

THE Gun Owners

35 YEARS OF NO COMPROMISE – 1975-2010

VA Abuses Highlight Dangers of Health Care Database

– *Bill to repeal Veterans Disarmament Act now moving*

by John Velleco

The involvement of Gun Owners of America in the year-long battle over nationalized health care raised more than a few eyebrows in the media, the halls of Congress, and even the White House. Many have asked why is GOA, Washington's only no-compromise gun lobby, participating in the Obamacare debate at all?

"There is no mention [of] 'gun-related health data' or anything like it anywhere in either the Senate or the House [health care] bill," complained one administration official in reaction to GOA's opposition to the Obamacare legislation.

The reason is simple. GOA has seen firsthand how a centralized health care system can be used to disarm thousands of gun owners.

The federal Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) oversees the



A vocal opponent of the ObamaCare legislation, Sen. Richard Burr (R-NC) has also sponsored a bill to protect veterans' Second Amendment rights.

health care needs of many of the nation's military veterans. With over 150 medical centers, hundreds of outpatient clinics

Continued on page 2

Will UN Blue Helmets be Enforcing Gun Control in Your Neighborhood?

by Erich Pratt

Having been stymied in the Congress, President Obama is pushing global gun control in a back door effort to restrict the firearms of American citizens.

According to *Bloomberg News*, the Obama administration voted "aye" late last year at the United Nations in support of continued talks aimed at regulating firearms around the world. The Obama administration's vote reversed the Bush administration's strong opposition to any arms control treaty that would impact the rights of American gun owners.

To be sure, gun owners can expect any arms treaty to limit their rights.

The Heritage Foundation, a think-tank based in the nation's capital, has followed the arms control discussions at the UN very closely. They report that a UN arms treaty would require all signatory nations to adopt the "highest possible standards" in keeping guns away from criminals and terrorists.

But as the think-tank notes, this standard is intended as an assault on the Second Amendment rights of all Americans because, ultimately, "there is no guarantee that any privately

held gun in the U.S. will never be used in criminal activity."

Hence, Americans could expect to see licensing restrictions, bans on most semi-automatic firearms, an end to private sales at gun shows, and much more.

President Barack Obama made promises to protect Second Amendment rights during his campaign. But he seems perfect-

Continued on page 7

Inside:

- **GOA presents its case to the Supreme Court (page 3)**
- **GOA members shoot holes in notion that gun owners want restrictions (page 5)**
- **The latest on the anti-gun ObamaCare bill (page 6)**

Veterans Disarmament

Continued from page 1

and nearly 300,000 employees, the VA runs its very own version of a national health care system. Bureaucrats in Washington, therefore, are in control of many health care decisions.

In 1999, under the direction of the Clinton administration, the VA was obliged to share certain mental health records with the FBI for the purpose of adding names to the national instant check system (NICS). People whose names are added to NICS, of course, are not allowed to purchase or possess firearms.

The health records in question had to do with persons the VA had deemed “mental defectives.” Since 1968, persons so adjudicated have been prohibited from possessing firearms. For decades, the common understanding of “mental defective” applied to people found not guilty of a crime by reason of insanity. In 1999, however, the Clinton Justice Department unilaterally decided to greatly expand the definition to include the VA’s very broad use of the term.

Without notifying the people affected by the decision, the VA turned over the names of 90,000 veterans who “because of injury or disease lack the mental capacity to contract or manage their own affairs.” Under the guise of “mental defectiveness,” therefore, many veterans who served their country honorably have lost their Second Amendment rights *for life* because a doctor or a bureaucrat in the VA appointed someone to look over their finances.

Thanks to routine data dumps, the number of veterans who have lost their gun rights due to common maladies like Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) has increased to an estimated 150,000. PTSD, incidentally, affects as many as one third of all combat troops.

These veterans were not convicted of a crime, were not found to be a danger to anyone, and they were not afforded any meaningful due process of law. They were added to NICS simply on the basis of the opinion of a government psychiatrist.

To make matters worse, what began under the Clinton administration as a blatant illegitimate abuse of power was

codified by a law, the so-called Veterans Disarmament Act of 2008, signed by President George W. Bush.

If such a travesty of justice was made possible through the VA’s national health care system, there is every reason to believe that it will also occur under Obama’s proposed health care legislation.

That is why GOA has been fighting Obamacare, and that is also why GOA is pushing a bill right now to protect the Second Amendment rights of veterans.

Pro-gun Senator Richard Burr (R-NC) authored a bill, S. 669, that will safeguard for veterans two of the most fundamental Constitutional rights enjoyed by Americans: due process of law and the right to keep and bear arms.

“Taking away a Constitutional right is a serious action and veterans should be afforded due process under the law,” Sen. Burr said. “Our veterans took an oath to uphold the Constitution and they deserve to enjoy the rights they fought so hard to protect.”

Sen. Burr’s bill, the “Veterans Sec-

the practice of psychiatrists subjecting veterans to a lifetime gun ban.

The bill passed out of the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee last June, but anti-gun Majority Leader Harry Reid will not let it see the light of day. Sen. Burr is currently seeking opportunities to attach the bill as an amendment to another piece of legislation.

GOA is also continuing to push for more cosponsors to S. 669. There are currently only 17 Senate cosponsors. [See if your Senator is listed in the box.] Given how many Senators claim to be pro-gun, that number should be much higher.

There could be a strategic reason why many Senators have not signed on to the bill. They know that once a bill garners around fifty cosponsors, it becomes very difficult for the leadership to ignore the legislation. Seeing that only one Democrat, Virginia’s Jim Webb, has cosponsored the bill, it could be that many moderate Democrats are staying off the bill to protect their party leader, Harry Reid.

Similarly, many Republicans might

GOA has seen firsthand how a centralized health care system can be used to disarm thousands of gun owners.

ond Amendment Protection Act,” simply stipulates that a veteran cannot lose his or her gun rights “without the order or finding of a judge, magistrate, or other judicial authority of competent jurisdiction that such person is a danger to himself or herself or others.”

In short, S. 669 will put an end to

be staying off the bill to protect their own anti-gun Party members.

These Senators should be reminded, therefore, that it was the voters in their states, not their party caucuses, who elected them to office. GOA urges its members to contact their Senators and insist they cosponsor S. 669. ■

Has your Senator cosponsored the Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act?

Brownback, Sam [R-KS]

Coburn, Tom [R-OK]

Cochran, Thad [R-MS]

Crapo, Mike [R-ID]

DeMint, Jim [R-SC]

Ensign, John [R-NV]

Enzi, Michael [R-WY]

Graham, Lindsey [R-SC]

Grassley, Chuck [R-IA]

Inhofe, James M. [R-OK]

Murkowski, Lisa [R-AK]

Risch, James E. [R-ID]

Roberts, Pat [R-KS]

Thune, John [R-SD]

Vitter, David [R-LA]

Webb, Jim [D-VA]

Wicker, Roger F. [R-MS]

GOA Weighs in Before the U.S. Supreme Court

On March 2, the U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments in a case where four Chicago residents are seeking to invalidate the city's ordinance prohibiting them from owning or possessing a handgun in their own home. The case is *McDonald v. Chicago*.

Gun Owners of America and Gun Owners Foundation added their voices in the *McDonald* case with a friend-of-the-court brief which asks the Court to use the Second and Fourteenth Amendments to strike down the Chicago ordinance.

Two years ago, GOA and GOF filed a similar brief in support of a Washington, D.C. resident who was seeking relief from an almost identical city ordinance.

On June 26, 2008, in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the D.C. ordinance was unconstitutional because an absolute ban on handgun ownership and possession "infringed" on the D.C. citizen's right to keep and bear arms as secured by the Second Amendment.

"The question now before the Court is whether an American citizen who resides in Chicago, Illinois has the same right to keep or bear arms as the American citizen who resides in the District of Columbia," said GOA Executive Director Larry Pratt.

"Since both residents are American citizens, it seems logical that both ought to have the same rights," Pratt said.

According to *Heller*, the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms belongs to "all Americans." The current GOA brief, which is supported by

By relying expressly on this "privileges and immunities" clause, the GOA brief urges the Court not to use a gun rights case to extend the power of the federal judiciary to impose its predilections upon the states in unrelated areas, such as business regulation and moral license.

Gun Owners of America and Gun Owners Foundation usually take the side that is against the federal government because it has become too big for its britches. And the Chicago case is no exception from that policy and principle.

Thus, it bears repeating that the Supreme Court found in *Heller* that the very purpose of the unalienable right to keep and bear arms is to prevent "tyrants" from "taking away the people's arms, enabling a select militia or standing army to suppress political opponents." To the Court's credit, it saw that the D.C. ban on handguns was just the kind of regulation prohibited by the Second Amendment. Thus, the Court ruled that the keeping of handguns for self-defense was a "central component of the right itself."

Another successful outcome of GOA's *Heller* brief was in countering the Bush Administration. Paul Clement was the chief lawyer for the Justice Department at the time. On the one hand, his brief rightfully argued

No. 08-1521

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OTIS McDONALD, ET AL., Petitioners,
v.
CITY OF CHICAGO, ET AL., Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Seventh Circuit

BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE OF GUN OWNERS OF AMERICA, INC., GUN OWNERS FOUNDATION, GUN OWNERS OF CALIFORNIA, INC., MARYLAND SHALL ISSUE, INC., DOWNSIZEDC.ORG, CONSERVATIVE LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND, THE LINCOLN INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, U.S. BORDER CONTROL, AND U.S. BORDER CONTROL FOUNDATION, IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS

WILLIAM J. OLSON *
HERBERT W. TITUS
JOHN S. MILES
JEREMIAH L. MORGAN
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.
370 Maple Avenue West
Suite 4
Vienna, VA 22180-5615
(703) 356-5070

*Counsel of Record
November 23, 2009

Attorneys for Amici Curiae

Gun Owners of America and Gun Owners Foundation submitted this brief to the U.S. Supreme Court, asking the Justices to use the Second and Fourteenth Amendments to declare the handgun ban in Chicago unconstitutional.

infringed" in the Second Amendment should prevent the Court from using the D.C. case as a justification for all sorts of gun control.

GOA was pleased that the Justices heeded our admonition to limit the Court's holding to the case before it, thus shooting down both the D.C. government and the Bush Administration in their quest to validate other firearms restrictions.

A brief like the one GOA filed regarding the Chicago case is very expensive. We constantly hear from gun owners that we need to be challenging gun bans in court, to counter the efforts of the Brady Bunch, the ACLU and other leftist organizations.

If you wish to donate to this worthy cause, please go to: www.gunowners.com/mcdonald.htm ■

GOA was pleased that the Justices heeded our admonition in *Heller* to limit the Court's holding to the case before it.

seven other like-minded organizations, contends that this right extends to every American citizen without regard to state of residence.

That argument is based on the Fourteenth Amendment's straightforward prohibition against any state that makes or enforces any law that "abridge[s] the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to keep and bear arms that predated the creation of the U.S. government by the people.

On the other hand, Clement's brief concluded that any and all guns can be controlled or banned if a federal court finds that to be reasonable.

To counter this, GOA's *Heller* brief argued that the words "shall not be

Election 2010: A Storm is Brewing

by John Velleco

The political world is bracing for the equivalent of a Category 5 storm in the 2010 Congressional elections.

With Democrats looking at as many as 50 of their seats being competitive in U.S. House races and possibly 11 in the U.S. Senate, what was unthinkable a year ago (a Republican takeover of one or both chambers) is rapidly moving into the realm of the possible.

The last time an election altered the balance of power to such an extent in Washington was the 1994 elections. By that year, Democrats had held control of the House continuously since 1954, and the Senate for 34 of the previous 40 years. With Bill Clinton in the White House, power in Washington was firmly consolidated to one party that set out on an ambitious agenda that included gun control and nationalized health care.

The Congress was able to pass two anti-gun laws: the ban on many semi-automatic firearms and the Brady bill. It took Congress nearly two years to pass these laws, leaving the so-called "HillaryCare" health bill to be dealt with after the ensuing election.

However, when President Clinton delivered his 1995 State of the Union address, he looked across the House chamber and noted that — thanks to their votes for gun control — many of his former allies were no longer in office. The American people were sickened by what one-party rule did to the country, and in particular to the Second Amendment, and took both the House and Senate out of the Democrats' hands.

Unfortunately, Republicans fared little better than their predecessors. In control of Congress for more than a decade, and the White House for eight years, they succeeded in growing government to historic levels. And, forgetting the lessons of 1994, they passed gun control laws like the Lautenberg misdemeanor gun ban and the gun free school zones act. The electorate was just as put out with Republican big government as they were with the Democrats'.



Rand Paul, son of the pro-gun Representative from Texas, is making a bid for the U.S. Senate in Kentucky.

The more things "change," the more Democrats keep things the same

Fast forward to 2009. With Barack Obama in the Oval Office and Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid sitting on comfortable majorities in the House and Senate, the year was supposed to usher in an era of "change." Instead, these hard-core leftists dished out more of the same.

Some of the first words out of their collective mouths had to do with gun rights. The administration and congressional leaders called for the immediate ratification of an international gun control treaty — see www.gunowners.org/cifta — and for the renewal of the Clinton semi-auto gun ban.

Rank and file Democrats, however, were reluctant to repeat the mistakes of 1994. Instead, Congress focused on other planks in the left's agenda, such as more bailouts, environmental extremism and socialized medicine. The latter took up most of Congress' time in 2009 and was like gasoline on the fires that were already burning in grassroots America.

Besides taking over one sixth of the country's struggling economy, the ObamaCare legislation could potentially take away the Second Amendment rights of millions of American citizens. The reason is that a national health records database will allow government bureaucrats to deny gun rights based on the opinion of a doctor for ailments such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). This has already affected more than one hundred thousand military veterans.

So with the 2010 election season in full swing, it is also noteworthy that, like 1994, nationalized health care and gun control again sit at the top of the agenda and are foremost on the minds of gun owners. But while there are many similarities between the two election cycles, there is also a significant difference.

The 1994 election was, to a certain degree, a top-down effort (recall Newt Gingrich's "Contract with America").

The 2010 political environment, however, is largely the result of spontaneous, leaderless resistance growing out of the fertile soil of the grassroots. It was not the Republican establishment, after all, that brought tens of thousands of people out to town hall meetings across the country. The Washington Republican establishment did not get Scott Brown elected in Massachusetts to slam the brakes on Obamacare. It was not the party hacks inside the D.C. beltway who scared the bejeebers out of the so-called blue dog Democrats all summer long.

That has not, however, kept national Republican figures from running to the head of the troops in an effort to assume the mantle of leadership. GOP leaders are looking to align themselves with the grassroots fire that has swept the nation in the past twelve months, as if they were somehow responsible for the current uprising or that they are the apple of the Tea Party movement's eye. The fact is, the American people are well aware that politicians of all stripes are equally capable of screwing up the country.

Already, political elitists are undermining the great gains that constitutionalists stand to make in the 2010 elections. Operating as one of only a handful of national party organizations, the National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC) has been particularly antagonistic to freedom-loving candidates trying to take back the U.S. Senate. Under the leadership of Texas Senator John Cornyn, the NRSC continually favors hand-picked, milquetoast establishment candidates in the hopes of riding the wave of voter anger back into power.

Republican establishment supporting anti-gun incumbents

In the first in the nation primary, the NRSC has guaranteed an anti-gunner will be elected in 2010 by supporting Mark Kirk in the Illinois Republican contest. Kirk, F-rated on gun issues, is one of two of the most anti-gun Republican members of the House of Representatives. The other is Mike

Continued on page 5



GOA Members Speak Out

Over the past couple of months, thousands of GOA members have been giving us their thoughts in the Members Survey for 2010. Here are the highlights from that survey.

Which of GOA's legislative priorities are most important to you?

1. Keeping the anti-gun U.N. from imposing gun control on American citizens
2. Preventing the reenactment of the Clinton semi-auto ban
3. Stopping the anti-gun ObamaCare legislation

Do you favor or oppose a ban on private sales at gun shows?

Favor — 9%
Oppose — 88%

Do you believe criminals would still get firearms even if guns were completely banned?

Yes — 96%
No — 2%

Should GOA seek to stop Congress from interfering with states which pass Firearms Freedom Acts (guns made in a state and remaining there are subject to no federal firearms laws)?

Yes — 91%
No — 4%

ATF and Austin Police Cracking Down on Private Sales



In January, police in Austin, Texas combined with the ATF to force all private gun sales at an Austin gun show to be run through licensed dealers so that background registration checks could be performed, despite there being no legal authority for such a requirement. Authorities claimed the background checks were needed because guns were illegitimately being sold to illegal aliens in Austin. The irony is that Austin is a sanctuary city for illegals.

Election 2010

Continued from page 4

Castle of Delaware, who is also endorsed by the NRSC for that Senate seat. Sen. Cornyn likes Kirk and Castle because they are “electable.” But if we fill the Senate with the likes of those two, there will be no Second Amendment left to defend.

The NRSC has its thumb on the scale in a number of other races as well, but it's not too late for voters to veto the establishment choices. In Florida, the NRSC endorsed moderate Governor Charlie Crist over staunch pro-gun conservative Marco Rubio. Rubio, who is supported by Gun Owners of America, started out in single digits in the polls but has opened up a twelve point lead over Crist.

In Kentucky, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell thought he had hand-picked the successor of retiring Sen. Jim Bunning. McConnell supports Secretary of State Trey Grayson, a Harvard grad who was a Clinton supporter before changing parties after 1994. GOA has endorsed ophthalmologist Rand Paul, who is running on an agenda of constitutional fidelity. Dr. Paul started out as a dark-horse candidate, but came out of nowhere and now leads Grayson in the polls by nearly twenty points.

In California, the NRSC favors Carly Fiorina while practically ignoring the very conservative and pro-gun candidate, Chuck DeVore.



Marco Rubio, supported by GOA, leads establishment candidate Charlie Crist in the polls in Florida's Republican primary for U.S. Senate.

And Republicans in D.C. are all but measuring the drapes for the office of former Sen. Dan Coats of Indiana. Coats, who voted for the semi-auto ban and the Brady bill, is running in a primary against two pro-gun stalwarts: former Rep. John Hostettler and state Senator Marlin Stutzman. The race in Indiana is to replace retiring Sen. Evan Bayh (D).

Thankfully, the NRSC's counterpart on the other side of the Capitol is keeping a much lower profile in primary elections. In a New York special election late last year, the National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC) wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars in support of far-left candidate Dede Scozzafava. After getting hammered by Gun Owners of America and other organizations, the NRCC now seems content to let candidates battle it out for themselves in seeking the

party's nomination to be on the November ballot.

Gun Owners of America Political Victory Fund (GOA-PVF) is as active as ever in 2010 in races for the U.S. Senate, U.S. House, and state level offices. The same “no compromise” philosophy GOA applies in the legislative arena applies equally to electoral battles. Gun owners are tired of politicians who say whatever they need to in order to get elected, but then immediately blend into the furniture once they get into office. Instead, they are looking for citizen-legislators who will go to Washington unafraid to rock the boat.

That is exactly the type of candidate GOA-PVF looks for in every election. Through a survey program, extensive research, and hundreds of interviews with candidates, GOA-PVF seeks out those candidates who will most aggressively defend the Second Amendment. And defense of the right to keep and bear arms means more than just stopping new gun control laws — unconstitutional gun laws on the books also need to be repealed.

Gun Owners of America is a leader in pushing bills to repeal anti-gun laws such as the Veteran's Disarmament Act (see article on page 1). But we need, with the help of gun owners and sportsmen all across the country, to elect men and women with the mettle to get the job done.

To learn more about GOA-PVF candidates, please visit us online at www.goapvf.org. ■

Anti-gun ObamaCare on Life Support!

– But still needs one final stake through its heart

by Mike Hammond

On January 19th — with the election of Scott Brown to the U.S. Senate — Massachusetts voters wrote a prescription for ObamaCare. In a very audible voice, they said: “kill the bill”!

Or, to put it even more explicitly: take the vampire-like “undead” ObamaCare monstrosity and shoot it with a silver bullet, cut its head off at a midnight crossroads, put garlic around its neck, drive a stake through its heart, and bury it in a lead coffin with a crucifix on top.

Given the damage which ObamaCare would do to America, this is hardly too much overkill.

For nearly a year, Americans have made it clear that they *hate* ObamaCare. They understand that ObamaCare will:

- Put their gun-related health data into a federal database;
- Send their premiums through the roof (purportedly to \$25,900 by 2019);
- Take away the insurance they currently have;
- Increase health care costs (by \$245 billion);
- Increase the deficit by half a trillion dollars (when the accounting tricks are discounted);
- Raise their taxes; and
- Put 20% of all doctors and hospitals out of business (according to the government’s own actuary).

But Nancy Pelosi and her liberal cronies are convinced that Americans are too stupid to make determinations about their health care. According to *New York Times* columnist Charles Blow: “The next time [Obama] gives a speech, someone should tap him on the ankle and say, ‘Mr. President, [the American people are] down here.’”

Wow! As much as the *New York Times* may believe that American people are groveling at Barack Obama’s feet, the polls show that — by margins of 20-30% — Americans hate ObamaCare. And between 20-45% are transformationally angry.



Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi are both trying to resurrect the stalled health care legislation and send it to the President’s desk.

What About Guns?

For twelve months, congressional Democrats assured their constituents — generally with more than a hint of arrogance — that ObamaCare “would not take away your guns.”

Well, these Democrats were shown to be the liars they truly are in December of last year.

Lo and behold, in the wee hours of December 20, when Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid revealed his “manager’s amendment,” the first ten pages contained page after page of language intended to supposedly protect gun owners.

According to the online version of *Slate* magazine on December 20:

Score one for the Gun Owners of America, a lobby group positioned well to the right of the National Rifle Association.... [T]o pacify GOA, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (who represents the gun-loving state of Nevada) has inserted into his “manager’s amendment” a section titled “Protecting 2nd Amendment Gun Rights.” It states that no wellness program implemented under health reform may require disclosure or collection of any information relating to gun ownership.

This would seem to suggest that all the letters from your congress critters assuring you that ObamaCare would not take away your guns were — well —

lies. Senators could no longer ignore all of the postcards and letters from gun owners, so they took steps to fix some of the problems in the bill.

But, you ask, has Reid fixed everything? The answer is “no.” The amendment is full of holes. And the largest hole is its failure to prohibit ATF from trolling the new federal health database to take guns away from Americans with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), attention deficit disorder, and other emotional problems.

Hence, just as the government has taken guns away from 150,000 honorable veterans, ObamaCare could be a go-ahead to take guns away from *tens of millions* of Americans with emotional issues.

Where are We Now?

First, the good news. With the election of Massachusetts Republican Scott Brown, Democrats now lack the 60 votes needed to pass a large-scale ObamaCare bill in the Senate. And they may not even have the 218 votes needed in the House.

Moreover, Democratic threats to pass an ObamaCare “fix-up bill” with 50 Senate votes — through a process designed exclusively for deficit reduction — would run up against a series of parliamentary obstacles which would probably be insurmountable.

As we predicted, the bad news for ObamaCare has spilled over to potentially stalling other items on the Obama agenda: gun control, the UN Small Arms Treaty, the cap-and-trade environmental tax increase, and a variety of other Obama priorities which now face a very tough road for the remainder of the year.

Don’t Get Complacent

To paraphrase Winston Churchill: “Never give up. Never give up. Never give up.”

We cannot remove the pressure from senators and representatives, just because things are looking good.

Just as a football team doesn’t leave the field at half-time — even if it has a healthy lead — we cannot let up the

Continued on page 7

ObamaCare Life Support

Continued from page 6

unrelenting pressure on our elected representatives in opposition to ObamaCare.

Nancy Pelosi hasn't given up her efforts to socialize America's health care system and bring your private medical matters under strict government control. Congressional leaders continue to work on a compromise.

Pelosi herself has said that, if the "gate" to ObamaCare is locked, she will climb over the fence or pole-vault over the wall or parachute to a liberal socialist victory.

So you can't celebrate yet. But do keep up the good work. You are winning! ■

Michael Hammond is the legislative counsel for Gun Owners of America.



Gun Owners of America was the first national gun lobby to endorse Scott Brown as the replacement to fill Senator Ted Kennedy's seat. His victory in January — making him the deciding vote in maintaining a Republican filibuster — has stalled further movement on the ObamaCare bill for now.

UN Gun Control Treaty

Continued from page 1

ly happy using the United Nations to enact gun restrictions that he cannot otherwise get passed in the Congress.

Remember the President's startling proclamation during the State of the Union speech in January? When the Senate voted down a commission he wanted, he said this: "Yesterday, the Senate blocked a bill that would have created this commission. So I will issue an executive order that will allow us to go forward."

In other words, the Separation of Powers be damned! "If Congress doesn't give me what I want," he seems to tell us, "then I'll just go around them using my Executive Order pen."

There is no regard for the Separation of Powers ... no desire to limit himself to the boundaries set by the U.S. Constitution, a document he swore to uphold. For Obama, the United Nations has become a convenient surrogate to get his anti-gun agenda enacted.

One hopes that if an international arms treaty were to pass, our country could just ignore its edicts. That would be the best-case scenario.

Of course, there will be many in Congress and at the White House who

will then dust off their copies of the Constitution (which they love to ignore) and argue that treaties are the supreme law of the land, according to Article VI. We will then see anti-gun liberals — and the rest of the world — use the treaty as a stick to beat us into compliance.

The worst-case scenario for gun owners involves the United Nations directly enforcing compliance. As noted by the Heritage Foundation, the International Criminal Court could be "an alternative avenue of enforcement."

For example, the Foundation states that the ICC could investigate and charge U.S. policymakers who, wanting to help freedom fighters in other countries, vote to send them arms. But that is just the tip of the iceberg.

Could we see the international court rule against gun owners for refusing to

UN Blue Helmets at Your Door?



If the Obama administration gets its way, Americans could see an international gun control treaty imposing licensing restrictions, bans on most semi-automatic firearms, an end to private sales at gun shows, and much more.

lock up their firearms? What happens if one of our guns is stolen and is later used in a crime or the gun is smuggled south of the border?

Americans are not used to seeing UN Peacekeepers donning their blue helmets in our country. For most Americans, the presence of international troops here would not be welcome.

The enforcement question is a huge question mark and necessitates that gun owners continue to watch these arms control talks very closely and hold their policymakers accountable. ■



Fearing the Government more than the Crooks

by Larry Pratt

Eleven years ago, Sandy Javelle was visiting the Massachusetts office of the company he worked for. Sandy was a concealed carry permit holder in New Hampshire who normally carried a firearm with him —

unless he was visiting the Massachusetts branch.

He feared the Massachusetts laws that penalize self protection and prohibit concealed carry of firearms for most citizens. But why worry? Javelle was not going to a dangerous area by visiting the Massachusetts office.

Sadly, Michael McDermott came to work that day intending to make it a dangerous place. McDermott brought three firearms to the office in order to kill some folks he was mad at. He did not post a notice that he would be on a murderous rampage that day. He struck without warning.

Javelle acted to protect his co-workers and then confronted McDermott. Alas, Massachusetts law required him to go empty-handed to a gun fight, and Javelle was one of seven legally disarmed victims to die that day.

Not long ago, I got an email from a GOA member. Let's call him Jim. The parallels to what happened to Javelle were frightening.

Jim lives in New Jersey and commutes to New York City. For some time he had carried a knife in his bag and would take it out and hold it in his hand when he got off the train. Jim had become aware of increased police activity in New York City and knew that anti-self defense Mayor Michael Bloomberg was threatening to throw the book at anyone caught using a weapon to defend himself — indeed, even carrying a knife or a gun for self-defense.

Thus it was that Jim had taken to not carrying the knife, showing that the authorities are a terror to peaceful citizens even while failing totally to be a terror to predators.

One night, after getting off the train,

Jim was walking unarmed. All of a sudden Jim heard someone behind him and, on turning around, was hit on the head with a blunt object. After falling to the ground, Jim was pummeled and robbed. He was the eighth victim to suffer the same type of assault in that area.

Jim was seriously injured and spent the next three days in intensive care. The hospital staff was amazed that Jim could talk before his brain injuries healed.

The assault on Jim did not become a national headline. He was just one of thousands of Americans who are assaulted while disarmed every year.

Sandy Javelle feared the Massachusetts laws that penalize self protection and prohibit concealed carry of firearms for most citizens. That fear cost him his life....

Just as the legislators in Massachusetts have Sandy Javelle's blood on their hands, so does elitist Mayor Bloomberg share in the pain and suffering Jim had to endure.

Americans are increasingly alarmed by a government whose spending is out of control. It appears that an electoral redress is coming — first in the primaries, and later in the November general elections.

But gun owners also need to keep unrestricted carrying of concealed firearms on the table. It is outrageous that our employees have presumed to tell their bosses — We the People — that we cannot carry concealed firearms. This is unacceptable, and we must demand that the candidates we back support effective self-defense.

In other words, gun owners must demand legal protection for doing what criminals do anyway — carrying concealed firearms without permission from those who work for us. ■



Michael McDermott (above) shot and killed seven unarmed victims in Wakefield, Massachusetts in 2000. One of the victims, Sandy Javelle, was legally permitted to carry in his home state of New Hampshire, but was disarmed by law in Massachusetts.

THE Gun Owners

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

Tim Macy
Vice-Chairman

Larry Pratt
Executive Director

Erich Pratt
Director of Communications

John Velleco
Director of Federal Affairs

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

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

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