Obama’s proposals could pave the way for gun confiscation

by Erich Pratt

The President declared war on gun owners in January when he unveiled 23 Executive Actions on gun control and a myriad of other anti-gun legislative proposals.

President Obama’s initiatives run the gamut — from imposing gun and magazine bans to expanding our current background check system.

Of course, none of the policies he recently unveiled would have stopped Adam Lanza in Connecticut from killing his mother, stealing her weapons and carrying them onto school grounds to commit his despicable crimes.

 Sadly, the President didn’t deal with the one proposal that would actually make a difference. That is, repealing the Gun-Free School Zones Ban which prevents armed teachers or principals from protecting the children — just like Assistant Principal Joel Myrick did at his Mississippi high school.

Gun Owners of America met with Texas Rep. Steve Stockman in early January to congratulate him on introducing H.R. 35, the Safe Schools Act of 2013. This bill would repeal the federal Gun-Free School Zones act and allow teachers and principals, who are qualified by their state to carry concealed, to also do so at public and private schools.

Guns for me, but not for thee

The Stockman bill is truly the greatest step that Congress could take toward securing our schools. But it is clear that many of our politicians in Washington are so blinded by their anti-gun ideology, that they care more about protecting themselves than they do our children.

In the roughly 15 square block area of Capitol Hill, there are 1,800 Capitol Hill police officers to protect our Congressmen. How many armed adults are protecting our kids on any given day at school?
offline for hours at a time — sometimes for days. And when it has failed on weekends, it results in the virtual blackout of gun sales (and gun shows) across the country.

According to gun laws expert Alan Korwin, “With the NICS computer out of commission, the only place you could legally buy a firearm — in the whole country — was from a private individual, since all dealers were locked out of business by the FBI's computer problem.”

Of course, now the President wants to eliminate that last bastion of freedom!

Recently, the FBI’s system went down on Black Friday, angering many gun dealers and gun buyers around the country. “It means we can’t sell no damn guns,” said Rick Lozier, a manager at Van Raymond Outfitters in Maine. “If we can’t call it in, we can’t sell a gun. It’s cost us some money.”

Researcher John Lott says that in addition to crashes in the computers doing the background checks, “8 percent of background checks are not accomplished within two hours, with almost all of these delays taking three days or longer.”

Such delays could be deadly for any person, especially women, who need a gun in an emergency to defend themselves from an ex-boyfriend or husband.

Prelude to gun confiscation

Even still, the most serious involves the threat of gun confiscation — as every background check identifies the purchaser as a gun owner and creates the framework for a registration system.

Since the Sandy Hook shooting, spokesmen for Gun Owners of America have defended our rights in hundreds of media outlets. In one debate, the anti-gun spokesperson actually said, “I don’t know what you’re talking about in regard to registration” and insisted that nobody was trying to take away our guns.

Really? Do gun grabbers actually think the American gun owners don’t realize the gun confiscation agenda that is afoot? Consider just some of our recent history:

- “Confiscation could be an option,” declared New York Governor Andrew Cuomo in a radio interview (December 27, 2012).
- “We cannot have big guns out here,” said Iowa Rep. Dan Muhlbauer. “Even if you have them, I think we need to start taking them.” (Interview with the Iowa Daily Times Herald, December 19, 2012.)
- “No one is allowed to be armed. We’re going to take all the guns,” said P. Edwin Compass III, the superintendent of the New Orleans police, right before several law-enforcement agencies began confiscating the firearms of lawful gun owners in the wake of Hurricane Katrina (2005).

The task of confiscating guns is much easier when the government has a registration list. And that is the number one reason gun owners should oppose background checks, because they give federal bureaucrats the framework for a national registration system.

In the mid-1960's, officials in New York City began registering long guns. They promised they would never use such lists to take away firearms from honest citizens. But in 1991, the Mayor David Dinkins administration banned (and soon began confiscating) many of those very guns.

In 1992, the New York City Daily News reported that, “Police raided the home of a Staten Island man who refused to comply with the city’s tough ban on assault weapons, and seized an arsenal of firearms. . . . Spot checks are planned [for other homes].”

If Obama gets his way, we will be much further down road to giving the Andrew Cuomos and David Dinkins of the world the registration lists they need.

But we still won’t be able to stop creeps like Adam Lanza from circumventing those background checks and getting guns to attack children.

What they’re saying about GOA

Rave reviews after GOA shootout on MSNBC

Erich Pratt went toe-to-toe with Andrea Mitchell of MSNBC in an intense debate over the President’s gun control proposals on January 16. Comments on the GOA Facebook page, in the aftermath of the debate, ranged from “Erich Pratt owned her” to “She got schooled” to “I’m so pleased I rejoined GOA.”

“The reason the NRA is moving to the right is to counter “more extreme groups like Gun Owners of America.”

– Joy Reid, MSNBC (January 25, 2013)
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“Larry Pratt of Gun Owners of America (GOA) deserves credit for going on the CNN Piers Morgan program ... and calmly and rationally taking the arrogant British host completely apart [and] debunking every tired liberal claim about ‘gun control.’ ”

– Cliff Kincaid, “Obama’s Media Parrot Demolished on CNN” (December 20, 2012)
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“It’s people like [Erich] Pratt who could derail even modest efforts to bring a modicum of sanity to the nation’s gun laws.”

– The Washington Post’s Jonathan Capehart, reacting to Pratt’s unwillingness to compromise or concede any ground while debating MSNBC’s Andrea Mitchell (January 16, 2013)
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Erich Pratt met with Rep. Paul Broun (center), who is the Chairman of the Second Amendment Task Force in the House, and gun show promoter Ron Dickson (right). At the request of the Task Force, Dickson and researcher John Lott (who is not pictured) spoke to several dozen Capitol Hill staffers and Congressmen on the dangers of implementing a universal background check system.

GOA met with newly-elected, “A” rated Congressman Tom Cotton (R-AR) in January. GOA’s Political Victory Fund strongly supported Cotton in the recent elections.

Larry Pratt spent time with Rep. Steve Stockman (R-TX) in January, right before he introduced his bill to repeal the Gun Free School Zones ban (H.R. 35).

Erich Pratt met with Rep. Paul Broun (center), who is the Chairman of the Second Amendment Task Force in the House, and gun show promoter Ron Dickson (right). At the request of the Task Force, Dickson and researcher John Lott (who is not pictured) spoke to several dozen Capitol Hill staffers and Congressmen on the dangers of implementing a universal background check system.
Erich Pratt debated the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence before a Fox audience in mid-January. Despite his opponent’s claim that “no one is trying to take your guns,” Pratt was able to give several examples of gun confiscation that have either been discussed or have actually occurred in our country. (See story on page 1.)

GOA’s Larry Pratt (right) debated a former ATF agent on MSNBC and dropped Chris Matthews’ jaw by stating that the primary purpose for the Second Amendment was to keep the government in check.

Judge Jeanine Pirro invited both Larry Pratt (right) and Otis McDonald (the chief plaintiff in the McDonald v. Chicago case) to discuss how New York has abused their background check information — allowing a newspaper in the state to print the names and addresses of gun owners possessing pistol permits in two counties.

In January, GOA’s Erich Pratt (upper right) debated the former head of the Brady Campaign on the Lou Dobbs show. Pratt smacked down his opponent on his facts and overblown rhetoric — and blasted elitists like Sen. Feinstein who have carried concealed firearms in the past, but are now trying to restrict the guns that average Americans use for self-defense.
Some in Congress want to ban millions of semi-autos and limit the size of gun magazines. But they can only do so by threatening all of our God-given rights and by putting people in greater danger.

After all, if we are going to infringe upon the Second Amendment — in order to save just one life — then why not limit the First Amendment, too? Do we really need the “high capacity” news coverage that barrages our homes 24 hours a day and only encourages disaffected youth to act out what they see on TV?

One could make a cogent argument that limiting such broadcasts would end copycat killings and save lives. However, is this really the road we want to travel, where our God-given rights are no longer considered inalienable?

In regard to Second Amendment rights, those who are unfamiliar with guns simply don’t understand how self-defense works. Real life is not like the latest action movie where the bad guys shoot their guns endlessly (and miss), but the good guys fire off one or two rounds and hit their targets.

When Matthew Murray entered the New Life Church in Colorado Springs, intent on killing hundreds of people, it was Jeanne Assam (one of the worshipers there) who fired off 10 rounds before Maury was critically injured enough to halt the attack and end his own life.

Good thing there was only one attacker. If Assam had used a reduced-capacity magazine or there were multiple attackers, she would have been out of luck. As would have those New Orleans residents who, in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, discharged more than two dozen rounds during one firefight, where they fended off a roving gang in the Algiers neighborhood.

Self-defense expert Massad Ayoob talks about an Arkansas drunk who opened fire on an officer, who then responded by firing 29 shots. It was only the last bullet which finally killed the drunk and stopped him from shooting. Same with an Illinois criminal who was shot 33 times by the police before the druggie finally dropped and was unable to shoot any longer.

In the real world we live in, there are violent gangs who get high on drugs and are resistant to pain when they attack. Banning the tens of millions of “high capacity” magazines that are already in circulation won’t keep them out of dangerous hands. But infringing the Second Amendment will threaten our safety and our other liberties, as well.

This article originally ran in the January 8 online edition of U.S. News & World Report.
Expanding Background Checks Threatens Gun Owners

by Mike Hammond

Recent articles in the liberal media have suggested that setting up a framework for gun registration and confiscation — the so-called “universal background check” — is somehow less insidious than other gun control proposals currently on the table.

Anyone who believes this is delusional. Here are several reasons why the “universal background check” is the most insidious gun control of all.

Violation of Rights. The principle that no American can own a firearm without getting the go-ahead from the government is offensive to Americans. We don’t require breathalyzer checks before people get into their cars even though drunk drivers kill more than 30 times more people than “assault rifles” do. Nor do we require background checks on clubs and hammers, which also kill more often than “assault rifles.”

Ineffective. One of the nation’s leading anti-gun medical publications, the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), found that the Brady law has failed to reduce murder rates. In August 2000, JAMA reported that states implementing waiting periods and background checks did “not [experience] reductions in homicide rates or overall suicide rates.”2 And to be sure, universal background checks would not have stopped Adam Lanza (who stole his guns), or James Holmes or Jared Loughner (who passed background checks).

Overreaching. The NICS list currently contains the names of more than 150,000 law-abiding veterans who didn’t do anything wrong (but honorably served their country and then sought counseling for their wartime experiences) — and could soon contain tens of millions of names of Medicaid patients with post partem depression, IDEA students with ADHD, and soldiers, police, and firemen with PTSD.

Illegally retaining information. Increasingly, the ATF is illegally going into gun dealers’ stores and copying all of the 4473’s — a practice which represents the beginnings of a national gun registry.3 If such illegal activity is unashamedly occurring out in the open, one wonders what is happening behind closed doors with the NICS background checks on gun buyers.

Framework for confiscation. Anyone who doesn’t believe a national gun registry leads to national gun confiscation should consider the confidential memorandum advocating confiscation and circulated by New York Democrats prior to their most recent round of New York gun control.4

Inefficient. In a significant number of current transactions, purchases are held up for no reason other than the fact that the seller’s name is similar to someone else’s name. Often, these bott-ups permanently block gun purchases when (1) the FBI’s response remains non-committal after three days, (2) the gun dealer refuses to sell based on a non-committal response, despite the language of the Brady Law, and (3) the FBI’s response is “sue us.”

Hypocritical. Remember Fast & Furious? The Obama Administration knowingly approved (via background checks) the sales of thousands of guns to the Mexican Cartel in order to justify calls for greater gun control here at home. As a result, several hundred Mexicans have been killed — not to mention at least one U.S. federal agent. Considering the administration’s malfeasance on guns, can we really trust the administration to protect the privacy of gun owners?

This article is excerpted from a longer piece entitled: “Thirteen Reasons Why Congress Should Oppose Universal Background Checks” at www.gunowners.org. Erich Pratt also contributed to this article.

1 For drunk driving-related fatalities, see Table 3 Statistics, US Department of Transportation National Highway Safety Administration Traffic Safety Facts Report 12/2012: http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811701.pdf. For FBI statistics regarding rifle deaths (of which “assault rifles” would be a subset) and “clubs, hammers, etc.” see FBI Crime Report 2011, Expanded Homicide Data Table 11: http://tinyurl.com/cufdy6m.


4 See http://tinyurl.com/hg74i1y — and see Gov. Andrew Cuomo’s statement that “confiscation could be an option” at http://tinyurl.com/bglsp4t.
Eliminate ’gun-free zone’ regulations
The ban on semiautomatic rifles didn’t work then and won’t work now

by Larry Pratt
USA Today
December 17, 2012

A gunman whose name we do not need to memorialize took advantage of our gun-control laws to slaughter 20 children and six adults in a Newtown, Conn., elementary school.

In addition to the gunman, blood is on the hands of members of Congress and the Connecticut legislators who voted to ban guns from all schools in Connecticut (and most other states). They are the ones who made it illegal to defend oneself with a gun in a school when that is the only effective way of resisting a gunman.

What a lethal, false security are the “gun-free zone” laws. Virtually all mass murders in the past 20 years have occurred in gun-free zones. The two people murdered several days earlier in a shopping center in Oregon were also killed in a gun-free zone.

Hopefully, the Connecticut tragedy will be the tipping point after which a rising chorus of Americans will demand elimination of the gun-free zone laws that are in fact criminal-safe zones.

One measure of insanity is repeating the same failure time after time, hoping that the next time the failure will turn out to be a success. Gun-free zones are a lethal insanity.

Israel finally came to grips with this in the early 1970s and have decisively stopped these attacks after a busload of children was massacred by Muslim terrorists. When I was there in the late 1990s, if you saw a busload of students, you saw at least one young teacher with a machine gun protecting the groups of students.

The Israelis have decisively stopped these school-related attacks and proved they want to live. Do we?

During the decade of the Clinton ban on semiautomatic rifles (the so-called assault weapons) and high-capacity magazines, crime did not go down. Reinstating it would simply be another example of repeating the same failed policy and being surprised with the same failed result.

We must tell our elected officials that they are acting as the criminals’ friends as long as they continue to support legislation that protects only criminals, not decent people.

Oh, and we must also insist that these criminal-friendly elected officials not even try to blame gun owners and our “gun culture” for what a criminal did.

Had a few of us been available with guns at the Newtown school, most of the victims might still be alive.