

# THE Gun Owners

28 YEARS OF NO COMPROMISE – 1975-2003

## White House favors keeping Clinton gun ban

by Erich Pratt

In a surprise move in April, the Bush administration announced its support for keeping the Clinton-Feinstein gun ban on the books.

The law, which banned scores of firearms in 1994, is set to expire on its ten-year anniversary in September of next year. But *The Washington Post* had a startling revelation for many of its readers on April 12.

"The president supports the current law, and he supports reauthorization of the current law," White House spokesman Scott McClellan said.

The "current law" McClellan was referring to is the ban on semi-automatic firearms and on magazines of over 10 rounds -- a ban which was introduced by Senator Dianne Feinstein of California and then-Representative Chuck Schumer of New York.

The ban barely squeaked through a Democratic Congress -- the margin was a single vote in the 435-member House of Representatives.

At the time of its passage, more than 180 types of firearms were outlawed. The language was quite thorough and covered handguns, rifles and shotguns.

### Ban to sunset in 2004

Most bad legislation lives on forever. But in an effort to corral fence-sitters in Congress, Senator Feinstein had inserted a "sunset" provision into the bill. This provision means that the ban will expire after ten years -- specifically, in September of 2004.

At the time, the sunset provision didn't seem like much of a victory. But it soon became clear that this provision would be our best hope for repealing the notorious gun grab. Recently, it was beginning to look like gun owners would have a better than average chance of winning.

Until the announcement this past month.

### GOA Activists Deluge White House



Associated Press

Gun Owners of America mobilized thousands upon thousands of grassroots activists in mid-April after the White House announced its support for keeping the Clinton-Feinstein gun ban on the books.

The White House's statement means that people will not be able to rely upon a presidential veto if Congress musters enough votes to extend the ban.

Despite both houses of Congress being controlled by Republicans, the majority of Congressmen are either fence-sitters or anti-gun.

It is quite possible that the gun grabbers can get 51 votes in the Senate and 218 votes in the House to reauthorize the semi-auto ban and make it permanent.

This makes the recent announcement all the more distressing for gun owners. But Bush's position is not written in

stone -- at least not yet.

Because the above quote was not made by the President himself or by his primary spokesman, Ari Fleischer, many on Capitol Hill believe there is still some "wiggle room" that will allow the President to reverse course and do the right thing.

### GOA mobilizes enormous grassroots

Gun Owners of America alerted its email activists in April and generated almost 10,000 emails to the White House in the first 24 hours alone.

Many websites posted the GOA alert, and Internet news agencies picked up GOA's message as well.

For many in the Second Amendment community, the announcement came as a shocking surprise. After all, many gun owners went to the polls in 2000 and supported George Bush over Al Gore.

Pro-gun voters delivered three key Democratic states -- Tennessee, West Virginia and Arkansas -- and with those states, the victory went to Bush.

### Clinton admits gun control is a political loser

In the post-election aftermath, many political commentators attributed the Bush victory to one major issue -- Al Gore's support for gun control.

Senator Joe Lieberman, Gore's running mate, lamented that Democrats "lost a number of [pro-gun] voters who

*Continued on page 2*

### Inside:

- **GOA in the news (page 3)**
- **Patriot Act to terrorize gun owners (page 4)**

## White House favors gun ban

*Continued from page 1*

on almost every other issue realized they'd be better off with Al Gore."

Former President Bill Clinton has also bemoaned the political consequences resulting from the semi-auto ban -- repeatedly admitting over the years that passage of the 1994 semi-auto ban cost him control of the Congress.

"There are some [Democrats] who would be on this platform today," lamented Clinton during a White House press conference, "who lost their seats in 1994 because they voted for the Brady Bill and they voted for the assault weapons ban."

Well, the ban really wasn't about assault weapons. True assault weapons can fire in the automatic mode, and none of the guns covered in the 1994 ban were automatics.

But Clinton was right about one thing. Many Democrats lost their jobs

***"... the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."***

***-- The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution***

in 1994 because they voted for the semi-auto ban. The election became a political slaughter which convinced many Washington insiders that gun control is a losing issue politically.

But the Brady Bunch still doesn't get it.

### **Brady Bunch attacks GOA**

After GOA began mobilizing gun owners in opposition to the semi-auto ban last month, the Brady Campaign attacked GOA as a "radical gun group" that was calling for these guns to be "legal and available to all."

How ironic. Aren't they the "radicals" who are out of step with the American people?

After all, the American people correctly view the Second Amendment as safeguarding an individual right. The Brady Bunch doesn't think it does.

An *ABC News Poll* found last year that almost three-fourths of the American public believes that the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects the rights of "individuals" to



**The Clinton-Feinstein ban outlawed the manufacture of the above firearm, but not the bottom one. The only difference is the grip.**

own guns.

Only 20 percent thought the amendment referred to the right of a state to maintain a militia. The Brady Bunch fits squarely within that 20 percent -- a minority view to be sure.

Even the Supreme Court has sided

Amendment treat it as protecting an individual right.

And since William Rehnquist was appointed Chief Justice in 1986, every single Supreme Court opinion that mentions the Second Amendment has treated the right as one belonging to individuals.

### **Sixty-plus Congressmen lost their seats after supporting semi-auto ban**

There is no doubt that the 1994 law banned common household firearms that were meant to be protected by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

These are guns that were very popular among gun owners and, functionally,

*Continued on page 6*

with the American people on this issue.

Noted author and researcher, Dave Kopel, says that "almost all" of the Court's 36 references to the Second

## **Get Extra Postcards to help save your gun rights!**

The fight to sunset the semi-auto ban will be the key fight during the next year. And it all could come down to President George Bush.

That's why he needs to hear from every potential voter across the country. You can help by handing out multiple postcards at your gun club or other location where pro-gun people assemble.

The "Save Our Gun Rights" Pak contains 50 postcards addressed to President Bush asking him to OPPOSE the reauthorization of the heinous ban on commonly owned firearms.

### **ACTION:**

By going to <http://www.gunowners.org/pcards.htm> on the GOA website, you can get the postcards in one of two ways:

1. Download -- Microsoft Word documents that you can download and print on your own cardstock.
2. Purchase -- Online sales of pre-printed, brightly-colored postcards. Or call toll-free at 888-886-4867 to place your order.

There is a sliding price scale if you purchase postcards:

Per Pak of 50 cards
1 pak -- \$6.00
2 paks -- \$10.00
3 paks -- \$12.50
4 paks -- \$15.00

## GOA in the News

# Media Appearances in 2003

### Radio and Television

04/29/03 KXNT	04/15/03 KXYL	
04/22/03 Rick Bloom Show	04/15/03 KGAB	
04/24/03 WDEO	04/15/03 KTSA	
04/24/03 FreeRepublic.com	04/15/03 American Radio Network	
04/24/03 Bobby Enyart Show	04/10/03 IRN Radio Network	
04/23/03 MSNBC: Buchanan & Press	04/10/03 KXAM	
04/23/03 Alex Jones Show	04/08/03 Ken Hamblin Show	
04/23/03 KTSA	04/03/03 RNN TV	
04/22/03 WKSJ	04/01/03 IRN Radio Network	
04/22/03 WSBA	03/31/03 KARP	
04/21/03 Roy Masters Syndicated	03/17/03 KGAB	
04/21/03 WABC	03/13/03 KXAM	
04/19/03 KABC	03/12/03 KXEM	
04/18/03 Regional News Network	03/11/03 KPLS	
04/17/03 Heart of the Matter	03/10/03 American Family Radio	
04/17/03 KSIM	03/08/03 KVOI	
04/17/03 Roy Masters Network	02/20/03 KTAR	
04/16/03 Derry Brownfield Show	02/19/03 KGAB	
04/16/03 WHO Radio	02/17/03 American Freedom Network	
04/15/03 American Family Radio	02/12/03 Gordon Liddy Show	
	02/11/03 WMUZ	
		02/10/03 KXNT
		01/17/03 WPZZ
		01/16/03 Second Amendment Radio
		01/13/03 Ken Hamblin Show
		01/10/03 Sky TV News
		01/09/03 WWCR
		01/03/03 Judicial Watch



**Erich Pratt, GOA's Director of Communications, defended gun makers in April during a TV debate. Pratt sparred with a representative from the NAACP, an anti-gun group which has vowed to "break the backs" of gun makers and which is now suing many of them in court.**

## GOA denounces industry suits

### *Says litigation against firearm makers could weaken U.S. military*

by Jon Dougherty

(c) WorldNetDaily.com

A noted gun-rights organization has denounced a series of lawsuits against the firearm industry as financially debilitating and a danger to national security.

Gun Owners of America, a 300,000-strong advocacy group based in Springfield, Va., says the latest suits, which are being led by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, could bankrupt gun makers who must dole out thousands upon thousands of dollars in their own defense.

Also, said Erich Pratt, the group's spokesman, "the NAACP is helping to cripple the very industry that supplies our men with their weapons," even as U.S. troops were fighting abroad.

"The president of the NAACP has described his suit as part of an effort to 'break the backs' of those in the gun industry," said Pratt. "These lawsuits are nothing but judicial terrorism."

GOA says dozens of industry lawsuits have been filed by "anti-gun" groups and local politicians. Though

not a single suit has been successful in court, one gunmaker -- Navegar Inc., maker of the TEC-9 and TEC-9DC semi-automatic pistol -- has already been forced to declare bankruptcy.

The Navegar case made it all the way to the California Supreme Court; justices threw out an appeals court ruling that found Navegar liable for the

ple, and is partly "the fault of the government for not enforcing existing laws and the fault of the gun industry for not self regulating the sale and distribution of handguns."

"Long before I got to the Association, I realized [the proliferation of illegal handguns] was a problem," Mfume said. He added that as a member of

***"The NAACP lawsuit is not only completely frivolous, it could ultimately prove harmful to our country," said GOA's Erich Pratt. "Our military depends upon these gun makers, as do millions of law-abiding Americans who use these quality firearms for their own self-protection."***

deaths of eight people killed by Gian Luigi Ferri in a San Francisco shooting in 1993. The Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence filed the suit.

NAACP President Kweisi Mfume testified April 3 in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York in the suit brought by his organization that the proliferation of handguns kills thousands of blacks, particularly young peo-

Congress and a Baltimore city councilman, "I got tired of going to teen-age funerals and consoling mothers whose children had been killed with a handgun."

Representing the NAACP is General Counsel Dennis Hayes, Deputy General Counsel Angela Ciccolo and attorney Elisa Barnes. Joining the NAACP in the

*Continued on page 5*

# The Anti-Patriot Act: Terrorizing the American People

by Mike Hammond

A year ago, Gun Owners of America -- together with a wide range of organizations on all sides of the ideological spectrum -- warned that the so-called "P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act's" overly broad definition of terrorism could allow the federal government to spy on -- and potentially shut down -- groups like GOA.

GOA and other groups negotiated with the Senate and the administration in removing some of the more noxious provisions, but were only partly successful in correcting the bill's inadequacies.

In particular, the Federal Bureau of Investigation -- which hardly shrouded itself in glory in connection the Waco and Ruby Ridge incidents -- was given broad new powers to wiretap, monitor, search, and detain "suspects" without probable cause or due process and without giving them access to attorneys.

On February 7, the Washington-based Center for Public Integrity released a draft of follow-up legislation being crafted by the Justice Department. The broad new powers conferred on government by this follow-up bill, labeled "CONFIDENTIAL -- NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION," are alarming.

Our analysis suggests that, rather than toughening our ability to capture and kill Osama bin Laden and his ilk, this anti-Patriot II bill would instead rely on cosmetic "solutions" which threaten the constitutional rights of Americans, without increasing our national security. In fact, this placebo will probably make our country considerably less secure.

This draft has still not been introduced in Congress. Yet the Justice Department appears poised to use a future terrorist tragedy to create the impetus for passage of this bill, dubbed the "Domestic Security Enhancement Act of 2003." Some of the most significant provisions in the anti-Patriot bill follow.

## PRIVACY AND UNLAWFUL SEARCHES

- The government could bug, wiretap, or search anyone in America for up to 15 days without going to any court if



**The PATRIOT II bill would do little to catch real terrorists like Osama bin Laden, but rather, would stifle the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans.**

Congress had authorized the use of military force -- i.e., under circumstances which currently exist [Section 103].

- The government could seize personal information about Americans (including credit information, educational transcripts, etc.) in a wide range of circumstances without the approval of any court by issuing "administrative subpoenas" -- i.e., subpoenas or letters issued by bureaucrats and not authorized by any court [Sections 126, 128, & 129].
- All of this information could be used to prosecute Americans [Section 105].
- If the government, incredibly, was so inept that it failed to comply with the virtually non-existent limitations on bugs and searches, there would be a defense in a proceeding against an agent who violated the law and/or the Constitution, thereby effectively legalizing all searches [Section 106].
- Individuals and groups which engage in or advocate civil disobedience or Second Amendment rights, including GOA, could be classified as "foreign powers" and subject to electronic surveillance for up to a year without the approval of any court [Section 104].

## BIG BROTHER

- The anti-Patriot bill would authorize the creation of a DNA bank of all persons "suspected" of being terrorists [Section 302-306].
- Businesses that unlawfully turn over private consumer information to the federal government out of terrorism-related paranoia would be insulated from lawsuits [Section 313].

## ARRESTS AND SUSPENSION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

- The anti-Patriot bill would allow the government to revoke or suspend a pilot's license for two months without any intervening judicial review during that time period [Section 409]. This provision may well be intended to deter pilots wishing to carry firearms in the cockpit.

The guidelines issued by the Transportation Security Administration require all kinds of new testing (emotional, psychological, etc.) for every pilot who seeks to carry a firearm. Of course, pilots already go through similar testing before qualifying for a pilot's license.

These additional tests could become fishing expeditions for a future Clinton-Gore Justice Department -- giving officials a pretext to suspend or revoke the licenses of those pilots who wish to carry firearms in the cockpit under the bill's new suspension provisions.

- The bill could allow members and supporters of GOA and other organizations to be stripped of their citizenship [Section 501], arrested and held indefinitely without charges, here or abroad [Section 503-506], in secret at a secret location [Section 201], without access to an attorney or benefit of constitutional protections.

These are some of the scariest parts in the entire draft. The importance of provisions waiving constitutional rights for non-citizens increases dramatically if the government can revoke the citizenship of native-born Americans for any reason -- much less, for potentially minor transgressions.

Although people may disagree with some overly broad interpretations crafted by the courts, Americans have no

*Continued on page 6*

# Bill to Protect Firearms Industry Passes U.S. House

by John Velleco  
(Washington) -- A

bill to protect the firearms industry from reckless lawsuits advanced in the Congress recently, passing the U.S. House of Representatives by a vote of 285-140.

The *Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act* (H.R. 1036) would protect gun makers and dealers from lawsuits that stem from the misuse of their products by others.

Currently, there are around 30 lawsuits pending against the industry across the country.

Although the gun industry has been largely successful in defending itself, with many suits being tossed out by the courts, the vast costs associated with such legal action threatens to bankrupt the entire industry even if it wins every case.

In fact, several gun companies have filed bankruptcy since the wave of city lawsuits began.

One such company, Navegar Inc., was victorious in a case that went all the way to the California Supreme Court but was out of business by the time the verdict was delivered.

This phenomenon is not lost on the side of the gun haters.

A lawyer involved in one of the earliest suits against gun makers recognized the financial strain of a drawn out legal battle with gun makers, noting that, "If any one of these municipalities can figure out a way to stay in court, that would have a major impact."

## Anti-gun lawsuits designed to cripple gun industry

Chicago Mayor Richard Daley noted at the time of the filing of his city's lawsuit that, "If money is the only language they understand, then money is the language we will use.... We're going to hit them where it hurts -- in their bank accounts...."

In addition to the legal fees involved, these suits are also widely regarded as attempts by the anti-gun lobby to skirt the legislative process and impose stricter gun control laws.

Walter K. Olson, a Senior Fellow of the Manhattan Institute, recently told a congressional subcommittee that such lawsuits "demonstrate how a pressure group can employ litigation to attempt an end run around democracy, in search of victories in court that it has been

unable to obtain at the ballot box."

## Brady Center using courts to circumvent Congress and impose gun control

The Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, a radical disarmament group whose website serves as a veritable clearinghouse of gun lawsuit propaganda, has made such litigation a cornerstone of its agenda.

Dennis Henigan, a longtime Brady Center attorney and an original architect of the gun suits, is hopeful that litigation will lead to stricter gun control laws.

"A benefit of these suits is that they may give the industry substantial incentives to change its conduct. The industry may tolerate a certain amount of regulation that it has opposed in the past," Henigan said.

Proponents of the lawsuit protection bill point out that holding gun makers responsible for the actions of criminals is analogous to holding carmakers responsible for drunk driving.

The Senate version of the bill, S. 659, faces more of an uphill battle and the possibility of a Democrat-led filibuster. Proponents hope to have a bill on the Senate floor this year. ■

## GOA denounces industry suits

*Continued from page 3*

lawsuit is the Educational Fund to End Handgun Violence, the Violence Policy Center and the Brady Center, according to a statement.

The suit was filed March 24; U.S. District Judge Jack B. Weinstein is presiding over the case.

GOA says there is more at risk than the financial solvency of the gun industry. The group says the nation's security is being put at risk.

In a statement, GOA said, "The National Shooting Sports Foundation has documented the patriotic service that many of the gun makers, who are named in the NAACP suit, have offered to our country."

Included on that list are:

- Colt, the only maker of the U.S. military's M-16 series of rifles;
- Smith & Wesson, one of the largest



**M-16A2 battle rifle, the standard issue weapon for U.S. troops, is manufactured only by Colt Firearms, one of the firms named in the NAACP's most recent gun industry lawsuit.**

producers of firearms for the military and law enforcement;

- Browning, credited with giving the U.S. and its allies firearms superiority throughout the two world wars, as well as the Korean War;
- Sturm, Ruger & Company, which

donated rifles to the New York City Police Department in the days following Sept. 11, 2001, for the protection of the people of the city;

- Glock, also a major supplier of firearms to law enforcement and military personnel; and
- Sig Arms, which provides the official sidearm for the U.S. Navy SEALs.

"The NAACP lawsuit is not only completely frivolous, it could ultimately prove harmful to our country," Pratt said.

"Our military depends upon these gun makers, as do millions of law-abiding Americans who use these quality firearms for their own self-protection." ■

*Jon Dougherty writes for WorldNetDaily.com. This article was reprinted with permission.*

## White House favors gun ban

Continued from page 2

are no different than millions of hunting and target firearms which are completely legal to this day.

The Brady Bunch has tried appealing to fraudulent polls in the past that claim the American people want these semi-automatics banned.

But if that were so, then why did the American people throw the Democrats out of power in 1994?

Bill Clinton knows the answer. "The fight for the assault-weapons ban cost 20 members their seats in Congress," he told the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* after the election, and is "the reason the Republicans control the House."



**This handsome Springfield M1A rifle is a banned firearm under the Clinton-Feinstein law, and can no longer be manufactured as shown above.**

Well, he almost got it right. The real number of Congressmen who lost their seats because of that ban was over 60, according to the Dec/Jan 1995 issue of *Campaigns & Elections* magazine.

Remember that contrary to Clinton's assertion, the semi-auto ban doesn't cover real assault weapons at all.

Poor guy . . . Clinton never could get his facts straight.

Let's just hope that the current President doesn't make some of the same mistakes his predecessor did. ■

## Anti-Patriot Act

Continued from page 4

problem with constitutional rights for confessed serial killers, even though their admitted crimes are very serious. So the notion that bad people don't deserve the protections afforded by the rule of law is a relatively novel one -- and not a constitutional idea at all.

Rather than suspending the Constitution, concerned Americans believe the administration should honor it by:

- Creating a non-politically correct military;
- Allowing the military to seek, capture, and/or kill terrorists like Osama bin Laden, irrespective of whether resolute action has the approval of the UN or other participants in the "new world order";
- Treat REAL terrorists -- like the first bomber of the World Trade Center in 1993 -- with severity, rather than moving to shorten their sentences (as was done prior to 9/11/2001);
- Securing our borders.

On the other hand, with the new anti-Patriot draft posing the possibility that GOA and its officers, employees, and members could be stripped of their citizenship, the notion of suspending the Constitution for objectionable behavior is not something we support.

### THRESHOLD OBSERVATIONS

A couple of threshold observations:

First: Three thousand people died on 9/11. While this is a tragedy of immense proportions, it is important to remember that perhaps as many as 100,000,000 people were killed during the 20th Century by despotic governments given totalitarian powers.

Americans who believe "it can't happen here" should consider how federalizing police powers resulted in tragic consequences in places like Ruby Ridge, Idaho and Waco, Texas.

Second: Over the past thirty years, most of our "dire" predictions have, if anything, understated the government abuse of the open-ended programs and over-broad language which we opposed. If anything, many Americans underestimated the extent to which:

- The installation of seatbelts and air bags would result in "safety road-blocks," racial profiling, and the decapitation of infants;
- The Brady Law would give rise to an effort by the Clinton administration to tax and register gun transactions using its illegally maintained database;
- The enactment of a ban on full automatics in 1986 would only open the door to semi-automatic bans and calls for handgun registration; and
- The Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act would primarily apply not to the Mafia, but to legitimate businesses and political demonstrators -- and would be later used by "conservative" Republican Senators to penalize gun dealers for minor infractions.

The attempt to apply RICO to gun dealers occurred in 1998, but was beaten back after GOA mobilized thousands upon thousands of gun owners to lobby their Senators.

Given our experience with government, only a fool would agree to enact legislation which could arguably outlaw our organizations in the expectation that the language would not be interpreted as broadly as it could. ■

*Mike Hammond is the legislative counsel for Gun Owners of America. This article was excerpted from a much longer analysis and can be found on the GOA website at <http://www.gunowners.org/patriotii.htm>.*

## Unintended Consequences?



**While originally intended to target the Mafia, the RICO Act has been used by federal prosecutors to go after peaceful political demonstrators. Republican Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah (left) even tried to expand the law in 1998 to cover gun dealers who committed minor infractions.**

## Blood on DC Gun Grabbers Hand

Continued from page 8

**GOA:** What studies show that where citizens are armed crime has not been reduced?

[No reply.]

Bullock says: "The problem is that the guns that get into the general population, or guns that are in a home, often fall into the wrong hands -- children, intruders."

[Hello? Earth-to-Tony! Wake up, please! In Washington DC, because of your deady unconstitutional gun ban laws, guns are almost always in the "wrong hands," the hands of criminals!]

Mocking the idea that private citizens should be allowed to have guns for self-defense, Bullock says: "And I guess your answer would be that we should just graduate everyone from high school with a Glock?"

**GOA:** But, the people who have Glocks now are the criminals! The people who don't have Glocks now to defend themselves are your citizens! But, several of your citizens are in court now asking to have guns for self-defense. Why are you against this?

[Bullock says he believes the "individual right" to keep and bear arms is "a distortion" of the Second Amendment. He reiterates that he "has nothing against having guns for law enforcement and hunting." But, of course, he is not for private DC citizens having guns for self-defense when these citizens are being "hunted" by criminals!]

**GOA:** (laughing) You're just against guns being used for self-defense by private citizens, right?

**A:** If you find that so amusing --

**GOA:** I don't!

**A:** Then everyone who disagrees with you is a joke. Sorry, I don't share your advocacy position.

**GOA:** But, this is, literally, your position: Guns are OK for cops, OK for sports. But, not for private citizens to use in self-defense.

**A:** We have too many handguns in this country.

## Sticking to his guns



Washington, DC Mayor Anthony Williams does not favor repealing the city's draconian gun ban.

**GOA:** And in Washington DC it's the criminals who have them!

**A:** Well, maybe none of us should have them. That would be a better way to go.

**GOA:** So, how has your gun ban for private citizens worked? Has it reduced crimes committed by people with guns?

**A:** It's kind of hard to compete with Virginia when they can just throw them across the border.

**GOA:** And yet Virginia has looser gun laws and less crime committed by people with guns. Interesting, huh?

**A:** That's because they export all (!) their guns into the District of Columbia. We have a huge problem here (in DC) with crime and handguns and you don't solve it with more guns, by having shoot-outs in apartment houses.

**GOA:** But, now, because of your private citizen gun ban, there are no "shoot-outs" because only the criminals have the guns! Private, innocent citizens in your apartment houses and elsewhere are being shot and murdered but can't shoot back because you forbid them to have guns for self-defense! Your gun ban laws haven't prevented shootings. They've only prevented your citizens from shooting back and defending themselves!

[No reply.]

Finally, Bullock notes that he married a Canadian. He wonders why we are a more violent society than Canada in terms of guns. He's told that if this is true, then this is one more reason why private American citizens should be allowed to have guns for self-defense!

**GOA:** I don't understand why you and the Mayor are so against private citizens having guns for self-defense.

**A:** And I don't understand why some people think that people like me, or my wife and children, are going to feel safer walking around the city where every other person has a handgun. I don't want to be in the middle of that.

**GOA:** But, the status quo in Washington DC, which you and the Mayor are for preserving, means that, with almost total certainty, every other person walking around in the District of Columbia with a handgun, is a criminal! Does this make you, your wife and children safer?

[No reply. End of interview.]■

## Has Your Business Supported GOA with a Tax-Deductible Ad?



GOA has started an area on its website -- <http://www.gunowners.org/adpage.htm> -- for companies to take out advertisements. These ads are tax deductible for the business as a normal advertising expense and they give them exposure to thousands of visitors each day.

We encourage you to visit that section and support those businesses that are supporting GOA. Also, if you have a business of your own, or know of a business or foundation that might be interested in supporting GOA with their advertising dollars, you can use the e-mail address -- [goamarketing@earthlink.net](mailto:goamarketing@earthlink.net) -- to get more information. You can also call Marty Ohlson at 920-625-3975.■



# Blood of Innocent Victims In Washington DC On Gun Grabbers Hands

by Larry Pratt

It can be said, without the slightest exaggeration, that the blood of countless victims of murder, robbery and rape is on the hands of those who have supported, and still support, Washington DC's gun ban laws which deny private citizens their Constitutionally-protected right to keep and bear arms in self-defense.

One of the most rabid and vehement advocates of the DC gun ban is District of Columbia Mayor Anthony Williams whose views are represented by his press spokesman Tony Bullock. Commenting on a lawsuit challenging the DC gun ban, Bullock is quoted in *The Washington Times* (2/12/03) as saying:

The last thing this city needs is more handguns. You're not going to see any will on the part of this Mayor to relax the gun laws in the District.... We have to maintain the deterrent effect of the gun laws. I think it's a real myth that people would be able to arm themselves and avoid being shot.

The "deterrent effect" of the DC gun ban?! DC's unconstitutional gun ban has in no way been a deterrent as far as crimes committed by people using guns is concerned. The only "deterrent effect" of these deadly gun ban laws has been to disarm private citizens and thus prevent them from defending themselves against armed criminals.

And it's no "myth" that armed citizens are able to protect themselves against criminals. Various studies have shown that millions of Americans use guns in self-defense every year.

In his book *Can Gun Control Work?* (Oxford, 2002), James B. Jacobs, who is pro-gun control and a law professor at New York University, says (page 223-224) that the idea that more gun-carrying citizens means less crime should not "be scoffed at or ignored." He continues:

After all, Chicago, New York and Washington DC, which issue very few concealed carry permits, are still plagued by high rates of violent crime. Their laws may be counterproductive if criminals arm themselves with ease, while law-abiding citizens lack adequate self-defense. Perhaps these highly restrictive licensing jurisdictions should issue more permits to 'reliable' citizens.

But, the Mayor of Washington DC and Tony Bullock are fanatical anti-gun nuts. So, they scoff at and ignore any data which show that more citizens with guns would mean less crime.

In an interview, when asked by GOA if he or the Mayor had looked at any of the studies which show that more citizens with guns means less crime, Bullock says: "It's a moot issue because the DC law will not be changed." He says that what "really struck home" to him recently was a recent story where a young girl shot her brother with a handgun.

**GOA:** And what did you conclude from this story?

**A:** That guns are dangerous things and they kill people.

[Well, as the kids say: Duh! Yes, guns are dangerous and do kill people. In fact, they are used to murder people all the time in Washington DC -- innocent people who are disarmed and helpless because of the DC gun ban.]

**GOA:** So, what do you say to one of your citizens, Shelly Parker, who's a party to a lawsuit to change your anti-gun laws? She lives in a high-crime neighborhood and has been threatened with death by drug-dealers. She wants a handgun in her home for self-defense.

**A:** That's not the answer. And I'm reflecting the opinion of the Mayor.

[Bullock says the "appropriate place" for guns is for the police to have them and for "sporting activities." But, equipping average citizens with guns "is not the solution to crime." Why self defense with a gun, for a private citizen, is not "appropriate," Bullock does not say.]

**GOA:** But what about studies which show that where private citizens are allowed to be armed crime has been reduced?

**A:** Well, you can show studies that prove the other point.

*Continued on page 7*

## THE Gun Owners

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

**Larry Pratt**  
Executive Director

**Erich Pratt**  
Director of Communications

**John Velleco**  
Director of Federal Affairs

**Sheriff Richard Mack**  
Director of Public 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.