

## The Failure & Capitalization of Gun Control

On Thursday, October 10, Fox 13 reported that two people were killed from a shooting in a mobile home park in Tampa Florida. According to the article, which is only credited to Fox 13 Staff, there is no clear motivation for the shooting and the suspects are still on the loose. It is unclear how this could have happened because Florida passed its Red-Flag law immediately after the Parkland Shooting. Since that time more than 2000 people have had their guns seized based on nothing more than hearsay and speculation about what a person might do, and in the meantime, murderers are still getting away with murder. While groups like Everytown for Gun Safety claim Red-Flag laws to be an astounding success, the truth is that they do nothing but focus police efforts on people who probably have no intention of committing a crime while the criminals are still roaming free, as is the case with all gun control laws.

Red-Flag laws are on the books in fifteen states across the country. They violate nearly all aspects of the bill of rights by denying an individual due process before their property is taken on mere suspicion. In most cases, it is up to family members or law enforcement to file for an "extreme risk protection order" against someone they feel may be a danger to themselves or others. After an individual's guns have been confiscated, they must file a petition with the court to set a date for a hearing. In other words, gun owners are now guilty until they can prove their innocence.

How did we reach such a point in America where a fundamental principle like the presumption of innocence is so callously thrown away?

In 2013, Elementary School student Josh Welch was being suspended from school because his anti-gun, liberal teacher accused him of biting a pop-tart into the shape of a gun. Young Josh claimed he was trying to make a mountain but that didn't matter to the teacher. The school insisted their actions were necessary to keep the other students safe, from a pop-tart gun. Since this time there has been a series of related incidents. The most recent was the suspension of a Colorado High School student for posting pictures of him and his mother shooting at a range. There was another incident in Kansas with a twelve-year-old who is now facing felony charges for pointing a "finger gun" at other students after her classmates asked her what five students she would kill if she could.

This is a gray area because, in my opinion, this does cause some concern but doesn't warrant felony charges.

According to Cam Edwards from Bearingarms.com, two other students from the same school district were caught bringing real guns to school but no charges were pressed against them because there was no evidence they were going to use them. That makes perfect sense. The truth is that there is a deliberate effort coming from the Department of Education to brainwash our students against guns.

The News Education publication, "Educator Guide, The Battle Over Gun Control" clearly shows how the education system presents a one-sided argument in an attempt to sway the opinions of students into accepting restrictions against their rights. Using critical theory, they present the pro-gun argument and the anti-gun argument but only provide the studies and statistics of the anti-gun side. They are encouraging students to criticize their own culture to affect social change. Eric Holder has described how to change the public perception of America's firearm culture. Guns in America were once viewed as a proud tradition of free and independent people. After years of effective conditioning and teaching techniques, such as active shooter drills and suspending students for displaying any support for gun rights, they are creating a culture of fear and uncertainty, where the presumption of innocence is also thrown to the wayside.

The truth is that you cannot stop murderers from murdering. You can, however, capitalize on the failures of gun control by pushing for further restrictions until the ultimate objective has been achieved.

California has had some of the strictest gun laws in the country and was one of the first to pass Red-Flag laws. Governor Newsom recently signed fifteen new gun control measures into law. They have upped the ante and now allow teachers, employers, and co-workers to file "red-flags" against anyone they deem to be a threat to themselves or others. He also said there is so much more they need to do. Therein lies the point. Governor Newsom knows these gun control measures will not stop murder. They will allow him, however, to take advantage of their failures and make the argument that because gun control doesn't work, the only answer is an all-out repeal of the Second Amendment. The more gun control fails, the more the people who feel the need to act will call for further restrictions.

Florida's Red-Flag laws are an abysmal failure because they are confiscating guns from people who have done nothing wrong while there are currently two murders on the loose. Red-Flag laws are not needed. It is already against the law to make threats of violence and a person can be charged with a crime and prosecuted for doing so. In many cases concerning Red-Flag laws, individuals who have been deemed to be dangerous are simply left alone after their guns have been confiscated. They are not arrested or charged with a crime. If they are a threat to themselves or others, does it not stand to reason that they may commit an act of violence with something that kills far more people than a rifle, like a knife?

Red-Flag Laws must be opposed on all levels and those that exist need to be repealed before all gun owners are deemed a threat to themselves or others simply for owning a gun.

**Guns In The News, October 14, 2019 Article posted with permission from David Risselada**

### **FBI Data Shows 5 Times More People Killed With Knives Than Rifles In 2018**

On September 30, the FBI issued a press release noting they have published their 2018 crime statistics. Most notable about the report is the fact that despite constant fear mongering by the mainstream media and the government that crime is running rampant, the number of violent crimes decreased 3.3 percent as compared to the previous year. Also contained in the report were the numbers and causes of deaths in murder cases. Although the FBI did not make the comparison themselves, when reading the data we can see the number of murders carried out with knives or cutting devices was five times higher than the number of murders carried out with rifles. This comparison is particularly important given the current gun climate in America.

Before we go on, it is important to mention that handguns were responsible for the majority of firearms deaths. It is also important to point out that all firearms deaths combined made up the majority of all murders in the United States. Of the 14,123 murders in 2018, 10,265 of them involved firearms—a 7 percent drop from the previous year. That being said, the number of rifle deaths is extremely important given that this is the weapon most often targeted by gun grabbers.

“Hell, yes, we’re going to take your AR-15, your AK-47,” Democratic presidential candidate Beta O’Rourke recently said to a crowd in Houston, Texas. “We’re not going to allow it to be used against our fellow Americans anymore.”

But as the statistics show, it really isn’t being used against *that many* Americans. In fact, far more Americans are dying by knives. According to the FBI data, **1,515** were stabbed, cut, or maimed to death by a knife or other cutting instrument. This is a number 5 times higher than those killed by rifles, which sits at just **297**. What’s more, twice as many people were beaten to death with hands, fists, and feet (672) than were killed by rifles. And, nearly **150** more people (443) were bludgeoned to death with hammers and other blunt objects than killed with rifles. The weapon most often targeted by gun grabbers appears to play a rather tiny role in the majority of murders carried out in the United States. This is in spite of Americans owning around 16 million AR style rifles.

Perhaps this is the reason the right has joined the left in pushing for red flag gun laws which “take the guns first” and “go through due process second,” as Donald Trump famously said last year after the Parkland shooting. But would grabbing guns from people deemed a risk by the state actually have any effect on mass violence? Not likely. Stronger background checks would have little to no effect on mass shootings as most of the mass shooters acquire their guns legally and pass the background checks. As Reason points out: “The elements of that legislation are mostly window dressing that would do little or nothing to prevent attacks like these. The most frequently mentioned policy, “universal background checks,” is plainly irrelevant to these particular crimes, since both the El Paso shooter and the Dayton shooter purchased their weapons legally, meaning they did not have disqualifying criminal or psychiatric records. Nor do the vast majority of mass shooters, who either passed background checks or could have. Neither requiring background checks for private

transfers nor creating “strong background checks,” as President Donald Trump has proposed (perhaps referring to the same policy), would make a difference in such cases.

But what about red flag laws that take guns from people deemed a risk?

Citizens who are targeted by these laws will be deemed guilty **first** and only after their guns are taken, will they have a chance to defend themselves in court. This is the de facto removal of due process. As Reuters reports, under the legislation, a family member or law enforcement officer could petition a judge to seize firearms from a person they think is a threat to themselves or others. The judge could then hold a hearing without the targeted person being present and grant a temporary order for 14 days. Under the fifth and fourteenth amendments, due process clauses are in place to act as a safeguard from arbitrary denial of life, liberty, or property by the government outside the sanction of law. In spite of what officials and the media claim, when a person is stripped of their constitutional rights, albeit temporarily, without being given the chance to make their own case based on what can be entirely arbitrary accusations, this is the removal of due process. And, it doesn't work.

We've seen this play out before already. Earlier this year, a tragedy unfolded in California as a deranged gunman, Kevin Douglas Limbaugh, walked up on an innocent woman, officer Natalie Corona, pulled out his guns and began shooting her repeatedly until she died. Limbaugh then fired several more shots at others before turning the gun on himself and taking his own life. Had more people been nearby, Limbaugh would've likely carried out a mass shooting. Limbaugh's case is important to bring up due to the fact that — before he killed a cop — he was subject to California's “red flag” laws in 2018. Limbaugh was given a high-risk assessment that ordered him to turn in his registered weapons to police, the only one being a Bushmaster AR-15. On November 9, Limbaugh turned in the weapon. Despite being banned from possessing a weapon, he still obtained one illegally and used it to commit murder. Perhaps this push for taking AR-15s from law abiding citizens is a strategic one. Despite being used in very few murders, the AR-15 is an extremely effective deterrent against tyranny.

“The most foolish mistake we could possibly make would be to allow the subjugated races to possess arms. History shows that all conquerors who have allowed their subjugated races to carry arms have prepared their own downfall by so doing. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that the supply of arms to the underdogs is a *sine qua non* for the overthrow of any sovereignty. So let's not have any native militia or native police.” — Adolf Hitler, *Hitler's Table Talk, 1941-1944: Secret Conversations*

**Guns In The News , October 7, 2019 , Article posted with permission from Matt Agorist**

### **Montana Supreme Court finds localities cannot go rogue and enact extreme gun control**

The National Rifle Association's Institute for Legislative Action (NRA-ILA) today applauded a decision by the Montana state Supreme Court protecting the rights of law-abiding gun owners in that state. In an NRA-backed case, the justices held, in a 5-0 decision, that the City of Missoula's attempt to impose extreme gun control measures was a clear violation of state law.

"This is a huge victory for Montana gun owners and everyone who cherishes freedom in Big Sky Country," said Jason Ouimet, executive director, NRA-ILA. "The unanimous ruling from Montana's Supreme Court confirms that politicians cannot usurp a constitutional framework by contemptuously enacting gun control at the local level."

Montana, like more than 40 other states, has a preemption law restricting local governments from passing gun control measures that are more restrictive than state law. Preemption laws protect law-abiding gun owners from dealing with a confusing patchwork of laws that can make it nearly impossible to carry a firearm for home and self-defense. The City of Missoula's gun control ordinance would have criminalized virtually all private firearms transfers in the city, even between relatives, friends, and co-workers. Earlier this month, in an NRA-backed case, a Washington court similarly ruled that the state preemption law prohibits local governments from regulating the storage of firearms.

The NRA has led the fight to enact state preemption laws across the country to ensure uniformity in state gun laws.

"These cases underscore the peoples' need for judges who will faithfully interpret the law in defense of their freedom," Ouimet concluded.

**NRA-ILA ([www.nra-ila.org](http://www.nra-ila.org)), October 24, 2019**