Senate Office Says, “GOA Postcards Killed the Feinstein Ban!”

by Erich Pratt

The members of Gun Owners of America deserve to pat themselves on the back.

At a time when the U.S. Senate was debating gun control in early March — and strongly considering whether to pass several firearms restrictions with a vague promise to “clean things up later” — thousands upon thousands of GOA postcards were simultaneously being dumped on Senators’ desks.

The timing could not have been more perfect.

Senators were considering whether several gun control restrictions, including the Feinstein semi-auto ban, would pass the Senate in exchange for very minimal Second Amendment gains.

The tradeoff would have been catastrophic for gun owners.

Thankfully, the GOA postcards made it quite clear to Senate offices that — in the words of one Senate staffer — “no deals” were acceptable.

“GOA postcards killed the Feinstein ban,” he said, echoing the sentiments of many others on Capitol Hill.

Continued on page 2

Two Bills to Arm Pilots Introduced

By John Velleco

(Washington, D.C.) — Since Congress overwhelmingly enacted legislation to allow commercial airline pilots to carry firearms for the protection of themselves, their passengers, their crew and innocent Americans on the ground, the newly created Transportation Security Administration (TSA) has made monumental efforts to obstruct the implementation of the program.

Initially, the administration certified fewer than 100 pilots. Applicants were “flunked” because they expressed reservations about TSA policy, and elaborate and redundant physical and psychological exams were used to deter pilots who had already been certified to fly planes containing hundreds of passengers.

Only one training facility was authorized by the TSA at a remote site in New Mexico, making it needlessly inconvenient for most pilots to participate.

The TSA also implemented an absurd “lock-box” requirement, which forces a pilot to carry his firearm outside his person until the flight deck door is sealed. Pilots who are “dead-heading” must place their lock boxes in the cargo area. This has led to firearms being lost, mishandled or stolen.

One pilot with years of federal law enforcement experience told a reporter that, “Pilots go down [to the cargo hold] to get the gun and the baggage handlers have already been in the belly … and the gun is on its way to baggage claim. The [pilots] then have to get back up into the airplane, go down out of the terminal, down to baggage claim and hopefully find their gun on the carousel.”

According to an explosive news story by CNSNEWS.COM, when pilots began to complain to the Congress and the media about problems with the program, they were threatened with fines and dismissal from the program.

Continued on page 3
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Semi-auto ban defeated … for now

It is certainly no surprise that the number one goal of gun grabbers this year is to renew the Clinton-Feinstein ban on more than 180 types of semi-automatic firearms and on magazines holding more than 10 rounds. The ban is scheduled to sunset in September of this year.

Because of this, the author of the ban — anti-gun Senator Dianne Feinstein (D) of California — has committed herself to do whatever she can to get it extended for 10 more years.

Her first attempt was to offer the semi-auto ban extension in early March as an amendment to the gun makers’ protection act. Senators narrowly voted to renew the ban by a 52-47 vote.

Republican Senator John McCain of Arizona then offered a gun show ban provision which passed by a narrow vote, as well.

All of this was in addition to the “Lock Up Your Safety” requirement that had previously been added. The myriad of gun restrictions had now turned a positive piece of legislation into a full-blown gun control bill.

[Readers can see how their Senators voted on these anti-gun amendments on pages 4-5.]

These anti-gun provisions were tacked onto the gun makers’ protection act — a pro-gun bill which would have taken a small step towards slowing down the number of frivolous lawsuits that gun haters have launched against the gun industry.

The bill had now become a confusing mess of pro- and anti-gun initiatives. And so it was no surprise that a very strange (but predictable) coalition formed on the floor of the U.S. Senate to vote the bill down.

Pro-gun lawmakers didn’t want the anti-gun amendments to pass, while the anti-gun zealots didn’t like the underlying bill because they want the frivolous lawsuits against gun manufacturers to continue.

On March 2, Senators almost unanimously agreed to kill the bill (90-8), and in doing so, killed all the anti-gun amendments with it.

Senators Had Been Warned

The sad fact was that the demise of the lawsuits protection act was entirely predictable.

As far back as six months ago, Gun Owners of America warned Senate personnel that a strange coalition of Senators could form to kill the gun makers’ protection act, and we laid out the necessary steps to make sure it didn’t happen.

There was enormous support for the underlying bill. Almost 60 senators — some of them Democrats — had cosponsored the original version of the gun makers’ protection act (S. 659). The second draft of this bill (S. 1805) was watered down to gain additional Democrat support.

The Senate leadership should have brought this bill to the floor in such a way that anti-gun amendments were not allowed. An “up or down” vote on the bill should have been immediately demanded. This could have been done very easily, and GOA began privately working to educate senators on how to achieve victory.

Dubbed the “tree and cloture” strategy, GOA laid out the procedure for insuring that “killer amendments” banning firearms, shutting down gun shows, and outlawing the use of firearms for self-defense could NOT be offered on the Senate floor.

By the way, this is not a strategy which is unfamiliar to the Senate leadership. In late March, the Senate leadership used the “tree and cloture” strategy to prevent Democrats from offering certain killer amendments to the Jumpstart our Business Strength (JOBS) Act. (Democrats, of course, howled in protest — ignoring the fact they used to use the same strategy quite often when they controlled the Senate chambers.)

Readers can go to www.gunowners.org/a030204a.htm on the GOA website to read in greater detail how this “tree and cloture” strategy is done.

A Bad Decision

Unfortunately, the Senate rejected this strategy and, instead, opted for the “circus approach,” where anti-gun sena-

The GOA postcards made it quite clear to Senate offices that — in the words of one Senate staffer — “no deals” were acceptable.
GOA in the News

GOA Media Appearances
Jan.-Mar. 2004

TV and Radio
3/30/04 KAHJ, California
3/30/04 KGAB, Wyoming
3/30/04 WHYN, Massachusetts
3/19/04 Heart of the Matter
3/19/04 WBKV, Indiana
3/18/04 WRL, Rhode Island
3/11/04 KFAR, Alaska
3/11/04 KCMN, Colorado
3/09/04 KNMX, New Mexico
3/09/04 Global TV
3/09/04 WCEO, South Carolina
3/05/04 WSBA, Pennsylvania
3/05/04 KSCI, Iowa
3/04/04 KCNN, Indiana
3/03/04 Ken Hamblin show
3/03/04 WDNS, Kentucky
3/03/04 WOCA, Florida
3/02/04 Dateline Washington
3/02/04 Chuck Harder show
3/02/04 Alex Jones show
3/02/04 KXYL, Texas
3/01/04 WRJZ, Tennessee
2/27/04 KIML, Wyoming
2/27/04 WZYM, Tennessee
2/26/04 WIBA, Wisconsin
2/26/04 WELJ, Alabama
2/26/04 KMED, Oregon
2/26/04 KSJL, Missouri
2/26/04 WHYN, Massachusetts
2/25/04 RNN TV
2/25/04 KGEZ, Montana
2/25/04 WTPL, New Hampshire
2/25/04 WFTW, Florida
2/25/04 WBKV, Indiana
2/24/04 KTKK, Missouri
2/24/04 KFTK, Missouri
2/24/04 KGAB, Wyoming
2/24/04 WGAB, Maine
2/24/04 Steel on Steel
2/23/04 WERC, Alabama
2/23/04 Ken Hamblin show
2/23/04 WACV, Alabama
2/23/04 WMOU, New Hampshire
2/23/04 Radio Liberty Network
2/23/04 WNTK, New Hampshire
2/19/04 WTKF, North Carolina
2/19/04 KTS, Texas
2/19/04 WMUZ, Michigan
2/18/04 Stan Monteith show
2/13/04 WYDE, Alabama
2/05/04 Tim Ziegler show
2/05/04 KSAL, Kansas
2/04/04 Radio Liberty Network
2/03/04 KRFR, California
1/30/04 KVY, Pennsylvania
1/29/04 WVNN, Alabama
1/28/04 KSIM, Missouri
1/27/04 KKBI, Oklahoma
1/27/04 Radio Liberty Network
1/26/04 WNAW, Massachusetts
1/22/04 WOCA, Florida
1/21/04 Kahi, California
1/21/04 KFNX, Arizona
1/21/04 Ken Hamblin show
1/21/04 KMED, Oregon
1/21/04 KXYL, Texas
1/21/04 WFTW, Florida
1/20/04 Talk Sport
1/20/04 KTKK, Utah
1/20/04 WCEO, South Carolina
1/20/04 KJSL, Missouri
1/19/04 KGAB, Wyoming
1/19/04 KCMN, Colorado
1/19/04 KTSA, Texas
1/19/04 WJZ, Tennessee
1/15/04 WKRK, Ohio
1/16/04 Ken Hamblin show
1/15/04 WTKF, North Carolina
1/15/04 WHCB, Tennessee
1/14/04 Voice of Freedom
1/14/04 Paula Zahn Show (CNN)
1/12/04 WCTC, New Jersey
1/12/04 WMUZ, Michigan
1/09/04 Judicial Watch
1/08/04 KNMX, Nevada
1/08/04 KIML, Wyoming
1/07/04 WELJ, Alabama
1/07/04 KGEZ, Montana
1/07/04 WCEO, South Carolina
1/06/04 KGB, Wyoming
1/02/04 Bob Dornan show
1/02/04 WNBC, Kentucky

GOA Executive Director Larry Pratt appeared on Fox News with Judge Andrew Napolitano this past December after the Supreme Court upheld the campaign finance law — better known as the “Incumbent Protection Act.” Gun Owners of America was one of the plaintiffs which had helped bring the case before the Supremes.

Newspaper
3/08/04 World Net Daily
3/05/04 CNS News
3/04/04 CNS News
3/03/04 Chicago Tribune
3/03/04 Boston Globe
2/25/04 CNS News
2/25/04 Pittsburgh Tribune
2/24/04 Chicago Tribune
2/19/04 World Net Daily
2/17/04 The Hill
2/03/04 The Hill
2/23/04 CNS News
2/12/04 Fairfax Journal
2/12/04 Roll Call
1/06/04 Newark Star-Ledger

Note: The media outlets above are only a partial listing of the appearances that GOA representatives have made this year.

Two Bills to Arm Pilots
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To address these and other problems with the armed pilots program, Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY) and Representative Joe Wilson (R-SC) recently introduced legislation that will force the TSA to comply with congressional mandates with respect to armed pilots.

The legislation will require that 90% of all pilot/applicants be trained and certified within six months of passage. This time frame will put pressure on the TSA to encourage training by private facilities — a measure which has been consistently resisted by the TSA.

In addition, the Bunning-Wilson bills will require that pilots carry their firearms when they deboard their planes and proof of firearms proficiency to be deputized immediately.

Finally, the Bunning-Wilson bills deal with a series of “housekeeping” matters that have been bungled by TSA incompetence, including provisions relating to the “chain of command” aboard aircraft.

The two bills have been referred to the relevant committees in the House and Senate. Gun Owners of America and its grassroots supporters will continue to push for quick action on this legislation.

Legislation often comes up with little notice on Capitol Hill, leaving time only for e-mail alerts. If you are not already receiving GOA alerts, please visit www.gunowners.org/ean.htm to sign up for e-mail notifications.
Lock Up Your Safety Requirement. This amendment would impose an implicit “gun tax” on all handgun purchasers by requiring them to buy a trigger lock when they purchase their handgun, irrespective of need. In addition, the amendment would create a broad and implicit cause of action against gun owners who fail to actually use the storage device to lock up their firearms. Of course, a locked gun then becomes unavailable for self-defense. The language was offered by Senator Herb Kohl (D-WI) on February 26, 2004 and passed the Senate 70-27 as an amendment to S. 1805, the gun makers’ protection act. A vote against the Kohl amendment was a pro-gun vote and is listed as a “+”.

Feinstein Semi-auto Ban. On March 2, 2004, the Senate voted 52-47 in favor of the amendment offered by Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA). This amendment would extend the ban that was signed into law by President Clinton in 1994 — a ban which outlawed certain magazines and more than 180 types of semi-automatic firearms. Without such a legislative extension, the ban will sunset in September 2004. The Feinstein language passed as an amendment to S. 1805. A vote against the amendment was a pro-gun vote and is listed as a “+”.

McCain Gun Show Ban. Senator John McCain (R-AZ) offered a gun show amendment to S. 1805 on March 2, 2004. His language would outlaw the private sale of firearms at gun shows, unless the buyer agrees to submit to a background registration check. Also, it could effectively eliminate gun shows because every member of an organization sponsoring a gun show could be imprisoned if the organization fails to notify each and every “person who attends the special firearms event of the requirements [under the Brady Law].” Thus, if the person responsible for handing out “Brady pamphlets” took a break to go to the bathroom, everyone responsible for the event could be sent to prison. The McCain amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 53-47. A vote against the amendment was a pro-gun vote and is listed as a “+”.

Hunting ammo ban. Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA) offered this amendment to S. 1805 in an attempt to extend the federal ban on many types of ammunition. In the name of prohibiting so-called “cop killer” ammunition, the Kennedy ban would have included superior performance bullets in popular hunting calibers such as the .30-06. While the Kennedy amendment was defeated by the Senate, a Craig-Frist amendment to study the issue did pass. A vote against the Kennedy amendment was a pro-gun vote and is listed as a “+”.

Having voted correctly on the Feinstein semi-auto ban in 1994, Republican Senator John Warner of Virginia changed his vote to support the extension of the ban this March.
New Hampshire Senate Approves “Vermont Carry” Bill

By Mike Hammond

In a stunning victory for the Second Amendment, the New Hampshire state Senate approved legislation to allow Americans to carry concealed firearms in the “Granite State” without the government’s permission.

The Vermont-style carry bill, S.B. 454, passed the Senate by a 13-to-10 vote, and now goes to the House Committee on Criminal Justice, where it faces stiff resistance from anti-gun forces.

Gun owners will remember that the state of Alaska passed real right to carry legislation last year. Similarly, the Senate-passed bill in New Hampshire would allow state residents to apply for permits, if they wished, for the purpose of avoiding repeated Instantchecks or obtaining reciprocity in another state.

But it would no longer be illegal to carry a concealed firearm in New Hampshire for the protection of your family, your friends, and yourself — even if you did not have the government’s permission to do so.

If S.B. 454 passes, New Hampshire would join Vermont and Alaska — two of the safest states in the country — in allowing residents to exercise their Second Amendment rights without a government permit.

New Hampshire resident Norman Bernier, testifying before a Senate committee, put it exactly right: “Society is safer when criminals don’t know who is armed.”

Bernier went on to point out that — under current New Hampshire law — a woman being stalked by a homicidal ex-boyfriend could be required to wait up to 14 days in order to obtain the right to defend herself.

GOA Communications Director Erich Pratt encouraged the New Hampshire House to follow the Senate’s lead: “On New Hampshire’s license plate is emblazoned the phrase immortalized by Revolutionary War hero John Stark: ‘Live Free or Die.’ Now is the time for New Hampshire to demonstrate that these are more than just empty words.”

---

Senate Votes

Continued from page 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Mississippi</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cochran (R)</td>
<td>Bingaman (D)</td>
<td>Santorum (R)</td>
<td>Jeffords (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lott (R)</td>
<td>Domenici (R)</td>
<td>Specter (R)</td>
<td>Leahy (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Bond (R)</td>
<td>Clinton (D)</td>
<td>Chafee (R)</td>
<td>Allen (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talent (R)</td>
<td>Schumer (D)</td>
<td>Reed (D)</td>
<td>Warner (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Baucus (D)</td>
<td>Dole (R)</td>
<td>Graham (R)</td>
<td>Cantwell (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burns (R)</td>
<td>Edwards (D)</td>
<td>Hollings (D)</td>
<td>Murray (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Hagel (R)</td>
<td>Conrad (D)</td>
<td>Daschle (D)</td>
<td>Byrd (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson (D)</td>
<td>Dorgan (D)</td>
<td>Johnson (D)</td>
<td>Rockefeller (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Ensign (R)</td>
<td>DeWine (R)</td>
<td>Alexander (R)</td>
<td>Feingold (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reid (D)</td>
<td>Voinovich (R)</td>
<td>Frist (R)</td>
<td>Kohl (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Gregg (R)</td>
<td>Inflo (R)</td>
<td>Cornyn (R)</td>
<td>Enzi (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sununu (R)</td>
<td>Nickles (R)</td>
<td>Hutchison (R)</td>
<td>Thomas (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Corzine (D)</td>
<td>Smith (R)</td>
<td>Bennett (R)</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lautenberg (D)</td>
<td>Wyden (D)</td>
<td>Hatch (R)</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state house in Concord, New Hampshire.
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and does, use the product in a manner involving unreasonable risk..."

All 34 of the existing, frivolous lawsuits are based, in part, on this argument.

Thus, there is a huge question as to whether this bill would even be a positive "one step forward" if it had been passed as originally drafted. But once the anti-gun amendments were tacked on, it became clear that the bill would have taken us "ten steps backward" if it ever reached the President's desk.

Clean up the Bill Later?

Ah, some said, but we could have taken care of those anti-gun amendments in a House-Senate conference committee. We could have cleaned up the bill before it ever got to the President.

This is always a dangerous strategy. After all, when is the best time to kill a poisonous snake?

Answer: the first chance you get. The longer you let it live, the better chance it has to bite you.

This is exactly what happened in 2002, when many senators voted for the McCain-Feinstein restrictions on free speech, based on the assumption that the conference committee would clean up the bill later or the Supreme Court would overturn it.

Gun owners are now well aware that the conference committee never cleaned up the bill, and draconian restrictions on the ability of Gun Owners to inform people of their legislators' anti-gun records went to the President's desk.

President Bush then signed the bill, also relying on the chance that the Supreme Court would strike down unconstitutional provisions that were in it.

Well, wrong again. The Supreme Court upheld the restrictions this past December.

Remember, you always kill a poisonous snake the first chance you get. One can only assume that a conference committee will "take care of the problem" if one ignores the determination of Ted Kennedy, Dianne Feinstein and Chuck Schumer.

Know Your Opponent

Democrats would not have allowed the gun liability bill to even go to conference without a pre-commitment that the Clinton gun ban stay in the bill. Consider that Democrats used the same strategy to obtain concessions on a pension bill recently.

The only other option would have been for the House to take up the Senate bill and strip off all the anti-gun amendments and then send it back to the Senate.

But under those circumstances, the bill would then come back to the Senate as a fully amendable bill, and that would mean we would be back at square one, passing a gun makers' protection bill in the U.S. Senate while trying to keep anti-gun amendments off of it.

To ban or not to ban?

The stakes are quite high in this ongoing battle. Will Americans live under a Constitution and the Bill of Rights? Or will we be dominated by the changing whims of politicians and judges?

The argument for banning certain semi-automatics seems to be one of firepower. "No one needs a gun this powerful," they tell us.

Perhaps they are just ignorant (hardly) . . . or perhaps they are simply being

If I could have gotten 51 votes in the Senate of the United States for an outright ban, picking every one of them — Mr. and Mrs. America, turn them all in — I would have done it."

— Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA)

"It's (definitely). But gun grabbers have to realize that many hunting rifles and shotguns have much greater firepower than the average semi-automatic banned in 1994 — even though those guns might contain magazines holding 30 or 40 rounds.

If these magazines are considered excessive, how long will it be before the Brady Bunch starts arguing that shotguns are excessive, too? After all, a standard shotgun actually has far greater firepower than any of the semi-automatic firearms that were banned by President Clinton.

Take a typical Remington 1100 shotgun. It pumps out more lead (and faster) than any of the banned semiautos — even with their large capacity magazines. Each 00 buckshot shell contains twelve .33 caliber pellets. Thus, the Remington 1100 can unleash 72 projectiles in about two and a half seconds, as compared to an AKS, which can only fire forty aimed shots in about a minute."

If the AKS is too dangerous for pri-
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magazine of over five rounds.

The battle over the Feinstein ban is really over the heart and soul of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. We can only hope that Americans will rise to the occasion and ask their elected officials, “What part of ‘shall not be infringed’ don’t you understand?”

It ain’t over till it’s over

Gun owners should revel in the initial defeat of the Feinstein ban and rejoice in the victory from this first skirmish. But the battle to repeal one of the most onerous gun laws on the books has just begun.

Backers of the Feinstein gun ban told the New York Times they would try to “tack the measure onto other bills,” or to pass it on its own. It is not clear whether they will be able to generate the 60 votes necessary to overcome a Republican filibuster, and so GOA is working to strengthen the opposition.

But Sen. Feinstein’s obsession remains firm. “We will come back, and we will come back, and we will come back again,” she threatened.

“If we can’t get it done by Sept. 13 then you can be sure . . . we will come back to fight another day.”

Please stay tuned.


GOA Blasts Anti-Business “Switch Hitters” Like Daschle

Following the defeat of the gun makers’ protection act in March, Gun Owners of America blasted the 11 “switch hitting” Senators who tried to appear pro-business, while stealthily trying to sink the bill.

Trying to have it both ways, Sen. Tom Daschle (D-SD) and ten other Senators cosponsored pro-gun legislation even while plotting to kill it — and have thus earned a special contempt of the Second Amendment community.

In addition to Daschle, there were ten other “switch hitters” including Senators Breaux (D-LA), Lincoln (D-AR), Collins (R-ME), Dorgan (D-ND), Gregg (R-NH), Hagel (R-NE), Landrieu (D-LA), Reid (D-NV), Smith (R-OR) and Snowe (R-ME).

The Hill, a Capitol Hill newspaper, reported that the lawsuit protection bill sponsor, Larry Craig, felt that Senate Democratic Leader Tom Daschle “should have worked to get a clean bill passed and steered it into a conference with the House.”

Far from expediting the bill’s passage, cosponsor Daschle did everything possible to insure that it would go down to defeat — balking at the prospect of a clean bill, facilitating the submission of “killer amendments,” and conditioning a House-Senate conference on a pre-commitment to retain the “killer amendments.”

“For those senators who have no regard for their oath to support and defend the Constitution, fine,” said GOA’s Erich Pratt. “But please don’t betray us with a kiss.”

What Went Wrong at Columbine
Continued from page 8

As a result, Rohrbough’s litigation has focused on freedom of information suits to obtain the documents which have exposed the government’s lies.

The Governor’s commission to investigate Columbine was on the verge of issuing a report saying that everyone in authority had done all they could when Rohrbough dug up the non-executed search warrant. The commission never did hammer the police for allowing two killers to roam the halls while the cops covered outside.

The commission recommended two improvements. One was to improve communication technology between police departments and the Sheriff’s office in the county. But Rohrbough has learned that the difficulty was solved almost instantly. The other recommendation was that troubled students not go to their diversion programs in the same car. That was all the commission could come up with!

No guns in schools

Rohrbough lamented that there were no teachers or other adults with a concealed firearm in the school. He pointed to the case of Israel where teachers have been encouraged to arm themselves.

Certainly, if the police are going to insist that they have no responsibility to protect victims from criminals, then it is unconscionable for the police and politicians to oppose people protecting themselves, including legalizing firearms for self-defense in schools.

Rohrbough is of the opinion that the killers’ accomplice who legally bought the guns for the killers had advance knowledge of the crime. According to her, she told the killers when she gave them the guns, “You’re not going to do anything stupid, are you?” She was not prosecuted for transferring firearms to persons ineligible to own them.

Rohrbough suspects that she was not prosecuted because she played the politically correct game of testifying that if there had been a gun show background check she never would have bought the guns.

One good thing that has resulted from the revelations of official misconduct was the defeat of the Sheriff in the next election.

What Went Wrong At Columbine

By Larry Pratt

This April marks the five-year anniversary of the Columbine tragedy. I had an opportunity to interview Brian Rohrbough, a father of one of the victims, for my talk show Live Fire within the past year.

In the interview, my listeners were informed of the continuing lawsuits pursued by Rohrbough to pry relevant information from authorities who have engaged in a massive cover-up.

The killers were well-known to the school and the police as very dangerous characters. After stealing equipment from a van, they were reported to have made death threats against a student. The Sheriff denied that any such report had been made, but unhappily for the Sheriff, the father had kept a copy of the report on the official form used for that purpose.

Rohrbough said that other death threats had been made, as well. The police had recovered from the killers pipe bombs which had been reported to them.

Massive cover-ups

A year before Columbine, a search warrant was drawn up to search the house of the killers but was never executed. For two years the Sheriff’s department denied that there had been a warrant. It has now been revealed in court that the cops were lying. Rohrbough suspects that one of the killers’ parents was close to someone in the Sheriff’s department.

One of the killers was being medicated on a psychotropic drug. There is a line at many of the county schools in the cafeteria where such drugs are handed out. The schools get $1000 per year from the federal government for handing out drugs that the parents pay for.

The Sheriff’s department covered up the records of the juvenile diversion program that the killers had attended. The parents had described in documents for the program that the kids were angry.

Ignoring the obvious

One of the killers answered questions on a form saying that he wanted to kill someone, wanted to kill himself and hurt as many people as possible. They wrote essays in a creative writing class where they described the joys of murdering innocent people.

The only negative comment by the teacher who graded the paper was that you should not swear at people before murdering them. In one class, they produced a video depicting the blowing up of the school.

The killers had been on the internet bragging about the bombs they built. They even put their names on the bombs. Other video tapes were made by the killers bragging that they wanted to kill as many people as possible. They had a hit list, but that has not been released yet — although Rohrbough is trying to get it produced in court.

The school authorities reported concerns about the killers to the Sheriff department’s school resource officer. The officer denied that he was ever told that information. This is one of the many lies that Rohrbough has uncovered in over 30,000 pages of documents he has pried from the clutches of the authorities.

Official cowardice

Rohrbough accuses the police of having been cowards. Most of the officers he hastens to add wanted to go in, but the first officers on the scene became cowards. They had a gun fight with the killers and ran to hide behind their cars instead of running into the school. Their cowardice soon became the prevailing orders from above, ultimately from the Sheriff himself.

There was about seven minutes before the killers killed anyone inside the school (two had been killed outside, including Rohrbough’s son). Obviously, if the officers had gone into the building immediately, there is a great likelihood that many lives could have been saved.

It is now known that the police waited for three hours after they knew the killers were dead before they finally entered the building. This was the time during which a teacher bled to death in plain sight of the world.

Lies and more lies

Rohrbough has alleged that the county lied about 28 material facts. When he presented this in a case against the county, the judge said that the government is immune from criminal penalties when it lies.

The county’s defense, when they were caught lying, was to hide behind the doctrine of sovereign immunity which protects bureaucrats from liability for their misdeeds. As a result, they actually argued in court that they were not responsible for protecting the victims or the dying teacher.

Continued on page 7