Ronald Dixon never intended to gain national attention for himself. He had no desire to be on the national nightly news for days on end, no desire to be a hero or to become an inspiration to change the laws of this country.

Ronald Dixon, a 28-year-old U.S. Navy veteran, merely wanted his realization of the American dream: work hard, raise a family and provide for the future.

That is why Mr. Dixon worked eighty hours a week at two full-time jobs, sacrificing pleasures of the present for the contentment of a secure future.

His future was recently thrown into uncertainty, however, when he made the decision to use a firearm.

Mr. Dixon did not use his gun for personal gain or to steal from someone else. His actions were forced upon him by an intruder into his own house, an intruder lurking in the early morning hours in his 2-year-old son’s bedroom.

According to an article in the New York Times, this is what happened on the fateful December morning in Brooklyn, NY:

Mr. Dixon was upstairs, in bed, when he heard a noise in the hallway. Half asleep, he opened his eyes and saw a man at the top of the stairs heading toward the bedroom of Mr. Dixon’s 2-year-old son, Kyle.

That was enough for the father. He grabbed a 9-millimeter pistol that he kept in a closet, walked toward the man and asked what he was doing there. This man, Mr. Dixon said, ran at him, screaming. That’s when he pulled the trigger. He shot the intruder twice, wounding him seriously but not mortally.

Dixon prosecuted for having a gun

The intruder Mr. Dixon faced is a career thug with a fourteen page criminal record.

His story is any parent’s nightmare. But for Mr. Dixon, the nightmare didn’t end when he successfully defended himself and his family; it had just begun.

The local district attorney’s response to Ronald Dixon’s bravery is to attempt to put him behind bars for up to a year.

Interestingly, Mr. Dixon is not in trouble because of his actions. Authorities are not accusing him of acting improperly or for the unlawful use of a firearm.

Instead, he’s in trouble for merely possessing the firearm in violation of the New York City gun laws.

Is Charles J. Hynes, the district attor-
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ney in this case, really out to protect the public from violent thugs, or is he an anti-gun extremist with a political ax to grind?

The evidence suggests the latter.

Anti-gun prosecutor ignored Dixon’s brave act of self-defense

Mr. Hynes has the discretion not to charge Ronald Dixon. After all, no one, including police investigators, dispute the essential facts of the case.

But Mr. Hynes chooses to ignore Mr. Dixon’s brave act of self-defense. He wants Mr. Dixon to do jail time, period.

Sure, he’s offered the Jamaican native a plea bargain that would cost four weekends in jail, but Mr. Dixon is not willing to tarnish his record and jeopardize his career if he’s done nothing wrong.

According to the New York Times article, Hynes said that “Nobody is going to get a bye” on a gun charge. “Everybody is going to do some time.

“There have to be some consequences. The Dixon case is a perfect example of what we’re trying to do. We’re sympathetic. No question, he had the right to shoot the guy in his house. But he had no right to have an illegal weapon.”

This is not the first time Hynes has embarked on a crusade to target gun owners.

In 1999, Hynes initiated a gun ‘buy-back’ program he dubbed “Turn it in for a Benjamin,” referring to Benjamin Franklin, whose portrait appears on the $100 bill.

The following year Hynes’ program turned into an embarrassment when many of the guns, which were ‘bought’ by the government for $250 each, turned out to be obsolete revolvers owned by court officers.

Other gun owners disarmed by police after using guns in self-defense

The case of Ronald Dixon is, sadly, not unique.

In December of 2002, Long Island resident Mark Freamon shot an intruder climbing through a window in his home, slightly wounding the man.

In what amounted to little more than a bluff, Richardson held the two assailants at bay until police arrived. Then, to the absolute horror of the bloodied victim, as well as Richardson’s on-looking wife and four children, police arrested and handcuffed Richardson and threw him in the same wagon as the two attackers.

He spent 26 hours in jail, and it wasn’t until a month later that prosecutors finally dropped all charges against him.

In a famous 1994 case in Washington, D.C., a woman identified only as ‘Becky’ successfully defended herself and her daughters with a firearm.

According to The Washington Times:

The two men... came equipped with knives, gasoline, ski masks and duct tape. When Becky came upon the intruders, they had already tied up one daughter’s wrists with the tape. After struggling with one assailant armed with a knife, rolling downstairs in the process, Becky grabbed a gun out of the closet and shot him in the torso and head when he came after her again.

Although the government ultimately did not prosecute the woman (knowing, no doubt, that no jury in the District would convict), there was widespread concern that the traumatized woman would be charged for possessing a firearm without a license.

There are many, many more such cases of harassment of gun owners.

In fact, because gun owners use firearms more than two million times per year successfully to thwart criminals, this type of case can become a commonplace source of harassment of lawful gun owners.

“A person who has already been victimized by a criminal should not have to fear further harassment at the hands of politically motivated prosecutors who don’t believe in the Second Amendment,” Wilson told The Gun Owners.

According to the Philadelphia Inquirer, in August 2002, a jury found Philadelphia resident Tony Knighten “not guilty of attempted murder and aggravated assault, but guilty of firing a gun that he was not licensed to carry.”

Though Knighten was found to be acting in self-defense, he faces the possibility of jail time for violating the City’s unconstitutional gun laws.

Save a life with a gun, go to jail

In a 1996 incident, Maryland resident Theron Richardson saw through his window a neighbor being strangled. Ironically, as his wife called the police, Richardson actually unloaded his regist-
Will Armed Pilots Program Be Grounded Before Ever Taking Off?

by Erich Pratt

“A TSA attorney-advisor, Mr. Stephen L. Cohen, has made it clear that the TSA intends to make the [armed pilots] program so difficult, intimidating and burdensome that no pilot will volunteer.”

-- Captain Tracy Price, Chairman of the Airline Pilot’s Security Alliance, February 12, 2003

The above quote should come as no surprise.

When Congress passed legislation authorizing the administration to arm pilots in November 2001, Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta refused. Thus, Congress had to pass additional legislation last year mandating that the Transportation Department move forward on arming pilots.

GOA members were extremely involved in helping this legislation to clear several hurdles and finally be signed into law.

But now the TSA (Transportation Security Administration), which is an agency of the Transportation Department, is still doing all it can to kill the program, even while it goes through the motions of implementing the law.

The pilots who are close to this process are outraged. The Airline Pilot’s Security Alliance (APSA) is the premier pilot’s organization that is fighting to get arms into the cockpit.

The Washington Post quoted APSA chairman, Captain Tracy Price, on February 13 as saying, “[The TSA] is requiring us to jump through so many hoops so that we can’t meet the requirements.”

Arming the nation’s pilots is an idea that has garnered enormous support among the American people and the Congress. GOA has already begun lobbying the administration to stop undermining the program that passed overwhelmingly in both houses of Congress.

As this newsletter goes to press, the official TSA regulations have yet to be issued, but GOA will keep its members apprised on the latest details.

In other words, in cases where a person is found to have committed no crime but is nevertheless convicted of violating gun restrictions, that person can take the authorities and the law itself to court.

“A person who has already been victimized by a criminal should not have to fear further harassment at the hands of politically motivated prosecutors who don’t believe in the Second Amendment,” Wilson told The Gun Owners.

Rep. Wilson’s bill has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. GOA will work to get the Committee to hold a televised hearing on the bill to highlight some of the abuses decent gun owners have suffered through the legal system.

GOA members will be alerted to any action taken on this legislation.
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defend themselves without fear of prosecution for violating unconstitutional gun laws.


This bill, H.R. 648, simply reaffirms what already exists, that citizens have a right to protect themselves with a firearm; and, it allows a citizen to sue (in federal court) the local government that sought prosecution.

Ronald Dixon
by Larry Pratt

One of our members has made the excellent suggestion that we put together, for distribution, a rebuttal of the rabidly anti-gun movie Bowling For Columbine which is directed by Michael Moore.

We thought that was a good idea. So we produced an eight part series which we have now made available online at www.gunowners.org.
[Please go to the section entitled Op-Ed Pieces.]

Generally speaking, Bowling is one of the most dishonest movies ever made. This awful film closes with Moore actually bowling a strike at an alley. But Bowling is not a strike. It is an uninterrupted series of gutterballs which never come close, figuratively speaking, to hitting even one bowling pin.

Bowling is the film equivalent of Michael Bellesiles’ fraudulent book Arming America -- which was so bad that when it was exposed, Bellesiles was forced to resign from Emory University and return his $4,000 Bancroft Prize.

Michael Moore wants to fool us into thinking he’s not really anti-gun. He often talks about how he grew up around guns, hunted as a kid in Michigan, as a Boy Scout was in shooting contests, is a lifetime member of the NRA, blah, blah, blah. But, in seeking to leave the impression he’s not anti-gun, he’s a liar.

On the Oprah Winfrey show (11/1/02), Moore says “we have too many guns.”

On MSNBC’s Donahue (10/28/02), Moore says yes, he’s talking about “stopping the selling of ammunition for weapons that are specifically designed to kill human beings” and this means “handguns or weapons where you can fire multiple rounds at a time.”

When Donahue asks if he’d like a ban on the sale of handguns, he says: “Yes, I believe that we don’t need handguns.”

So much for being a pro-gun Boy Scout and lifetime member of the NRA.

In addition to the outright deceptions promulgated by Moore, the movie takes a really weird turn when he starts analyzing the causes behind the Columbine massacre in 1999.

Following the mass murders at Columbine High School many news stories reported that the two murderers, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, were fans of the vile, nihilistic, grotesque, obscene, foul-mouthed, death-loving “shock rocker” Marilyn Manson.

An Associated Press story (4/21/99) quotes one Columbine student as saying of Harris and Klebold: “They [sang] Marilyn Manson songs and joked about killing people.”

But, Moore adamantly rejects the notion that Manson’s songs -- many of which encourage death and killing -- might have in any way influenced Harris and Klebold.

In Bowling, we see Moore noting that the morning of the Columbine slaughter the two murderers went to an elective bowling class. He asks, in all seriousness: “Why wasn’t anyone blaming bowling for warping the minds of Eric and Dylan to commit their evil deeds? Wasn’t that just as plausible as blaming Marilyn Manson?”

Is he really serious?

A little later, we see Moore interviewing Manson. Returning to his anti-American theme which he hits quite hard throughout the movie, Moore asks Manson if he knows that on the day of the Columbine murders the United States dropped more bombs on Kosovo than at any other time during this war?

Manson: “I do know that and I think that’s really ironic, you know, that nobody’s said, ‘Well, maybe the President (Clinton) had an influence on their violent behavior.’ But this is not the way the media wants to spin it. Because the idea of the media is: ‘Keep everyone afraid and they’ll consume.’”

Moore: “Right.”

In an interview on CNBC (10/19/02), Moore tells Tim Russert that what Manson says in Bowling are “some of the most intelligent things in the film” -- a statement which, if true, is a damning indictment and all you need to know about this disgraceful movie.

That Moore does not understand the Bill of Rights is clearly made evident throughout the entire movie. And he is anti-American even when we strike back at terrorists who murdered thousands of our people.

In the previously mentioned interview with Tim Russert, he is asked: Do you understand why, when we’re attacked as we were on 9/11/01, the American people want to go to Afghanistan to punish the Taliban and Osama bin Laden, the people “who killed their fellow Americans”?

Moore replies, incredibly: “No, I don’t understand that.”

He also calls “nutty” the idea of an anti-missile defense system that would protect us from an attack. Thus, Moore is against handguns for personal defense and he’s against our collectively defending ourselves against a missile attack.

At least he is consistent. Consistently goofy.

The entire text of this film review can be read at www.gunowners.org/optb.htm on the GOA website.

For more Columbine Gutterballs, go to www.gunowners.org/optb.htm on the GOA website to read GOA’s entire eight-part analysis of Michael Moore’s Bowling for Columbine.
Gun-Related Crimes Jump In Britain Despite Tough Gun Restrictions

by Robert B. Bluey, CNSNews.com

Handgun-related crimes are up sharply in England and Wales despite strict gun-control measures that were implemented in the late 1990s, according to statistics released by the British government in January.

Crimes involving guns jumped 35 percent in the yearlong survey, while the use of handguns -- already illegal -- rose 46 percent.

Gun-control laws in the United Kingdom are some of the strictest in the world, but gun-related crimes have increased annually since a ban on handguns was imposed after the Dunblane Primary School massacre in 1996. Sixteen students and a teacher were left dead in the shooting.

Overall, crime rose slightly more than 9 percent in England and Wales, but violence stemming from guns soared the most. There were nearly 10,000 incidents involving firearms, including 97 gun-related murders and 558 serious causalities.

Pro-gun groups in the United States attributed the rise in crime to the government’s restrictions on firearms. But British lawmakers immediately moved to tighten those laws in January, imposing a mandatory five-year prison sentence on anyone found carrying a handgun.

Home Secretary David Blunkett announced the new punishment, and then following a recent summit released other initiatives, including an amnesty program that will allow citizens to hand in guns to police.

“We’ve already have some of the toughest gun laws in the world, there sentence will send criminals a clear message. The Conservative opposition in Britain called the crime report “terrible”

“We’ve seen the same thing in this country,” GOA spokesman Erich Pratt said. “In Washington, D.C., Chicago, Los Angeles -- wherever firearms have been strictly curtailed, inevitably there’s an increase in crime because people can no longer defend themselves.”

“This was also a problem in the United States in the 1990s and 2000s, when gun control measures were enacted,” Pratt said. “In those states, there was a significant increase in violent crime, as people could no longer protect themselves.”

“Now, in the United Kingdom, the same thing is happening,” he added. “We’ve seen the same thing in this country,” Blunkett said in a statement, noting that the new mandatory

has been an unacceptable increase in the flagrant use of guns in crime across the country,” Blunkett said in a statement, noting that the new mandatory

and chided the government for making careless decisions that have led to the spike in gun-related violence.

Meanwhile, the Liberal Democrats said the statistics demonstrate the need for stricter gun-control measures.

Gun Owners of America spokesman Erich Pratt said some states and cities in the United States have taken an approach similar to the United Kingdom, only to find that crime almost always increases.

“We’ve seen the same thing in this country,” he said. “In Washington, D.C., Chicago, Los Angeles -- wherever firearms have been strictly curtailed, inevitably there’s an increase in crime because people can no longer defend themselves.”

©CNSNews.com. This article was reprinted with permission.
If you have never visited the GOA website, look at all the great stuff you're missing . . .

- GOA Ratings for the entire U.S. Congress -- are your Senators and Representative pro-gun?
- Voting Records for all 435 Congressmen and 100 Senators, plus hundreds upon hundreds of state legislation vote reports
- Up-to-date alerts and bill analysis of current legislation -- where are the threats and opportunities today?
- Informative Fact Sheets and Opinion Editorials, including the famous Gun Control Fact-Sheet containing tons of statistics and 154 footnotes
- Free, low-volume E-mail Alerts (when you sign up for these, your e-mail address is kept confidential and is never shared with third parties)
- Extensive Links section connecting to large numbers of firearms-related websites
- Webcasts of Larry Pratt’s weekly radio program, Live Fire
- Contact information for Congress, all 50 state legislatures, and a vast array of media outlets across the country

This and much, much more. It’s just a click away.

Go to [http://www.gunowners.org](http://www.gunowners.org) and find out why the experts rely on Gun Owners of America for timely and accurate reports affecting your gun rights.

*Legal Times:*  
“Using a sophisticated Web site, the Gun Owners of America has mounted a massive lobbying campaign to mobilize its members.”

*Dave Kopel, National Review:*  
“The GOA’s e-mail and fax grassroots network has become extremely effective. GOA was the most important organization behind the failure in the last two Congresses of Senator Orrin Hatch’s [gun control] bill to federalize much of the juvenile justice system.”

Log on at [http://www.gunowners.org](http://www.gunowners.org) and become a “keyboard lobbyist” today!

---

Defend the 2nd Amendment Through Creative Giving...

As we confront the challenges of the future, we know that the generosity of those who assist us will make all the difference in our success. That’s why we seek your long-term support.

Yes! I want to know how to keep control of my assets and make a gift at the same time.

Please provide me with information on how to make a gift to GOA through:

- ☐ a bequest  ☐ a retirement plan  ☐ my will or living trust  ☐ an insurance policy

Name _______________________________ Birth date _________________

Spouse’s Name __________________________ Birth date _________________

Address _______________________________________________________

Phone _______________________________ Email _______________________

Please return in the enclosed envelope. Requests for information are confidential and do not represent an obligation.
By Francesca Adjapon-Yamoah

As an immigrant from a country whose citizens do not possess guns, I was amazed, even appalled, that private citizens could own guns.

I grew up believing that only the police and military had a right to carry guns because of the nature of their work. I lived through four military takeovers of an elected government. Each time, many of us lived in fear, powerless to do anything about military excesses.

I personally witnessed people bludgeoned with the ends of bayonets. I read reports of innocent people killed because some policeman’s pride had been injured.

On one occasion, I was forced to flee the capital and live with friends because stray bullets shattered the windows of our home. We had no right to defend ourselves. We never questioned that. He who has never known freedom does not miss it.

Several years ago, I came to America and became a high school teacher in a Christian school. One evening, a student whose girlfriend had left him came to the school with a gun. His intention was to intimidate the person he believed was responsible for the breakup with his girlfriend. His intention was to intimidate the person he believed was responsible for the breakup with his girlfriend.

When a day-care teacher confronted him, he pulled out the gun and threatened her. Fortunately, the situation was resolved without bloodshed, but the teacher was unharmed. She had preschoolers in her care and no way to protect them. We thank God that no one was hurt, but the point is that she was powerless to do anything to deter the gunman.

When I separated from my husband, he began stalking me. Again, I felt powerless. The more powerless and scared I became, the more daring he got, until I became convinced that he might kill me one day.

At a hearing, I broke down on the witness stand and told the judge that if I died an accidental death, my death should be investigated. I did not understand the value of my life as God saw it. I spent my time waiting, wondering when it was going to happen.

Then one day, it hit me: I was letting my life be controlled by another human being who had no right to take my life. Until that moment, I couldn’t make up my mind about guns.

Reading the GOA website was the turning point for me. For the first time, I understood how precious my life is. My ex-husband stopped stalking me after I threatened him some years ago; but I cannot assume that he or anyone else will never make a threat on my life.

The fact is that, unlike in the movies, real-life violence does not come with a warning, that eerie music that tells you something terrible is about to happen.

And the rules or laws in the world will not change the heart. What changes the actions of a person intent on violence is lack of opportunity and dreaded, instant punishment.

America is a land of freedom, and we should fight to keep our freedom. The loss of freedom is gradual. Any colonized people know that. It starts with giving an inch here and there, and before one knows it, one has lost it all.

We need to fight to make sure that America does not become like countries whose citizens have been so whipped that they do not know there is such a thing as the right to protect oneself.

“One day, it hit me: I was letting my life be controlled by another human being who had no right to take my life. Until that moment, I couldn’t make up my mind about guns. Reading the GOA website was the turning point for me.”

Reading the GOA website was the turning point for me. For the first time, I understood how precious my life is. My ex-husband stopped stalking me after I threatened him some years ago; but I cannot assume that he or anyone else will never make a threat on my life.

We women in particular need to be able to defend ourselves in a decisive manner against violence. We need to do it for our country, and for our children.

GOA Teenage Member Becomes State Legislator

New Hampshire state Rep. James Wheeler, age 18, is probably the country’s youngest state legislator. He is also a GOA member. Congratulations, Rep. Wheeler. You encourage those of us who have gone on ahead of you.

Francesca Adjapon-Yamoah
FedEd: Anti-Gun Agenda of Government Schools

by Larry Pratt

FedEd is a book by Allen Quist, a former Minnesota state legislator, university professor, farmer and education activist.
FedEd: The New Federal Curriculum and How It's Enforced is a book all Second Amendment defenders should read. You will see clearly how the federal government has more firmly than ever taken over local education. Having done so, the agenda for a New World Order is being crammed down our throats.

During the time we suffered under President Clinton, he rammed through the Congress the legislation needed to pull off what amounts to a coup d’etat of the American educational system.

H.R. 6 gave a no-bid contract in 1998 to the Center for Civic Education to revamp the country’s civic education. Because of the fed’s control of the purse strings entangling local school systems, the changes have been made and are already showing up in classrooms.

Quist cites the number of times various topics appear in the National Standards for Civics and Government produced by the Center to guide curricula, textbook and test content. The Standards are the result of the 1998 law. He found the following number of references: environment, 17; multiculturalism, 42; First Amendment, 81; Second Amendment, 0.

Textbooks will not be purchased unless they comply with the standards. Schools won’t buy textbooks that do not conform to the standards for fear that their federal funding will be cut off. And the textbooks are just as PC as are the national civic standards.

In general, Quist says, “One-world curriculum, one-world values, one-world culture, one-world job skills, one-world economy, universal system of schools -- that is what the new Federal Curriculum is all about. Such utopian dreams require massive central planning.”

The testing companies are under the same constraints as are the textbook publishers. The tests that students must take are rapidly becoming as PC as the Federal Curriculum.

The view of education is quite utilitarian. People become mere resources to be managed for the greater good of the whole.

Quist compares the views of two great socialist educators:

Every bit of knowledge one acquires should be accompanied by a demonstra-