Dear Subscriber,

The Democratic presidential candidates have thrust gun control forward as a dominant issue for the national election, something that Democratic nominees have previously avoided. The spate of shootings in the past year has given them courage. But not too much: when Senate Democrats gathered recently on the steps of the Capitol to announce a new push for tougher gun-control laws they were surrounded by about a dozen armed guards. Guns for them, not for you.

Democratic presidential front-runner Hillary Clinton proposed tighter gun-control measures during a campaign swing, including expanded background checks, and suggested that if elected she would use executive powers to achieve her goals. “I want to push hard to get more sensible restraints,” Clinton said on NBC’s “Today” show. “I want to work with Congress, but I will look at ways as president.”

But surprisingly, the Obama administration told the Washington Post that it has already taken a long, internal look at the same executive-action proposal Clinton has promised to undertake, and has doubts over whether it can be made to work in practical terms, according to current and former senior administration officials.

It’s noteworthy that Clinton is pledging to go farther in using executive action in this area than the Obama administration, based on practical constraints, has determined is advisable or feasible, at least thus far. It turns out that the idea may be significantly more complicated to put into effect than it may appear from the campaign trail.

But voters need a long memory. Hillary might not need to use executive power, particularly if she wins and has a Democrat-controlled House and Senate. Recall that while testifying before the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee on Sept. 30, 1993, Hillary Clinton was asked by Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.) if she supported the imposition of a new, 25 percent national sales tax on guns. Clinton emphatically endorsed the tax, stating: “I am all for that.” That was just her “personal opinion,” because she was First Lady, not a candidate running for president. A new tax battle could be in the offing if she succeeds to the presidency.

Back in reality, President Barack Obama had to deal with a shooting rampage that left 10 people dead at a Roseburg, Oregon community college, and, as usual, he placed the blame squarely with Congress for not passing laws that politicians know will have no effect on criminal violence, but will please the political left. Obama urged Americans to become "single issue voters" and cast ballots based on the gun control issue — even if it means voting against politicians who they normally support. He then singled out the National Rifle Association as particularly effective in using this tactic to influence lawmakers.

NBC News gave us a preview of how it will cover the campaign season in the way it covered Obama’s frustration, reporting, "The president has acknowledged that widespread change is difficult on the federal level because the political will just isn’t there." The political will of gun rights advocates to protect a basic civil liberty didn’t enter the minds of the almost entirely Democrat news room.

"I came away from the Roseburg families feeling just as strongly as I did the day it happened. ... This is a choice we make," Obama said. "This is not inevitable."

"It's not just mass shootings," the president said. "It is the daily shootings that take place in cities across America.”
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Then **OBAMA** said something striking: *It is easier to buy a gun than buy a book,* referring to the lack of bookstores in low-income areas. He could have said that in the crime culture *it is easier to steal a gun than to learn how to read* — lack of education and endless violence among gangs is not news.

The president's comments were made during a Hollywood fundraising blitz, before a crowd of about 200 people gathered at a DNC concert fundraiser with Jamie Foxx in Pacific Palisades. His comments echoed remarks he made earlier at a roundtable discussion hosted by director J.J. Abrams for 20 deep-pocketed donors. That event, which raised an estimated $750,000 for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, was the first of three on the Los Angeles Westside.

So, after collecting *more than a million dollars,* he’s back to his executive pen. Eight days after the shootings in Roseburg, Oregon, *with weapons acquired through a background check,** **OBAMA** weighed the option of an executive order to circumvent Congress and make background checks a requirement for certain private sellers.

The executive order would *set a threshold as to the number of guns one can sell each year and still be considered a private seller.* Selling any number of guns above that threshold would require that the seller to obtain a Federal Firearms License from the government and perform NICS background checks on every purchaser. **OBAMA**’s advisors are warning that enforcing such an order would have political fallout.

Meanwhile **HILLARY CLINTON** got caught with her true self showing during a small private fundraiser in New York last month and slammed the Supreme Court as “wrong on the Second Amendment” according to audio of her remarks obtained by the Washington Free Beacon.

This is the first time since launching her campaign that she indicated that she would *take on the Supreme Court over gun issues.*

Although **CLINTON** did not identify which Supreme Court case she disagreed with, she appeared to be criticizing the landmark 2008 ruling in *District of Columbia v. Heller,* which found the handgun ban in Washington, D.C., unconstitutional.

She also used some of her strongest language yet to *criticize the NRA, vowing to take on the gun rights lobbying group and make this a key component of her campaign.*

“I’m going to speak out, I’m going to do everything I can to rally people against this pernicious, corrupting influence of the NRA and we’re going to do whatever we can,” she said. **CLINTON** argued that the NRA has *iso intimidated elected members of Congress and other legislative bodies that these people are passing the most absurd laws.*

iThe idea that you can have an open carry permit with an AK-47 over your shoulder walking up and down the aisles of a supermarket is just despicable,* she said. The comments *earned applause at the closed-door fundraiser,* and demonstrate **CLINTON**’s efforts to appeal to progressive donors as she faces a growing challenge from the far-left candidate **BERNIE SANDERS,** who has been criticized by some liberal observers for his mild support of gun rights. Expect her to become more shrill.

**Rep. BRENDA LAWRENCE** (MI-14) has proposed the formation of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force to End Gun Violence. Representatives who have said they would join in the task force include, but are not limited to, Reps. **DONNA F. EDWARDS** (MD-04), **SHEILA JACKSON LEE** (TX-18), and **ROBIN KELLY** (D-02).

The task force is a response to “the ongoing epidemic of mass shootings and firearms-related deaths in America.” *The wide-ranging impact of gun violence is real and the consequences are far too great to ignore. It is critical that we ensure that Americans’ Second Amendment rights are protected by enforcing existing laws and focusing on responsible gun ownership measures,* she said **LAWRENCE.**
CALIFORNIA HIT WITH FOUR GOVERNMENT THREATS TO GUN OWNERS

Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom is running for Governor, so he filed a voter initiative to get anti-gun votes by forcing owners to turn in large-capacity magazines and pass background checks for ammunition sales. Also, San Francisco passed an ordinance requiring video of all firearm sales. In addition, Gov. Jerry Brown banned concealed carry on campuses, but gun control activists complained when he vetoed a bill that banned people convicted of certain gun-related crimes to own firearms on the basis that existing law already covered the issue.

BIPARTISAN GROUP OF DELAWARE LAWMAKERS START GUN CAUCUS

A bipartisan group of downstate lawmakers have established a caucus that looks to protect Second Amendment rights and boost wildlife conservation efforts. The new Delaware Legislative Sportsmen's Caucus reacts to failed Democrat attempts to impose stricter gun-control measures. This year, lawmakers scaled back a bill that would have required anyone with a protection-from-abuse order issued against them to turn over their firearms immediately. Most recently, Senate lawmakers stalled bills unfairly affecting the mentally ill.

MICHIGAN SENATE PANEL MAKES NEW RULES ON CARRYING IN SCHOOLS

A Michigan Senate panel approved gun bills that would allow concealed carry instead of open carry in schools, moving ahead despite concerns from education officials who fear the proposal will do little to shield students from possible violence. Senate Bills 442 and 561 would essentially swap existing rules, prohibiting open carry but allowing permit holders to seek an exemption to carry concealed weapons in schools, college dorms, sports stadiums and other regulated venues. "We're actually trying to do (schools) a favor," said sponsoring Sen. Mike Green, R-Mayville.

FLORIDA BILL TO ALLOW OPEN-CARRY TO STOP ABUSE OF CW LICENSE HOLDERS

Anytime you carry concealed in Florida, you are in danger of being charged with a crime and prosecuted if your gun is accidentally seen by another person. HB-163 is a bill to solve that problem by allowing persons with a Concealed Weapons & Firearms License to carry firearms concealed or openly. It will prevent CW license holders from being charged with the crime of violating the "Open Carry" law because a concealed firearm, being legally carried, accidentally or inadvertently becomes visible to the sight of another person.

CHRISTIE LOSES AS SENATE OVERRIDES GUN CONTROL VETO

Democrats in the New Jersey Senate shot down Gov. Chris Christie’s veto of a controversial gun-control bill Thursday, setting the stage for rare and embarrassing policy defeat for the Republican presidential hopeful. The bill will become law — over Christie’s objections — if the Assembly also votes to override. Christie, who has disavowed his previous support for gun-control while courting more conservative presidential primary voters, vetoed Bill S-2360 even though the measure passed originally with the unanimous support of lawmakers, Democrats and Republicans alike.

OREGON COUNTY BALLOT MEASURE SEEKS TO NULLIFY GUN CHECKS

Voters in rural Coos County, Oregon will vote on a ballot measure that seeks to prohibit enforcement of new anti-gun laws. The decision to hold the election follows the state Legislature's vote to require background checks for private, person-to-person gun sales. The move angered gun-rights advocates and prompted a backlash in much of rural Oregon. "What we're trying to do is stop the erosion of our Second Amendment liberties," said Rob Taylor, chief petitioner behind the ballot measure. "The liberty to protect ourselves against harm and the liberty to hunt and own a gun."

PENNSYLVANIA LAWMAKERS TRY FOR TOTAL GUN LICENSING

Senate Bill 1029, sponsored by Sen. Haywood (D-4), would require Pennsylvania residents to obtain a license for possession, use, manufacture, control, sale or transfer of firearms. In order to qualify for a license, an individual would need to be 18 or older and a resident of the Commonwealth. A resident would also need to complete a firearms safety course and pay unreasonable firearm eligibility licensing fees. This legislation would have no impact on criminal activity and would severely infringe on Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners. Clearly, there is no dearth of existing firearm laws in Pennsylvania.
COUNTY SHERIFFS SUE LOS ANGELES OVER BAN OF iLARGE-CAPACITYî MAGAZINES

The City of Los Angeles has adopted an ordinance prohibiting possession of standard capacity magazines capable of holding more than ten rounds. Under the conditions of the ordinance, Los Angeles residents must get rid of their banned magazines by November 19, 2015 or face misdemeanor charges. Thirty California Sheriffs, two law enforcement organizations, the California Rifle and Pistol Association (CRPA), and several other individuals have filed a lawsuit seeking to invalidate the ordinance. The lawsuit challenges the magazine possession ban on legal “preemption” grounds, because California state law specifically allows for the possession of such magazines.

PLAINTIFFS MOVE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN CHALLENGE TO SEATTLE GUN TAX

Plaintiffs challenging a so-called “gun violence tax” recently passed by the Seattle City Council have filed a motion for summary judgment in their lawsuit, citing Washington State’s preemption statute which “fully occupies and preempts the entire field of firearms regulation within the boundaries of the state.” Plaintiff Second Amendment Foundation’s Executive Vice President Alan Gottlieb said “This so-called ‘gun violence tax’ clearly seeks to limit access to firearms and ammunition by imposing what amounts to a regulatory fee on the sale of all firearms and ammunition within City limits. The city can’t do that, and we’re confident the court will tell them so.”

NEW YORK JUDGE’S ROLE IN D.C. GUN CASE CHALLENGED

Frederick Scullin Jr., a New York federal judge who declared the District of Columbia’s gun regulations unconstitutional in Wrenn v. District of Columbia, should never have been assigned to the case, lawyers for the city argue. Scullin, who sits in the federal district court in Syracuse, was assigned to Wrenn because he was specially approved to preside in an earlier D.C. gun case, Palmer v. District of Columbia. Palmer was one of 10 cases assigned to Scullin in the D.C. federal district court in July 2011. Lawyers for the challengers, led by Second Amendment litigator Alan Gura, defended Scullin’s assignment. Gura said that the order authorizing Scullin to hear Palmer carried over to Wrenn.

APPEALS COURT UPHOLDS PARTS OF NEW YORK, CONNECTICUT GUN-CONTROL LAWS

The 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New York upheld parts of laws passed in New York and Connecticut after the 2012 Sandy Hook shootings, laws that banned the possession of semiautomatic weapons and large-capacity magazines. The court struck down a provision regulating load limits and a Connecticut prohibition on the non-semiautomatic Remington 7615. The court, however, upheld the core provisions of the two laws that banned semiautomatic weapons and large-capacity magazines. The decision comes as gun control becomes a hot political topic after the October shooting at Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Ore., in which 10 people were killed.

DAVE KOPEL: 2ND CIRCUIT DEFIED SCOTUS TO UPHOLD “ASSAULT WEAPONS” BANS

Independence Institute’s Dave Kopel says that the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals defied the Supreme Court of the United States in handing down a verdict upholding “assault weapons” bans in New York State Rifle & Pistol Assoc. v. Cuomo, and in Connecticut Citizens’ Defense League v. Malloy. Kopel said the ruling is fashioned to defy the SCOTUS ruling in McDonald v Chicago (2010) and District of Columbia v. Heller (2008). Heller called handguns “the most popular weapon for self-defense in the home” and invalidating any “complete prohibition of their use”. The 2nd Circuit cited “assault weapons” as “easier to use for ‘deadly’ purposes,” which means they “are exactly the guns that may be banned.” Kopel opined: “By the 2nd Circuit’s reasoning, inferior guns enjoy greater constitutional protection.”

SUPREME COURT URGED TO REVIEW ASSAULT RIFLE BAN

Gun rights advocates are urging the Supreme Court to strike down an ordinance prohibiting semiautomatic "assault weapons" that can carry more than 10 rounds in Chicago suburb Highland Park. Despite early October predictions that the justices would soon decide whether to hear the appeal in Friedman vs. City of Highland Park, the high court had not decided nearly a month later. But if the justices vote to take up the case, it would put in doubt the constitutionality of laws in other places, including California, that prohibit semiautomatic weapons.
**MILWAUKEE SHOOTING VICTIM’S DAUGHTER SUES WEBSITE**

The daughter of a Milwaukee-area woman killed in a multiple shooting at her workplace is suing the operators of an online marketplace for gun buyers and sellers that the gunman used to buy his firearm, court documents showed. Radcliffe Haughton, 45, shot and killed his estranged wife Zina Haughton, 42, along with two other women on Oct. 21, 2012, at Azana Salon and Spa in suburban Brookfield, where she worked. The lawsuit was filed in Milwaukee County Circuit Court on behalf of Zina's daughter Yasmeen Daniel against the website Armslist.com. Haughton used Armslist.com to make contact with Devin Linn, a private gun seller. Linn sold Haughton a .40-caliber handgun and high-capacity magazines for $500 the day before the shooting, the complaint said. Federal law makes gun manufacturers and suppliers largely immune to lawsuits with some exceptions. One of the exceptions is when a gun supplier is negligent in the sale of a firearm. The lawsuit claims Armslist.com operators and Linn were negligent for failing to run a background check on Haughton who was not allowed to have a firearm because of a restraining order granted to Zina days before the shooting.

**JUDGE DISMISSES MURDER CHARGE WITHOUT DEFENSE EVIDENCE IN TRIAL**

Jefferson Circuit Court Judge Judith McDonald-Burkman dismissed a murder charge against Adam Lee Kuhn in the middle of the trial, without the defense even having to present its case. The judge issued a “directed verdict” when prosecutors finished their case, ruling that Kuhn was acting in self-defense when he shot Frank “Buzz” McCaslin near Churchill Downs last year. Defense attorney David Lambertus asked that the case be dismissed after the prosecution finished putting on evidence in the trial, which is normal. Lambertus argued that "it is beyond dispute" that Kuhn had been stabbed in the back in his home by McCaslin, which led to the shooting.

**MISSOURI SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE WHETHER AMENDMENT LETS FELONS OWN GUNS**

More than a year after voters overwhelmingly approved a constitutional amendment to strengthen gun rights in Missouri, it's still unclear what that measure, known as Amendment 5, actually does. Supporters say that Amendment 5's language makes its goals perfectly clear: to ensure "the right to keep and bear arms is a unalienable right," and to obligate the state to defend that right. But since its passage in August 2014, the amendment has sparked disagreement. Some have argued that the amendment's protections extend even to felons, making the state's broad felon-in-possession law unconstitutional. The Missouri Supreme Court is set to hear three Amendment 5 cases dealing with that very issue. Each case involves a convicted felon who cited Amendment 5 during trial or appeal.

**AMISH MAN SUES TO BUY FIREARM WITHOUT PHOTO ID IN RELIGIOUS FREEDOM LAWSUIT**

In a suit that brings together the Second Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), Andrew Hertzler, an Amish man, filed a federal lawsuit in Pennsylvania because he wants to buy a gun without the required photo ID because being photographed violates his religious beliefs. “The Amish faith prohibits an individual from having his/her photograph taken,” the suit read. He tried to buy a gun from a Pennsylvania dealer “using a non-photo, state-issued identification.” This wasn’t enough, Hertzler needed a picture ID. Now he must either forego his constitutional right to keep and bear arms, or violate his religion,” the suit read. Whether Hertzler can prevail in his case will depend on whether a judge finds that his right to his religion outweighs the government’s requiring photo identification for gun permits.

**THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS ONE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE FROM REPEAL**

It is certain that the next Democratic nominee for the Supreme Court will adopt the view that the Second Amendment doesn’t encompass an individual right to own a weapon, even for self-defense. If that nominee replaces, for example, Justice Kennedy or Justice Scalia, then the five-justice majority in District of Columbia v. Heller will be gone. If that majority goes, then the next gun-rights case will transform the Second Amendment into nothing more than a historical artifact. If Heller is overruled, then the regulatory state, in all its immense power, can launch a systematic, undemocratic effort to deter gun ownership even without true confiscation.
POLLS AND STATISTICS

55% WANT STRICTER GUN LAWS, 56% THINK CONCEALED FIREARMS MAKES THE COUNTRY SAFER

Gallup has released a new series of polls on the Second Amendment and found some interesting things, according to the political blog Hot Air. First, a candidate’s stance on gun rights is an important issue to almost one-in-four voters. Yet, 55 percent are in favor of stricter gun laws, which are primarily being driven by more Democrats and Independents leaning towards curtailing Second Amendment rights. At the same time, the polling company noted that this issue fluctuates between support for more and less gun control:

In 2007, the year of the Virginia Tech massacre, the percentage of Americans who favored stricter laws on gun sales dropped to a bare majority (51%) for the first time in several years. Since then, support for stricter laws had stayed under 50%, except in the wake of the Sandy Hook school shootings in Newtown, Connecticut, in December 2012. At that point, 58% of Americans said they were in favor of stricter laws on gun sales. Although support for stricter laws receded after those shootings, in which a young man fatally shot 20 children and six adults, it has yet to return to the 44% level it was at before that tragedy.

Lastly, 56 percent of Americans feel that more concealed firearms would make the country safer, though only after an applicant has passing a background check and taken a training course. This is standard protocol for most who are applying for a concealed firearm permit. Also, support for a ban on handguns fell to a near record low of 27 percent.

AMERICANS BLAME MASS SHOOTINGS ON MENTAL HEALTH, NOT GUN CONTROL

The majority of Americans blame mass shootings on mental health issues rather than gun control laws, a new Washington Post/ ABC News poll showed. While the majority thinks gun violence is a serious problem, nearly 50 percent would prioritize protecting the right to own a firearm.

As the gun control debate intensified with renewed energy in the aftermath of the Roseburg, Oregon shootings, a new survey by Washington Post/ ABC News has revealed that 63 percent of Americans think that mass shootings depend directly on “mental health problems,” while only 23 percent believe gun control laws are at the core of the problem.

According to the Washington Post, there are sharp partisan divisions on the question. Eighty-two percent of Republicans see a problem in failing to identify and treat people who show mental health issues, compared to 65 percent of independents and 46 percent of Democrats.

Overall, Americans agree that gun violence is a severe problem for the country with 82 percent combined considering it “very” or “somewhat” serious. Only 17 percent thought of gun violence as “not so” or “less” serious an issue, while 1 percent had no opinion whatsoever.

The Post-ABC poll was conducted between October 15 and 18, when 1,001 adults were interviewed on both land-lines and cell phones.

THE REASONS FOR THE DECLINE IN SUPPORT FOR GUN CONTROL

NBC News reports that “The gun debate in the United States has changed a lot over the last 20 years.” Support for gun control has declined sharply as support for gun rights has risen. Those trends are evident in data from a range of sources including Gallup and the Pew Research Center.

A complicated mix of emotions, attitudes and perceptions go into how people feel about guns, but when you look at the data, two points help explain the drop in support for gun control. Over the same period of time the violent crime rate has also dropped sharply. And the partisan divides that have come to define U.S. politics have pushed into the gun control debate.

The political factor in the gun debate would be hard to change. As the nation has become more politically polarized and voters have retreated into their red and blue camps, the partisan differences on gun control have become much more pronounced. Overall, support for gun control has indeed dropped, but Democrats and Republicans have moved in different directions.
Austria: Hordes of Islamic migrants flooding into Austria brought violence and already portend a change in culture. Many Austrians are seeking firearms with which to defend their lives and the lives of their families—and women are predominant in this push for guns for self-defense. Nearly all shotguns are sold out because there is no permit required to purchase them. For all other firearms, however, a difficult-to-get license is required. Perhaps Austrians did not think about it until a time like this, but every control in the gun control spectrum puts a bit more distance between the life endangered tonight and the gun that could defend that life.

Brazil: Brazil, which has one of the highest murder tolls on the planet, could soon end most restrictions on gun ownership, risking what one critic called a "Wild West" scenario. A draft law stripping away current limits has already been approved in committee and is due to go to the lower house of Congress in November. Under the law, anyone over 21, including people accused of crimes or convicted of less than serious crimes, would be allowed to purchase up to nine firearms a year and 50 rounds of ammunition a month. State employees and public figures, ranging from government inspectors to politicians, would be authorized to carry arms, as would private citizens often in the public eye such as taxi drivers. At present, weapons can only be bought legally by people obtaining a license on a case-by-case basis.

Bellevue, Washington: Senate Democrats are blocking legislation to crack down on sanctuary cities and planning to release thousands of prison inmates early, noted Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms Chairman Alan Gottlieb. He says an Italian mayor faced with rising crime may have the right plan. “Mayor Gianluca Buonanno of Borgosesia in Piedmont in northern Italy has offered 250 Euros apiece to citizens to help them pay for a gun. The mayor has made that offer after accusing the Italian government of failing to protect honest citizens with laws that seem soft on bad guys.” Mayor Buonanno’s offer is “to allow people to defend themselves from delinquents, who the government is privileging.” Here in America, Gottlieb observed, Senate Democrats working to protect their far left urban political allies have essentially given the same “privilege” to often dangerous illegal aliens for whom sanctuary cities serve as magnets. “When government becomes part of the problem rather than part of the solution,” Gottlieb said, “the citizens must act. Mayor Buonanno’s offer to help his constituents buy defensive firearms is an example that his American contemporaries could follow.”

New York City: Linda Stasi, a columnist for the New York Daily News, has a unique proposal to share with her readers. She thinks the NRA should be listed on the State Department terrorist list because they are responsible for thousands of gun deaths over the last few years. She wants the National Rifle Association on the terrorist list “for their unending lobbying that’s kept a lid on gun control so we now have 428 times more American deaths by gun than deaths by foreign terrorists.” Maybe she should be on the list for killing all the people who can’t have a gun for self defense because of her writing. It makes as much sense.

Indianapolis, Indiana: An Indianapolis restaurant owner is offering a 25 percent discount to people licensed to carry handguns after his business was robbed. Art Bouvier announced the discount on Facebook Saturday night, shortly after the robbery at his Cajun restaurant Papa Roux. "I don't want Papa Roux to turn into the O.K. Corral, but I don't want to be an easy target," Bouvier told The Indianapolis Star. It's unclear how much money was taken. No one was injured. Bouvier said his employees handled the situation like pros and that none of his customers even knew the restaurant was being robbed until the robber had left. Legal gun owners with licenses to carry handguns will be offered the discount until further notice, he said. Indianapolis police said about a half a dozen city restaurants and bars have been robbed in the past month.
WHOSE LIVES MATTER?

Steven Hildreth, Jr. is a Tucson, Arizona author, veteran, occasional essayist, and firearms enthusiast. He wrote up an encounter everyone should read. Here it is:

So, I’m driving to my office to turn in my weekly paperwork. A headlight is out. I see a Tucson Police Department squad vehicle turn around and follow me. I’m already preparing for the stop. The lights go on and I pull over. The officer asks me how I’m doing, and then asks if I have any weapons.

“Yes, sir. I’m a concealed carry permit holder and my weapon is located on my right hip. My wallet is in my back-right pocket.”

The officer explains for his safety and mine, he needs to disarm me for the stop. I understand, and I unlock the vehicle. I explain that I’m running a 7TS ALS holster but from the angle, the second officer can’t unholster it. Lead officer asks me to step out, and I do so slowly. Officer relieves me of my Glock and compliments the X300U I’m running on it. He also sees my military ID and I tell him I’m with the National Guard.

Lead officer points out my registration card is out of date but he knows my registration is up to date. He goes back to run my license. I know he’s got me on at least two infractions. I’m thinking of how to pay them.

Officers return with my Glock in an evidence bag, locked and cleared. “Because you were cool with us and didn’t give us grief, I’m just going to leave it at a verbal warning. Get that headlight fixed as soon as possible.”

I smile. “Thank you, sir.”

I’m a black man wearing a hoodie and strapped. According to certain social movements, I shouldn’t be alive right now because the police are allegedly out to kill minorities.

Maybe... just maybe... that notion is bunk.

Maybe if you treat police officers with respect, they will do the same to you.

Police officers are people, too. By far and large, most are good people and they’re not out to get you.

I’d like to thank those two officers and Tucson Police Department in general for another professional contact.

We talk so much about the bad apples who shouldn’t be wearing a badge. I’d like to spread the word about an example of men who earned their badges and exemplify what that badge stands for.

#BlueLivesMatter #AllLivesMatter

Alan W. Gottlieb  Joseph N. Tartaro