

# THE Gun Owners

34 YEARS OF NO COMPROMISE – 1975-2009

## Obama, Congressional Leaders Continue Assault on the Second Amendment

By John Velleco

The Obama administration and Congressional leaders are on a crusade to destroy the Second Amendment.

Fueled by a violence-obsessed media, politicians are blaming American firearms for killings by lawless Mexico drug cartels, and they are pushing for sweeping new gun control laws that will punish law-abiding gun owners in the U.S.

During a recent trip to Mexico, President Obama pledged to stop the “southern flow of guns.”

“As [Mexican President Felipe] Calderón and I discussed, I am urging the Senate in the United States to ratify an inter-American treaty known as CIFTA to curb small arms trafficking that is a source of so many of the weapons used in this drug war,” said President Obama in Mexico City.

The CIFTA treaty, officially titled the “Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms,

*Continued on page 2*

## GOA takes on Justice Dept.



President Obama met with Mexican President Felipe Calderón in April. After falsely claiming that 90 percent of crime guns confiscated in Mexico come from the United States, the Obama administration has issued repeated calls for banning semi-automatic firearms currently owned by law-abiding Americans. In response, Gun Owners of America issued a Freedom of Information Act request to the Justice Department in April, demanding that DOJ justify its 90 percent claim and produce documentation. DOJ faces an uphill battle, as FOX News Channel documented the 90 percent factoid is totally false.

## Health Plan Threatens to Feed Your Gun-related Data into a National Database – and charge you \$10,000 a year for the privilege

by Mike Hammond

In a year when trillion dollar bailouts have become routine, many Americans have become almost numb to our acceleration towards socialism.

But gun rights activists aren't in that crowd, and so GOA has to inform you of yet *another* threat to your privacy, the Second Amendment, and your wallet.

It is called an “individual mandate” or, alternatively, the “Massachusetts plan.” And the “old time” media — like *The Washington Post* and the *New*

*York Times* — have been working hard to build momentum for it.

First, a little history.

When President Obama signed the so-called stimulus bill into law in February, he set our government on a course to spend between \$12 and \$20 BILLION to require the medical community to retroactively put our most confidential medical records into a government database — a database that could easily be used to deny gun rights for veterans (and other law-abiding Americans) who have sought treatment

for things such as PTSD.

Currently, gun owners can avoid getting caught in this database by carefully

*Continued on page 6*

### Inside:

- **GOA in the News (page 3, 7)**
- **Did your senators vote for another gun ban? (page 5)**

## Leaders Continue Assault on Second Amendment

Continued from page 1

Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials,” was signed by President Bill Clinton, but never ratified by the Senate.

Supporters of the treaty hope the large Democrat majority in the Senate will lead to a quick vote for ratification. But while proponents claim the treaty is not a threat to the Second Amendment, GOA warns Congress that approval of CIFTA will be an abrogation of its duty to uphold the Constitution.

If ratified and the U.S. is found not to be in compliance with any provisions of the treaty — such as a provision that could outlaw reloading ammunition without a government license — Obama would be empowered to implement regulations without Congressional approval.

[Visit [www.gunowners.org/fs0901.htm](http://www.gunowners.org/fs0901.htm) for more information about how the treaty could affect your gun rights.]

Obama is not alone in pressing for more gun control, and more than an anti-gun treaty is on the table.

At congressional hearings in El Paso, Texas, Senator Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D-MA) called for another ban on semi-automatic firearms and to take aggressive action in the U.S.

Kerry, giving the impression that gun dealers here are as much a problem as the cartels, wants Mexican authorities to work with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE) to “identify and shut down the sellers, who are almost always on our side of the border.”

Sen. Diane Feinstein is also aggressively pushing for the renewal of the Clinton gun ban, using Mexico as her excuse.

“I am prepared to wage the assault weapons battle again and I intend to do so,” Sen. Feinstein told America from the Senate floor.

U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder took his seat on the “blame America” bandwagon. “[T]here are just a few gun-related changes that we would like to make, and among them would be to reinstitute the ban on the sale of assault weapons. I think that will have a positive impact in Mexico, at a minimum,” Holder said.

And as if banning guns and entering into an international gun control treaty is not enough, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi offered up her own gun control proposal: “We want [firearms] registered,” Pelosi told Robin Roberts on ABC’s *Good Morning America*.

Pelosi’s comments give a strong boost to H.R. 45, a draconian gun owner registration and licensing bill introduced in Congress by Chicago-based Representative Bobby Rush.

## The new propaganda machine

The frenzy to pass more gun control is being driven by a misinformation campaign that would have made Joseph Goebbels proud. “More than 90% of the guns found in Mexico are not bought [in Mexico], but in the United States,” President Obama said during his Mexico trip.

That 90% number has been echoed by the media and anti-gun politicians on both sides of the border thousands of times, leading many people to accept it as fact.

However, William La Jeunesse and Maxim Lott set the record straight in a FOXNews.com report. “It’s just not true,” they said.

According to their report, the Mexican government sends to American authorities only those firearms that might have been in commerce in the U.S. The majority of crime guns recovered in Mexico are never sent to the U.S. for tracing.

Of the firearms traced by the U.S. in 2007-2008, only about half were done so successfully. Of *that* number, 90% were traced to this country. That amounts to about 17% of the total number of crime guns that are confiscated by Mexican authorities, a far cry from the 90% touted by the Obama administration.

And even that number is inflated. Many firearms are sent to the Mexico

Continued on page 3

# Are You A Bitter Clinger?

## Who is a Bitter Clinger?

According to Barack Obama, who was recorded unawares at a San Francisco fundraiser, bitter clingers are voters who are bitter because of their economic frustration and so cling bitterly to their Bibles and their guns.

**If you are a bitter clinger, Gun Owners of America has a T-shirt for you!**



You can proudly proclaim your membership in this class of people so looked down upon by the elites in our country.

To order a Bitter Clinger T-shirt, go to:

<http://www.gunowners.org/clinger>



## GOA in the News



GOA Communications Director Erich Pratt demonstrated the futility of gun control in our nation's capital during a debate in April. In related news, GOA supported an amendment to repeal the DC gun ban earlier during the year. The Senate passed the amendment as a rider to the DC Voting Rights Act — and this rider has had the effect of stalling the bill aimed at giving DC an anti-gun (voting) representative in the U.S. House of Representatives.



In February, Gun Owners Foundation Attorney Herb Titus spoke with CNN's Lou Dobbs about our defense of David Olofson — the former Army veteran who was prosecuted for transferring a malfunctioning firearm.

### Leaders Continue Assault on Second Amendment

*Continued from page 2*

government legitimately in shipments approved by U.S. authorities, but these guns often are filtered to the cartels through disaffected military personnel in Mexico.

For example, according to the FOX report, many of the 150,000 Mexican soldiers who deserted the Army in the last six years took their weapons with them.

La Jeunesse and Lott also question why the multi-billion dollar cartels

The *Los Angeles Times* reported in March that the cartels often use weapons not even available at U.S. gun stores, smuggling them through “Central American countries or by sea, eluding U.S. and Mexican monitors.”

The cartels also evade the law through corruption in the Mexican government. An article in the *New York Times* late last year noted that, “One of Mexico’s most notorious drug cartels made huge cash payments [\$150,000 to \$450,000 *each*] to officials in the Mexican attorney general’s office in exchange for confidential information on anti-drug operations.... The cartel

as reinstating the ban on semi-automatic firearms will make Americans less safe, especially if violence spills over to this side of the border.

As pro-gun Wyoming Senator John Barasso pointed out during the El Paso congressional trip: “Why would you disarm someone when they potentially could get caught in the crossfire?... The United States will not surrender our Second Amendment rights for Mexico’s border problem.”

Mexican authorities like President Calderón and Attorney General Eduardo Medina Mora have their hands full with corruption and violence in their own country, but they continue to call on the U.S. to change its gun laws.

Mr. Medina even lectured that “The Second Amendment was never meant to arm foreign criminal groups.”

Outrageously, many shameful American office holders who swear an oath to support and defend the U.S. Constitution are all too eager to bow to the wishes of “blame America first” foreign politicians.

All three gun control proposals — ratifying the CIFTA treaty, renewing the Clinton gun ban and registering all gun owners — will do *nothing* to combat the violence in Mexico, but will go a *long way* toward eroding our Second Amendment rights. ■

***“We would like to ... reinstitute the ban on the sale of assault weapons. I think that will have a positive impact in Mexico, at a minimum.”***

***— Attorney General Eric Holder***

would “bother buying single-shot rifles, and force thousands of unknown ‘straw’ buyers in the U.S. through a government background check, when they can buy boatloads of fully automatic M-16s and assault rifles from China, Israel or South Africa?”

might have had an informant inside the American embassy.”

Gun control laws do not reduce crime rates in the U.S. and it is absurd for politicians to suggest that restricting the gun rights of Americans will have any impact on the Mexico situation.

Actually, gun control proposals such

# 20/20 Just Can't See Straight When it Comes to the Second Amendment

by John Velleco

The title of ABC's *20/20* program, hosted by Diane Sawyer, was promising: "If I only had a gun."

Finally, the title suggested, a look at the self-defense benefits of firearms ownership.

But surprise, surprise, Ms. Sawyer had a different agenda. "If I only had a gun" was in fact a sarcastic title. What she really meant was, "Don't think that a gun would actually help you in a time of crisis, because it won't."

This show was a continuation of a program *20/20* produced ten years ago that made the astounding discovery that young boys will, given the chance, play with real guns that are mixed in with other toys. Their point was to prove that there is an epidemic of accidents involving children and guns.

As every parent would agree, even one accidental death is one too many. But before people get so frightened that they send their guns off to the U.N. to be melted down into Volvos, they should be reminded of the facts.

Accidental shootings have declined by more than 50 percent over the last three decades, even as the number of gun owners has greatly increased. Children have a much greater chance of dying in an automobile accident, drowning, burning to death or suffocating than they do being accidentally killed with a firearm.

If do-gooders really want to protect children, keep them away from cars, swimming pools and matches. Guns, however, are a different story. But *20/20* did not even bother to ask how many children's lives are saved each year by armed citizens.

Ms. Sawyer failed to mention that multiple victim shootings such as Columbine or Virginia Tech usually occur in government-mandated gun free zones, aka, "criminal safety zones." Tragedies like these are sadly compounded by the fact that there is no one on the scene able to shoot back.

The program completely ignored the fact that American citizens use firearms more than one million times per year successfully in self-defense, and that



merely brandishing a weapon usually is sufficient to repel an attack.

Ms. Sawyer was also astounded at how "easy" it is to buy a firearm. She acts like it's no big deal that the federal government regulates all gun businesses in the country.

*20/20* gave the impression that the rules for buying a gun at a gun show are different than buying a gun any place else, the so-called "gun show loophole." Another fallacy. Any person who buys a firearm from a federally licensed dealer has to undergo a government background check, whether the

transaction is at a gun show or a gun store.

In many states, on the other hand, private citizens can buy and sell their lawfully possessed and constitutionally protected firearms to other private citizens without having to get Barack Obama's or Eric Holder's permission, whether the sale is at a gun show or in one's living room. That's why we call it a "right," and not a privilege. What Diane calls a "loophole" is what we call "freedom."

Those of us who cherish the First Amendment would recoil at the idea of needing a government-issued permit in order to buy a newspaper or to watch *20/20*. What makes some people think such infringements are acceptable for the Second Amendment?

While it might come as a surprise to Diane Sawyer, the right to keep and bear arms was not an afterthought of our Founding Fathers. They understood that the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness would be meaningless without the means to protect our lives and the lives of our loved ones from violent law-breakers. ■

## Defeating the media brainwashing

by Erich Pratt

In April, a survey of Christian teenagers uncovered stunning results:

- A third of the teens did not know that gun control policies around the world over the last 100 years have endangered people's lives.
- Almost 40 percent did not know that guns are used far more often in the United States to save life than to take life.
- And a whopping 90 percent did not know that the British effort on April 19, 1775 to steal the colonists' guns (a.k.a., gun control) was the immediate event which precipitated the shots fired at Lexington.

These are not the survey results from President Obama's church back in Illinois. They came from a conservative, suburban church in northern Virginia where almost every parent voted against Barack Obama in the most recent election.

Clearly, the national media is doing its job.

The good news is that there are pro-gun materials that can challenge their thinking.

To read the report which shows you which video materials helped change the minds of those teenagers who were surveyed in April, see *How to Combat TV Media's Anti-gun Bias* at [www.gunowners.org/mediabias.htm](http://www.gunowners.org/mediabias.htm) on the GOA website. ■

# Congress, President Obama Extend Parks Gun Ban

by *Erich Pratt*

In March, President Obama signed the Omnibus Public Land Management Act, a bill which grabs millions of acres of land and places it under the National Parks Service gun ban.

This new law means that hundreds of thousands of gun owners could inadvertently find themselves in violation of the gun ban, as they travel on roadways falling under NPS' authority.

This new law is a particular problem because U.S. District Court Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly granted the Brady Campaign's petition in March to block implementation of the Bush Administration's efforts to ease the park gun ban.

Because the Obama administration has indicated it will not appeal the judge's ruling, there is now a complete ban on carrying firearms for self-defense in National Parks — regardless of whether a gun owner owns a valid concealed carry permit.

During the waning days of the Bush Administration, Interior Department officials had lifted part of the gun ban

in National Parks to allow the carrying of concealed firearms.

But Judge Kollar-Kotelly's ruling effectively nixes the small gains that we achieved. To make matters worse, the lands bill that President Obama recently signed does nothing to overturn that judge's decision and actually expands the total amount of NPS land covered by the ban.

While gun owners were able to stall the bill in Congress for quite some time, the bill eventually passed both houses of Congress by a fairly over-



whelming margin.

While readers can see (below) how their senators voted, the House votes can be read online at <http://capwiz.com/gunowners/issues/votes>.

In related news, two congressmen have introduced a partial repeal of the National Parks gun ban, but Gun Owners of America is working with House and Senate offices to introduce a full repeal. ■

**Repeal of Amtrak Gun Ban.** Gun owners won a skirmish in the U.S. Senate in April when it voted to repeal the gun ban on Amtrak trains. Senator Roger Wicker (R-MS) offered the amendment as a rider to the budget resolution. Amtrak regulations currently prohibit firearms on both checked and carry-on baggage, which means that sportsmen who wish to use an Amtrak train for a hunting trip cannot take a shotgun, even in their checked luggage. GOA will be looking for opportunities like this to work with Senators who will offer pro-gun amendments to bills that President Obama wants. To see this vote (and others) go to: <http://capwiz.com/gunowners/issues/votes>

## Did Your Senator Vote to Expand the National Parks Gun Ban?

The following Senators voted to extend the amount of land covered by the National Parks gun ban on March 19. The bill was HR 146, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. In addition to maintaining the current gun ban on NPS lands, this bill greatly expands the total amount of NPS land. Since NPS-controlled parks and trails transect many busy roadways, hundreds of thousands of gun owners can unwittingly find themselves in violation of the gun ban without even knowing they are on federal land.

- |                  |                   |                   |                    |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Akaka (D-HI)     | Carper (D-DE)     | Harkin (D-IA)     | Menendez (D-NJ)    | Shelby (R-AL)     |
| Alexander (R-TN) | Casey (D-PA)      | Hatch (R-UT)      | Merkley (D-OR)     | Snowe (R-ME)      |
| Barrasso (R-WY)  | Cochran (R-MS)    | Inouye (D-HI)     | Mikulski (D-MD)    | Specter (R-PA)    |
| Baucus (D-MT)    | Collins (R-ME)    | Johnson (D-SD)    | Murkowski (R-AK)   | Stabenow (D-MI)   |
| Bayh (D-IN)      | Conrad (D-ND)     | Kaufman (D-DE)    | Murray (D-WA)      | Tester (D-MT)     |
| Begich (D-AK)    | Corker (R-TN)     | Kerry (D-MA)      | Nelson (D-FL)      | Udall (D-CO)      |
| Bennet (D-CO)    | Crapo (R-ID)      | Kohl (D-WI)       | Nelson (D-NE)      | Udall (D-NM)      |
| Bennett (R-UT)   | Dodd (D-CT)       | Landrieu (D-LA)   | Pryor (D-AR)       | Voinovich (R-OH)  |
| Bingaman (D-NM)  | Dorgan (D-ND)     | Lautenberg (D-NJ) | Reed (D-RI)        | Warner (D-VA)     |
| Bond (R-MO)      | Durbin (D-IL)     | Leahy (D-VT)      | Reid (D-NV)        | Webb (D-VA)       |
| Boxer (D-CA)     | Enzi (R-WY)       | Levin (D-MI)      | Risch (R-ID)       | Whitehouse (D-RI) |
| Brown (D-OH)     | Feingold (D-WI)   | Lieberman (ID-CT) | Roberts (R-KS)     | Wicker (R-MS)     |
| Burr (D-IL)      | Feinstein (D-CA)  | Lincoln (D-AR)    | Rockefeller (D-WV) | Wyden (D-OR)      |
| Byrd (D-WV)      | Gillibrand (D-NY) | Lugar (R-IN)      | Sanders (I-VT)     |                   |
| Cantwell (D-WA)  | Gregg (R-NH)      | Martinez (R-FL)   | Schumer (D-NY)     |                   |
| Cardin (D-MD)    | Hagan (D-NC)      | McCaskill (D-MO)  | Shaheen (D-NH)     |                   |

## Health Plan Threatens

*Continued from page 1*

selecting their doctors, and by purchasing insurance with carriers that have not signed an agreement with the government to place your records in a national database.

But that could change as a result of legislation that passed both houses of Congress in April. This bill — a budget resolution which is currently in a House-Senate conference committee — will be the first domino in a process that could force you to buy government-approved insurance, thus making it impossible to avoid the medical database.

Put another way: If you do not have health insurance — or, potentially, if you do not have the type of health insurance the government wants you to have — the government will force you to purchase what it regards as “acceptable” health insurance. And, in most cases, you will have to pay for it out of your own pocket.

What would all this cost? Based on comparable insurance currently on the market, it could cost \$10,000 a year -- or more.

If you were jobless, the socialists would probably spot you the ten grand. But if you are middle class and can't pay \$10,000 because of your mortgage payments, your small business, or your kids' college education, you would be fined (over \$1,000 a year currently in Massachusetts). And, if you couldn't pay the confiscatory fine, you could ultimately be imprisoned.

Scary, you say. But why is this a Second Amendment issue? Under the Massachusetts plan, your *mandated* insurance carrier has to feed your medical data into a centralized database — freely accessible by the government under federal privacy laws.

So ... remember when your pediatrician asked your kid if you have a firearm in the home? Or when your dad was given a prescription for Zoloft because of his Alzheimer's? Or when your wife mentioned to her gynecologist that she had regularly smoked marijuana ten years ago?

All of this would be in a centralized database. And all of it could potentially be used to vastly expand the prohibited



**Remember when your pediatrician asked your kid if you have a firearm in the home? Or, are you a veteran who sought out psychiatric help for the night tremors that have resulted from your service in battle overseas? This is the type of "medical" information that could soon be placed in a centralized database and be used to vastly expand the prohibited persons list maintained by the FBI in West Virginia.**

persons list maintained by the FBI in West Virginia.

Gun Owners of America activated its email list in April to fight this legislation and to support pro-gun amendments to the bill.

Thankfully, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by Senator James DeMint (R-SC) to prohibit any system of nationalized health care which would

---

***A “mandated” insurance system could not only cost you up to \$1,000 month, but could also result in your most sensitive personal information being placed in a medical database — information that could easily be used to put more names on the gun prohibition list (NICS).***

---

prevent Americans from being able to select their doctors and insurance companies.

This amendment could make it somewhat more difficult to institute either socialized medicine or a Massachusetts-style plan that requires everyone to purchase government-approved insurance.

Again, a “mandated” insurance system could not only cost you up to \$1,000 month, but could also result in your most sensitive personal information being placed in a medical database — information that could easily be used to put more names on the gun prohibition list (NICS).

Anti-gunners are expected to strip the pro-gun DeMint amendment out of the budget resolution that is currently in a conference committee. Nevertheless, DeMint was able to pin senators down on a very important issue early in the budget war, and as such, this provides us with an important strategic objective.

It is unclear when the conference report on the budget resolution will be sent back to the Senate and the House.

But the plan is to include language in the conference report which, in September, will pop out a health insurance bill that will probably include a mandate for you or your employer to purchase government approved insurance against your will.

They are not talking about this openly, but as an April 6, 2009 editorial in *The Washington Post* confessed:

“Though only some of the players [on Capitol Hill] will say so now, the [health care] plan will ultimately include a mandate requiring everyone to have insurance.”

You see, the power players on Capitol Hill are not admitting this openly because the American people oppose it. But if they set in motion a process to help sneak such a “mandate” into law, then gun owners will only have a few weeks to stop it in September.

This is why we need to keep the pressure on liberty-leaning Senators during the ensuing months.

Typically, there are many parliamentary procedures that pro-gun Senators could use in September to kill anti-gun legislation like this. Unfortunately, Senators will not be able to kill this bill by using the filibuster (that is, extended debate), or by offering pro-gun amendments, or by requiring a supermajority vote (60 percent of Senators).

This is because budget legislation falls under special Senate rules, which prevent a minority of Senators from killing the bill.

Please stay tuned. ■

# Gun Control on the High Seas

by John Velleco

The capture and dramatic rescue of Capt. Richard Phillips of the *Maersk Alabama* held the nation riveted for days.

Many people not familiar with the dangers of the open seas expressed surprise that just a few terrorists were able to overtake a vessel crewed by five times as many people. Why couldn't the crew just fire at the invaders as they tried to board the ship?

They could have if they had firearms onboard, but container ships like the *Maersk Alabama* are generally prohibited from carrying firearms because of gun laws in the countries of various ports. Shipping companies and crews don't dare violate these gun bans because the penalties can be severe.

For example, in Kenya, where the *Maersk* was headed, the government is expected to soon make possession of an unlicensed firearm a capital offense. Currently the offense carries a prison sentence of many years.

The outrageous but predictable result of these gun prohibition laws — although intended to disarm criminals — is that gigantic commercial vessels like the *Maersk* are vulnerable to attack from small groups of thugs in little motorboats.

The arguments for self-defense firearms possession are even more pronounced on the sea than on land. When a criminal attack occurs, almost always the only people present are the thugs and the victims.

On land, police are usually minutes away. On the sea, help can be hours or even days away. The terrorists know this, and they know that mariners are

normally unarmed.

Ships that do have armed crew members or hired security often successfully defend against attack. The cowardly pirates generally get back in their little boats and scurry away at the sight of armed resistance. They're looking for money, not a firefight.

Pirate attacks have only increased since the rescue of Capt. Phillips, leaving politicians wringing their hands trying to figure out a way to protect U.S. vessels in dangerous waters. But the answer is simple: arm the crew members.

Ships' crews are trained to repel an attack by speeding up, cutting grappling hooks, using high-pitched sounds and spraying fire hoses. They need — and deserve — more.

Anti-gunners will make the same arguments about arming mariners as they do about arming anyone on land or in the air. "Oh, the ships will be more dangerous with all those guns on board." But, as we've witnessed time and again, "gun free zones" simply make easier targets for criminals.

The skilled shooters who saved Capt. Phillips were armed. As is often the case, the criminal attack ended when armed assailants were met with armed resistance. But our Navy is not able to send a destroyer to every incident.

Not only that, there is mounting evidence that the White House even got in

the way of the Phillips rescue. *WorldNetDaily* reported on April 19 that the Obama administration refused to authorize deployment of a SEAL team for 36 hours, despite the recommendation for an earlier deployment by the on-scene commander; that it turned down two rescue plans offered up by the SEAL commander; and that it initially was unwilling to grant an order to use lethal force to rescue Captain Phillips, although it subsequently relented, placing the SEAL teams under strict rules of engagement that "required them to do nothing unless the hostage's life was in 'imminent danger.'"

While we can't change the extreme anti-gun laws of other countries, the American government should insist that American-controlled vessels, frequently carrying humanitarian aid, will not be unilaterally disarmed. Crew members must be permitted to carry firearms onboard for their own protection, and any effort to disarm mariners sailing under the U.S. flag should not be tolerated by our government. ■

## GOA in the News



During a debate on the Fox News Channel in April, GOA Executive Director Larry Pratt (left) told the nation that the piracy attacks would come to a screeching halt if sailors were permitted to arm themselves.

## THE Gun Owners

Sen. H.L. Richardson (Ret.)  
Founder and Chairman

Tim Macy  
Vice-Chairman

Larry Pratt  
Executive Director

Erich Pratt  
Director of Communications

John Velleco  
Director of Federal Affairs

GUN OWNERS OF AMERICA  
8001 Forbes Place, Suite 102  
Springfield, Virginia 22151  
703-321-8585

Web Site: <http://www.gunowners.org>

The Gun Owners publication is not copyrighted. Copies may be made freely, but it is requested that attribution be made together with GOA's address, phone number and web site location.



## Making Nice with Castro

by Larry Pratt

Who ever said that big-government liberals had to be consistent in their views?

Take the case of boycotting countries to leverage politically incorrect regimes. Boycotting South Africa under its apartheid government was good. Boycotting Cuba ruled by dictator

Fidel Castro and his brother Raul is bad.

Not only has the Obama administration ended the boycott of Cuba, a congressional delegation has already forged the path to improved relations with Cuba with their personal visit.

One wonders how previous U.S. governments could have been so mistaken about the Castro brothers. The delegation apparently found nothing wrong with the men who have murdered tens of thousands of Cubans while imposing tyrannical government on the once prosperous island nation.

Rep. Laura Richardson (D-CA) reported of Raul: "He looked directly into my eyes." Rep. Emmanuel Cleaver (D-MO) said of Fidel: "He's one of the most amazing human beings I've ever met!"

A comment about Raul Castro by Rep. Bobby Rush (D-IL) was typical of the other members of the delegation. Rush said that "Raul Castro was a very engaging, down-to-earth and kind man, someone who I would favor as a neighbor. It was almost like visiting an old friend."

Is Rush serious?

As a co-founder of the Illinois Black Panthers, Bobby Rush was a street thug in the 1960's and eventually did time in jail for illegal weapons charges. Now, this wannabe Castro neighbor wants to register all semiautomatic firearms and all handguns, the target of his bill H.R. 45. His fascination with Castro is unsettling to say the least because the Castros consolidated their power precisely through their use of gun registration in Cuba.

The first full day the Castros were in power, their goon squads went to every address where a gun was registered — and either the gun on the list or the owner of the missing gun was surrendered. Castro rules by monopoly of force, not popular support.

The Second Amendment of the Constitution of the United States is in place precisely to prevent government monopoly of force.

Registration is not a legitimate exercise of government power. The Constitution does not read that "the right of the people to keep and bear *registered* arms shall not be infringed." Moreover, registration is not a crime fighting tool, even assuming fighting crime is a legitimate reason to infringe people's constitutionally-protected rights, which it is not. Registration of handguns has been in force in

Hawaii and in Canada since the 1930s, but has never been used to solve a single crime.

Registration of guns is good for only one purpose, and the Castro regime is proof that registration is a very efficient vehicle for disarming the people.

Rush's gun registration bill (H.R. 45) has been assumed by some to be going nowhere, but that is a happy thought not supported by the facts. In an interview with ABC's Robin Roberts on April 7, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi said quite plainly: "We want them registered."

Who might the "we" be? Well, a co-sponsor of Rush's bill in the last Congress, Rep. Rahm Emanuel, is now President Obama's chief of staff. Pelosi would also qualify as substantial support.

Going from Rep. Bobby Rush's gun registration plan to the Castro gun confiscation plan is not such a long leap with all of the above in mind. We have an administration and members of Congress who admire Castro. Not only have they refused to criticize his oppression, they have been supporting the system that made it possible to confiscate guns under Castro.

But who can even dare oppose gun registration? The administration is now claiming that fear of gun control is one of the key views of rightwing extremism that might result in terroristic activity. It seems that the message coming from the Obama administration is: "Only a terrorist would oppose the President."

---

***Are you a terrorist? To see if the Obama administration thinks you are, read a short analysis of the "Rightwing Extremism" report that was issued by the Department of Homeland Security in April. Go to [www.gunowners.org/dhsreport.htm](http://www.gunowners.org/dhsreport.htm)***

---

In April, the Department of Homeland Security leaked a report entitled "Rightwing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climates Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment."

Key indicators of rightwing extremism in this report include those people who oppose gun control and are concerned that the Obama administration is preparing an assault on the constitutionally protected right to keep and bear arms.

Other key factors that disturb the authors of "Rightwing Extremism" are returning veterans. They are potential terrorists — all of them.

To read GOA's analysis of this report, please go to: [www.gunowners.org/dhsreport.htm](http://www.gunowners.org/dhsreport.htm) ■