charge understand the importance of having an informed and engaged membership and are encouraging that informed and engaged membership.

Stephen Gutowski (52:25.85)

Yeah. All right. Well, I think that gives people a pretty good understanding of where he thinks things are at, but, you know, we've gone over a little bit of the interview, but like you said, it's 40 minutes long. I think people should go and check out the full thing here from Doug Hanlon himself. We've, of course I've invited him to come on the show. and I had some interest, so we'll see if that happens, down the line here. I'd love to love the interview them too. hopefully he'll be out there explaining the NRA and explaining these reforms and.

committing to that transparency, right? That's part of it, going out and talking about this stuff.

Cam Edwards (52:58.563)

I mean, he, listen, he definitely talked the talk and I've spoken to some staffers who say that he walks the walk as well. The folks that I've talked to who are not necessarily part of the old guard seem pretty pleased, you know? And one thing that I found kind of endearing, I don't know that Doug would like me sharing this, but I'm gonna share it anyway. You know, he's not a guy who has spent a lifetime in front of the camera.

Stephen Gutowski (53:05.722)

Mm -hmm.

Cam Edwards (53:23.651)

He's not a guy who has done a lot of these, you know, major interviews. And so I think there's a little bit of a learning curve for him. Like when we first signed on, he was sitting at his desk, the camera was way across the room. So he was ant sized. I don't know if you know the old, the kids in the halls, I was like, I'm crushing your skull. He was that small, right? And so I actually asked him, I said, hey, I mean, no skin on my back, but you know, is there another...

Can you move? Can you change the camera? Can we just do something so that people can see you? And he hadn't really thought about that. And he's like, yeah, yeah, sure, absolutely. Give me a second. And he did it. He got up and we didn't have a handler get up and start messing around with this camera. But I don't think that Doug has really spent a lot of time in that world. And I don't think that his top priority that morning was, I want to look good for the camera. He's got a lot of stuff, a lot of other stuff going on. And again, I kind of liked that.

Stephen Gutowski (53:54.682)

That is interesting.

Stephen Gutowski (54:02.906)

Yeah.

Stephen Gutowski (54:17.69)

So there's a bit of an authenticity, yeah, but a bit of authenticity to that, I guess. I mean, maybe hopefully they'll have a more smooth operation in the future, but it does speak to like he really was trying to do your interview without having to go through whatever hoops to get a bunch, 20 people in the room to manage it or whatever.

Cam Edwards (54:20.803)

Yeah. Yeah. So.

Cam Edwards (54:38.179)

Yeah, there was no makeup artist, because again, the camera at first was so big, I could see pretty much the entire room. Nobody was powdering Doug's head or anything like that. It was just, you know, it was him sitting down, ultimately standing up so we could get a little bit closer to the camera. But, you know, wanting to have this conversation. And there was not a reluctance on Hamlin's part to shy away from any question. Again, there were a couple of things I didn't ask just because I knew he couldn't really get into it. But, you know,

As an NRA benefactor life member who has been disappointed in the direction of the organization over the last few years, I walked away again hopeful that maybe a corner has been changed or turned and rock bottom has been reached and now the NRA is on its way back up.

Stephen Gutowski (55:25.466)

Hmm. All right. Well, if people want to watch the full interview, where can they do that?

Cam Edwards (55:30.051)

Yeah, just go to barionarms.com. You can find the link to all of our cam and companies, I believe in the top right hand section of the website, but you can also go to YouTube, just look up Barion Arms Cam and Company. It's there. I will also give another plug for an interview I actually did this week with a couple, Doug and Stacey Duncan, who had to shut down their gun store in Illinois 12 years of the day after they opened because of the untenable nature of trying to do business.

in Illinois these days. They're a small town gun store. They lost half their business within the past year when Pritzker signed the gun and magazine ban into law. And it's a really sad story. This is one of those gun stores that was just a fixture in the community. They were raffling off guns to raise money for families who were going through medical problems. They were donating guns to Ducks Unlimited banquets. They had, I think, the only indoor rifle or gun in the archery range in Kankakee County, Illinois. So...

They were a real fixture to the community providing real gun safety, education and training. And unfortunately, the

environment in Illinois is so rough now. The stores like theirs, a lot of them are just finding it very, very difficult to stay open. So, you know, I know that the gun control activists love to talk about the victims of gun laws in the Second Amendment, but there are victims to gun control too.

Right? Those folks who are unable to exercise their second amendment rights because of the laws that are in place, businesses that are destroyed because of the gun control regimes that are in places like Illinois and California, and the communities that suffer when those gun stores, those ranges disappear.

Stephen Gutowski (57:08.282)

sounds like another good interview people should absolutely check it out and they should subscribe I think over there at Bearing Arms listen to Cam and Company every time it comes on I know that I listen to it often and it's a good source of news for me as well so I highly recommend Cam's writing and especially his show so

Cam Edwards (57:29.091)

And obviously our, your audience knows this, but we recommend the reload too at Baring Arms because Stephen is doing outstanding work. Jake is doing outstanding work. The, the, the, the, the websites, the columns, the news stories, the podcast, the newsletter. And yes, whatever you're doing to support the reload, thank you. And if you can do a little bit more, I would say do a little bit more. You don't even need to wait to see any reform efforts from the reload. You can write them a check right now and feel good about it.

Stephen Gutowski (57:32.57)

Okay.

Stephen Gutowski (57:52.186)

There you go. Yeah, and I think we, while we may be pseudo competitors or whatever, I think our work is complimentary because you often are focused on commentary and give some of the best commentary out there, I think, and especially on the pro -gun side of the equation. And we try to focus more on the hard news. Although, that interview you're talking about sounds like a pretty good hard news interview too. So you...

you certainly don't ignore the reporting side of things either. But I think it comes together well.

Cam Edwards (58:32.099)

I appreciate that very much. And I think this came together pretty well. I hope I get a chance to do it again soon.

Stephen Gutowski (58:36.922)

Absolutely. We love having you on. Always one of my favorite people to have on. Just love talking to you. You're a good guy. And of course, we hear our praying for Mrs. E as she continues her treatments. And hopefully, maybe they'll change the losses so you can have some of those gummies that you mentioned earlier. Anything that makes things a bit easier on you guys would be, I would support. But.

Yeah, that's all we've got for this week. I'm going to talk a little bit about The Dispatch now.

That's right: this episode is brought to you by The Dispatch. We're doing one of these classic promo swaps with them, actually on Kevin Williamson's newsletter, which is one that I personally subscribed to and read pretty much every time it comes out. I've actually been a paying subscriber to The Dispatch since they launched. They have over 400,000 readers now. You know, Jonah Goldberg, and Steve Hayes, and Chris Stirewalt, and Allahpundit, and there's so many people who write over there that I've long followed and respected and enjoyed their perspective. And of course, in addition to a lot of the great commentary that they have from people that you probably know better than me, the people who are more well known than I, they also have a lot of really deep and original news reporting that they do. And so that's why I've been happy to have them as one of our sponsors as a promo swap. I definitely stand behind their work and recommend it to you guys in a way that I couldn't say for a lot of other publications out there. So, you know, if you're interested in checking out The Dispatch, if you haven't heard of it before, or you haven't taken the time to go over and examine what they're bringing into the world from a journalistic standpoint, I think you should do it. And in fact, part of our promo swap includes a 30-day free trial for their paid version. So you'll get access to everything they have

for free for 30 days so you can read it and make up your own mind. Just follow the link in the description here or in our newsletter this week at The Reload. Honestly, I just do legitimately recommend them and so I'm glad to do this sort of promo swap because they're one of my favorite publications, and I think you guys will enjoy them if you enjoy what we do here at The Reload. So check out The Dispatch today at the link in our description.