

**“The laws that forbid the carrying of arms are laws of such a nature. They disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes.... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.”**

*- Thomas Jefferson, Commonplace Book (quoting 18th century criminologist Cesare Beccaria), 1774-1776*

# SAY **NO** TO “RED FLAG” LAWS



Defend your right to keep and bear arms and your right to due process.

**A HOW-TO GUIDE FOR ACTIVISTS**

\*



TEA PARTY  
PATRIOTS  
ACTION

[www.teapartypatriotsaction.org](http://www.teapartypatriotsaction.org)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Issue Overview .....	<b>3</b>
“Red Flag” Laws: The Basics .....	<b>4</b>
Reading List .....	<b>8</b>
Sample Letter to Elected Officials .....	<b>16</b>
Sample Script to Call Elected Officials .....	<b>19</b>
Content for Social Media .....	<b>20</b>
How to Write a Letter to the Editor .....	<b>21</b>
Sample Letter to the Editor .....	<b>22</b>
Constitutional, Alternative Solutions.....	<b>23</b>
About Tea Party Patriots Action .....	<b>29</b>



The forces of tyranny always stand ready to exploit any tragedy or vulnerable moment in order to steal our rights and our liberties. One of the rights most targeted is our right to keep and bear arms. This right, enshrined in the 2nd Amendment of our Constitution, is a God-given, natural right of all human beings, and we oppose any attempts to chip away at this right.

Unfortunately, with the latest mass shootings, the call to “do something” has begun again, without any consideration of whether the “something” would actually help or whether the “something” respects our constitutional rights.

The “something” that is gaining traction right now, even among many Republican members of Congress, are what are commonly referred to as “red flag” laws (also known as Extreme Risk Protection Orders). However, “red flag” laws don’t just chip away at your 2nd Amendment rights. They also chip away at your due process rights as enumerated in the 5th and 14th Amendments.

Like so many of the prescriptions for the ills of society that are offered by the left, they sound plausible and sincere, but in reality, they are direct attacks on our most fundamental, basic human rights.

## What is a “red flag” law?

While some of the fineprint likely varies from bill to bill, and state to state, the basic structure of a “red flag” law is described by *U.S. & Texas LawShield Blog* as follows.

Red Flag bills allow police or family members to petition a state court to remove firearms from a person who presents a danger to themselves or others. At the initial hearing, the petition and evidence are presented supporting the claims the individual in question (the “Respondent”) is a threat. These hearings may be conducted “ex parte,” meaning the respondent is not present to defend himself or herself. If the order is granted, police will execute the order removing firearms with no notice to the Respondent.

If the initial hearing is ex parte, the court schedules another hearing to take place within a few weeks for the Respondent to attend and present evidence to refute the claims. If the Respondent is successful in their defense, the temporary order will be dismissed and the firearms returned. However, if the judge rules against the Respondent, the order will be extended by a period of up to one year.<sup>1</sup>

## Why are some Republican officials supporting “red flag” laws?

Also from *U.S. & Texas LawShield Blog* referenced above are likely reasons that Republicans are coming out in support of “red flag” laws. Keep in mind that the blog post where this is taken from was written in June 2019, almost two months before the recent spate of mass shootings. Those have spooked Republicans even more, and getting reelected is a powerful motivator to pass feel-good bills that aren’t good at all.

Powerful people in the Republican party have come out in support of Red Flag laws, making it easier for the rank and file members of the party to accept some versions of these laws, especially since Red Flag laws do not impose new regulations on firearms themselves, but address the issue of mental health.

Shortly after the Parkland shooting, President Donald Trump expressed support for Red Flag laws. The Trump Administration formed the Federal Commission on School Safety last year following Parkland, and it too, endorsed Red Flag laws.

More recently, during his confirmation hearing in front of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, now-U.S. Attorney General William Barr said that Red Flag laws are “the single most important thing we can do in the gun control area to stop these mass shootings from happening in the first place.”

## “RED FLAG” LAWS: THE BASICS (CONT.)

---

But perhaps more telling are the polls that show a vast majority of Americans support Red Flag laws. A recent poll by the University of Texas and the Texas Tribune indicate 72% of Texans favor such legislation. A poll conducted by Everytown for Gun Safety claims nearly 90% of Americans support passing Red Flag legislation, “including more than 80% of Republicans and gun-owning households.”

Add to these reasons the fact that too many Republicans are scared of their own shadows, let alone criticism from the media and Democrats (i.e. the same entity), and it’s not surprising that some Republicans are willing to trade OUR rights for some good press and a false sense of job security.

### How do “red flag” laws violate my rights?

Though the concept of “keeping guns out of the hands of severely mentally ill people” sounds like a good idea, whether or not the actual law is a good law depends on how a proposal is written, implemented, and enforced.

There are some good reading materials included in this guide to help answer this question. Those can be found starting on page 8. We include short excerpts below as a starting point.

First, from *The American Spectator* (emphasis added).

In fifteen states and the District of Columbia, new Red Flag laws allow judges to take licensed firearms away from individuals even if they have not committed or even threatened to commit a crime. A simple petition from a third party triggers a court proceeding that could eliminate a person’s Second Amendment rights and cause a cascade of consequences.

Florida is a good example of one of those states.

Some civil rights organizations have expressed concern about constitutional principles being violated by such laws, such as the right to due process and the presumption of innocence until proven guilty.

**Red Flag laws seem intended to bypass processes that already exist to have someone adjudicated as mentally ill or guilty of a crime. Initial Red Flag hearings, like other restraining order hearings, often do not allow the accused time to retain an attorney or present a full defense before having their rights abridged.<sup>2</sup>**

## “RED FLAG” LAWS: THE BASICS (CONT.)

And, from Dana Loesch at *The Federalist*.

There is nuance to be had here, for sure, but realize that it is an abrogation of due process to invert the order of “innocent until proven guilty” to “somewhat guilty until proven innocent.” The question isn’t whether these laws do this, the question is whether you feel comfortable giving up a cornerstone of our republic for a safety dependent upon enforcement by a government that has failed at this before.<sup>3</sup>

More:

I hope that those promoting red flag laws address these concerns and answer questions like: What do red flag orders offer that our current legal options (civil commitments, TROs, et. al) do not? Why a long 14-day waiting period (Rubio’s bill) to defend oneself in court? Where are confiscated firearms to be kept — and if the answer is with local law enforcement, how are local enforcement agencies empowered to both store confiscated firearms and assume liability for that storage?

For friends of mine who have proposed Gun Violence Restraining Orders (GVRO), how soon are respondents able to defend themselves against claims, particularly ex parte orders? And with either ERPOs or GVROs, will any considerations be given to women defending themselves against domestic abusers who might misuse the system to render their victims defenseless?

How will GVROs be lifted — and doesn’t that still require the respondent to prove his or her innocence? Is anyone concerned that both of these proposals still invert the presumption of innocence until proven guilty?<sup>4</sup>

**Furthermore, there don’t seem to be any consequences for filing false reports to deprive someone of their 2nd Amendment right, so what consequences would there be for left-wing politicians and activists to abuse this system against conservatives or anyone who doesn’t agree with them?**

This meme, while it may simplify “red flag” laws a little, sums up the potential for these laws to be abused for political gain. Some people won’t believe that could happen, but then again, who would have believed that the IRS would have been weaponized against law-abiding American citizens exercising their right to peacefully be involved in the political process?

### RED FLAG LAWS DEFINED:

The same people who flag your FB posts as offensive will now be calling a tip line to have your guns seized.

Understand our opposition now?



<sup>3</sup><https://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/statement-by-fbi-director-james-comey-regarding-dylann-roof-gun-purchase>

<sup>4</sup><https://thefederalist.com/2019/08/06/red-flag-laws-not-good-solution-mass-shootings>

## “RED FLAG” LAWS: THE BASICS (CONT.)

---

Lastly, a form of “red flagging” already exists within the VA system. According to Michelle Malkin, writing at *BizPac Review*, veterans can be put on this **secret** list for simply expressing frustration about the notoriously awful VA services or wait times!

But if you want to know how this American version of China’s social credit system would work in practice, let me remind you of how Veterans Affairs recklessly red-flags “disruptive” citizens without due process, transparency or accountability in the name of “safety.” Government bureaucrats routinely deprive our nation’s heroes of medical treatment based on arbitrary definitions of who and what constitutes a mental health menace.

I first reported on the VA’s secretive database on “disgruntled” and “disruptive” vets five years ago. Under the VA policy on “patient record flags,” federal bureaucrats can classify vets as “threats” based on assessments of their “difficult,” “annoying” and “non-compliant” behavior. The VA manual says the flags “are used to alert Veterans Health Administration medical staff and employees of patients whose behavior and characteristics may pose a threat either to their safety, the safety of other patients, or compromise the delivery of quality health care.”

What a crock. It’s precisely because so many vets receive inferior care from the feds that they have been forced to raise their voices. Have we all forgotten the 40 veterans who perished at the Phoenix, Arizona VA, which relegated patients to a bureaucratic black hole through secret waiting lists? Among examples of patients’ behavior referred to the red-flags in the VA’s “Disruptive Behavior Committees” (Orwell couldn’t have cooked up a better name): venting “frustration about VA services and/or wait times, threatening lawsuits or to have people fired, and frequent unwarranted visits to the emergency department or telephone calls to facility staff.”<sup>4</sup>

### Summary of the arguments against “red flag” laws

- 1 They are unconstitutional.**
- 2 They will not stop mass shootings.**
- 3 They will likely make things worse by keeping people who may need treatment from seeking treatment out of fear that they will be put on a “red flag” list.**

*Please read through the full articles reprinted in the following pages to gain a fuller understanding of why and how these laws violate your rights, and why they will not likely bring about a solution to mass shootings that we are all so desperate to find.*



# THE AMERICAN SPECTATOR

EDITED BY R. EMMETT TYRRELL, JR.

## Rights Abridged: The Flawed Model for Red Flag Laws

If state lawmakers spent a day watching the proceedings of those whose lives are forever changed by hasty injunctions, they would think twice about using the restraining order system as a model for Red Flag laws.

*by Kerri Toloczko*

In fifteen states and the District of Columbia, new Red Flag laws allow judges to take licensed firearms away from individuals even if they have not committed or even threatened to commit a crime. A simple petition from a third party triggers a court proceeding that could eliminate a person's Second Amendment rights and cause a cascade of consequences.

Florida is a good example of one of those states.

Some civil rights organizations have expressed concern about constitutional principles being violated by such laws, such as the right to due process and the presumption of innocence until proven guilty.

Red Flag laws seem intended to bypass processes that already exist to have someone adjudicated as mentally ill or guilty of a crime. Initial Red Flag hearings, like other restraining order hearings, often do not allow the accused time to retain an attorney or present a full defense before having their rights abridged.

Proponents often make the case that Red Flag laws are generally modelled after existing protection order or restraining order laws and are therefore a reliable method of protecting the public. This implies civil rights are not already being violated in protection order

proceedings, even though examples abound of rights trampled and the judicial system abused by individuals advancing a personal agenda.

It may be that state lawmakers don't realize their well-meaning laws, when implemented, are harming citizens by depriving them of constitutional rights and wreaking havoc with their lives. Legislators may not perceive that courts are currently abused by individuals using the justice system as personal leverage in disputes such as child custody, divorce, or a bad break up.

If lawmakers spent a day watching the proceedings of those whose lives are forever changed by hasty injunctions, they would see the abuse and think twice about using this system as a model.

A recent observation day in a Lee County, Florida courtroom showed clear problems with the system. Those who had petitions filed against them had little time to prepare. One man was informed of a hearing just one business day before, leaving no time to retain an attorney. Within minutes he lost his ability to have firearms, was blocked from entering his own home, and had to stay away from his children and estranged wife, who showed no evidence of a threat in the few minute "hearing."

A judge granted a restraining order against another man in a four-minute hearing in which his accuser provided no evidence of a threat or harm. The accused was left in a position of trying to prove he was innocent rather than the accuser proving he was guilty. This is not how the American justice system is supposed to work.

A Southwest Florida attorney, who wishes to remain unnamed, explained that judges grant orders with little or no evidence because they are afraid if they don't and a crime occurs later, they will lose their jobs or face public ridicule. One can see how judges in Red Flag hearings could succumb to the same self-preservation methods.

If an order of protection is granted, from that point forward, the accuser can call 911 and claim the accused drove by their house or place of work in violation of the order. The accused is forced to prove that they did not drive that route, something nearly impossible to do.

A restraining order given under false pretenses can lead to the accused losing their home, children, reputation, job, Second Amendment rights and ability to move freely within their community. Procedures with negative consequences this significant should require a more thorough process to safeguard constitutionally protected rights.

It appears Red Flag laws are indeed a red flag. They point to inadequacies and injustices already occurring in our court system.

In order to protect civil liberties, lawmakers should work on fixing the restraining order practices in their states before they use a

broken system as a model for a new wave of orders.

They could start with criminal penalties for anyone who lies while filing a petition for a restraining order. If there were criminal perjury penalties with consistently implemented punishment it would be a deterrent to abuse of the system. In a recent case in Lee County, when it was clearly found in court that a claim was false, there was no repercussion for the accuser.

But reform of the system must go much further. Due process and the presumption of innocence are the bedrock of the American justice system — or at least they used to be. It will take a concerted effort by courageous lawmakers, prosecutors, and judges to fix it.

We all should be waiting to see who will lead the way.

*Kerri Toloczko is a Senior Fellow with the American Civil Rights Union, a non-partisan, non-profit public policy organization dedicated to protecting the constitutionally-protected civil rights of all Americans.*

ORIGINAL ARTICLE:

<https://spectator.org/rights-abridged-the-flawed-model-for-red-flag-laws>

*the*  
**FEDERALIST**

**Why Red Flag Laws Are Not A Good Solution To Mass Shootings**

Do you feel comfortable giving up a cornerstone of our republic for a safety dependent upon enforcement by a government that has failed at this before?

*by Dana Loesch*

The people who report your Twitter account and your Facebook pages because they dislike your opinion want you to trust a government-run system where people can, without serious penalty of law, report you and have your property confiscated before you're allowed to defend yourself in court weeks, even months, later.

Politicians refer to law-abiding, gun-owning Americans as "domestic security threats," yet want you to trust them with implementing such a system. I'm talking about red flag laws and the risk they pose to due process—you know, those other rights after the Second Amendment in the Constitution.

Red flag laws, also known as Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPOs), have passed through a number of state legislatures across the country; Sen. Marco Rubio has a somewhat new legislative proposal titled the Extreme Risk Protection Order and Violence Prevention Act. Sen. Lindsay Graham joined Sen. Richard Blumenthal to co-sponsor red flag legislation; even Rep. Dan Crenshaw has mentioned ERPOs for potential consideration.

There is nuance to be had here, for sure, but realize that it is an abrogation of due process to invert the order of "innocent until proven guilty" to "somewhat guilty until proven innocent." The question isn't whether these laws do this, the question is whether you feel comfortable giving up a cornerstone of our republic for a safety dependent upon enforcement by a government

that has failed at this before.

The murderers in Parkland, Florida and Dayton, Ohio, are two recent examples. These two monsters were walking red flags with access to firearms and yet, with all of the laws available to adjudicate them ineligible to carry or purchase guns, they continued unabated until the unthinkable. They weren't stopped.

In fact, the Parkland murderer was coddled by a school district that pretended a refusal to report crime (thereby suppressing their criminal statistics) was the same thing as reducing crime, and they received federal dollars for it. That murderer's violent behavior (beating his adoptive mother, sending death threats to fellow students, and putting a gun to another person's head, to list a few offenses) was so well known, teachers had a backup plan in case he decided to become threatening, and he was searched every morning after arriving at school.

We didn't need red flag laws to get either of these individuals before they committed their crimes. According to numerous local reports, had the previous Broward County sheriff performed his duties, case number 18-1958 would not have been able to legally purchase the rifle he used to carry out his evil. From everything reported on the Dayton murderer, it seems barring him from legal purchase or possession of firearms by adjudicating him mentally unfit was entirely possible.



None of this is to say that nothing can be done. To the contrary: I and others have spoken for some time about the need to ensure that the systems upon which we rely to stop heinous would-be criminals at the point of sale needs to be up-to-date with timely reporting of ineligible, violent cases. This problem was pushed into the national spotlight after the horrific murders at the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, where an evil prohibited possessor took the lives of 26 innocents and injured 20 others.

That murderer was convicted of domestic assault during a court-martial and thus ineligible to legally purchase or carry a gun before his spree. Yet because his record was not submitted to the federal database, the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), which is referenced during a background check at the point of sale when purchasing a firearm, he was able to legally purchase firearms.

The Air Force took responsibility and vowed a lengthy review and to never repeat the error. The Chicago Tribune examined other cases of oversight wherein states and even government agencies failed to forward similar cases to the NCIC.

For the system to properly work requires information. For us to properly address why these awful tragedies keep occurring, we need to ask why and give that every effort instead of only ever focusing on the how, with no considerations for anything else.

We have a society that champions disrespect for life, abandons responsibility for one's actions, a society that redefines criminal activity by calling it a "loophole" instead of what it is, a criminal act; a culture that is slowly accepting violence as a legitimate form of disagreement, a society where male role models are hard to find and there is a crisis among young men that isn't attributable to video games (are Republicans seriously

entertaining the idea of exchanging gun control for game control?). We need to fix these problems for our society to work properly.

I hope that those promoting red flag laws address these concerns and answer questions like: What do red flag orders offer that our current legal options (civil commitments, TROs, et. al) do not? Why a long 14-day waiting period (Rubio's bill) to defend oneself in court? Where are confiscated firearms to be kept — and if the answer is with local law enforcement, how are local enforcement agencies empowered to both store confiscated firearms and assume liability for that storage?

For friends of mine who have proposed Gun Violence Restraining Orders (GVRO), how soon are respondents able to defend themselves against claims, particularly ex parte orders? And with either ERPOs or GVROs, will any considerations be given to women defending themselves against domestic abusers who might misuse the system to render their victims defenseless?

How will GVROs be lifted — and doesn't that still require the respondent to prove his or her innocence? Is anyone concerned that both of these proposals still invert the presumption of innocence until proven guilty?

We all want to save lives and prevent terrorists, dangerously mentally unstable, or just plain evil people from carrying out horrific intentions. If preserving innocent people's right to defend themselves with force equal to that of their potential attacker is off the table, then how?

*Dana Loesch is a nationally syndicated talk radio host of "The Dana Show" with Radio America and a best-selling author.*

ORIGINAL ARTICLE:

<https://www.nationalreview.com/2019/08/red-flag-laws-are-the-wrong-solution-to-mass-shootings/>

# NATIONAL REVIEW

## ‘Red Flag’ Laws Are the Wrong Solution to Mass Shootings They haven’t reduced crimes, and the potential for misuse is great

*by Thomas Massie & John R. Lott Jr.*

Everyone is sick of mass public shootings in the United States. Enough is enough. Everyone, including us, is incredibly frustrated.

But let’s do something that doesn’t make the problem worse.

With President Trump’s endorsement, Senate Republicans are moving forward with one law that they hope will help — a so-called “red-flag” law, advancing on the federal level what are known as “extreme risk protection orders.” Ohio’s governor also came out and endorsed such a law for his state after the attack.

Depending upon the state, anyone from a family member, intimate partner, or ex to house- or apartment-mates or a police officer can file a complaint. Under Colorado’s recent law, anyone at all can make a phone call to the police. They don’t even have to be living in the state. There is no hearing. All the judge has before him is the statement of concern.

While Trump emphasized mental health in last week’s speech about the Texas and Ohio shootings, red-flag laws are not specifically about mental illness. Indeed, only one state law even mentions the term. It’s about figuring out who is going to commit a crime (or suicide). This is the realm of science fiction, and is the theme of the Tom Cruise movie *Minority Report*. At least the Future Crime division in the movie had the help of psychics.

Seventeen states have now adopted these laws. Thirteen states passed these laws since Parkland last year.

During the first nine months after Florida passed its red-flag law last year, judges granted more than 1,000 confiscation orders. In the three months after Maryland’s law went into effect on October 1, more than 300 people had their guns confiscated. In one case in Arundel County, a 61-year-old man died when the police stormed his home at 5 a.m. to take away his guns. Connecticut and Indiana, which have had these laws in effect for the longest time, have seen increasingly large numbers of confiscation orders.

Little certainty is needed. Initial confiscations often require just a “reasonable suspicion,” which is little more than a guess or a hunch. When hearings occur weeks or a month later, about a third of these initial orders are overturned, but the actual error rate is undoubtedly much higher. These laws make no provisions to cover legal costs, and many people facing these charges do not retain counsel.

These laws let the government take firearms away from people who are arrested but not convicted of crimes. Even simple complaints without arrests have been enough. That is quite a violation of due process, and hopefully the courts will strike down this provision. Gun-

control advocates have resisted making this rule explicit in the laws, presumably out of fear that it would create problems in the courts, but presentations before the State Uniform Law Commission make it clear that these actions are quite common. Also, courts frequently take into account other factors, such as gender and age, in predicting the chances that someone will commit a crime or commit suicide. This can be seen as a discriminatory practice.

It has always been possible to take away someone's guns, but all 50 states have required testimony by a mental-health expert before a judge. Under red-flag laws, however, expert testimony will no longer be used. Gun-control advocates argue that it's essential not even to alert the person that his guns may be taken away. Hence, the 5 a.m. police raids.

When people really pose a clear danger to themselves or others, they should be confined to a mental-health facility. Simply denying them the legal right to buy a gun isn't a serious remedy. If you think you are any more likely to stop criminals from getting guns than illegal drugs, you are mistaken. The same drug dealers sell both, and gangs are a major source of guns. Mentally ill individuals can also use other weapons, such as cars.

Guns are certainly not the only way for mentally unstable people to commit suicide. Many substitutes are as effective. Very effective poisons such as cyanide are readily available.

These laws may damage trust between people. In the absence of a red-flag law, a person contemplating homicide or suicide might speak to a friend or family member and be dissuaded from that course of action. But now that person may fear that the authorities will be tipped off. As a result, some of these individuals may

not seek help and instead may go on to kill themselves or others.

Police are also often depressed on the job, and it's not right for them to worry that they might lose their jobs if they share their feelings.

Liberals understand this point when it comes to something such as AIDS. They know that the threat of quarantining may discourage infected people from seeking medical help. But they seem unaware that the threat of early-morning raids and leaving people defenseless might engender similar problems.

Despite the sacrifices, the evidence shows no benefits from red-flag laws. Looking at data from 1970 through 2017, these laws had no significant effect on murder, suicide, mass-public-shooting fatalities, robbery, aggravated assault, or burglary. These laws do not save lives.

As a whole, the rest of the world has much higher murder rates from mass public shootings than does the U.S. This includes major European countries such as France, Finland, Russia, and Switzerland. Many of these countries also have much stricter gun-control laws, including bans on semi-automatic guns.

Everyone wants to stop mass public shooters. But we haven't previously punished people on the basis of little more than a hunch, without any specific guidelines in place. Stopping "future crimes" didn't work in the movies, and it doesn't work in real life.

*Thomas Massie represents Kentucky's fourth district in the House of Representatives. John R. Lott Jr. is the president of the Crime Prevention Research Center and the author of *The War on Guns*.*

ORIGINAL ARTICLE:

<https://www.nationalreview.com/2019/08/red-flag-laws-are-the-wrong-solution-to-mass-shootings/>



## The VA already ‘red-flags’ veteran patriots. A chilling warning on how it works.

*by Michelle Malkin*

Gun-grabbing crisis vultures just can't let the latest mass shootings go to waste. "Red flag" laws are now all the rage in the Beltway as the magic pill to prevent homicidal maniacs from wreaking havoc on the nation. Even President Donald Trump has endorsed the idea of preemptively confiscating people's firearms if they are deemed a "threat."

But if you want to know how this American version of China's social credit system would work in practice, let me remind you of how Veterans Affairs recklessly red-flags "disruptive" citizens without due process, transparency or accountability in the name of "safety." Government bureaucrats routinely deprive our nation's heroes of medical treatment based on arbitrary definitions of who and what constitutes a mental health menace.

I first reported on the VA's secretive database on "disgruntled" and "disruptive" vets five years ago. Under the VA policy on "patient record flags," federal bureaucrats can classify vets as "threats" based on assessments of their "difficult," "annoying" and "noncompliant" behavior. The VA manual says the flags "are used to alert Veterans Health Administration medical staff and employees of patients whose behavior and characteristics may pose a threat either to their safety, the safety of other patients, or compromise the delivery of quality health care."

What a crock. It's precisely because so many vets receive inferior care from the feds that they have been forced to raise their voices. Have we all forgotten the 40 veterans who perished at the Phoenix, Arizona VA, which relegated patients to a bureaucratic black hole through secret waiting lists? Among examples of patients' behavior referred to the red-flags in the VA's "Disruptive Behavior Committees" (Orwell couldn't have cooked up a better name): venting "frustration about VA services and/or wait times, threatening lawsuits or to have people fired, and frequent unwarranted visits to the emergency department or telephone calls to facility staff."

Disabled Air Force veteran and veterans advocate/attorney Benjamin Krause has exposed the Soviet-style targeting of veterans flagged for exercising their First Amendment rights or threatening to sue the VA over neglectful care or for simply being too "expensive." He calls it "straight out of a totalitarian regime." In 2013, the VA inspector general concluded that the bureaucracy "does not have a comprehensive definition of what constitutes disruptive behavior." In January 2018, a VA Office of Inspector General report found that large numbers of flagged veterans were being left in the dark about being placed on dangerous patient lists — with no recourse to remove phony flags or appeal in any meaningful way.

Despite rules requiring the "Disruptive Behavior

Committee” to notify flagged patients of their status and informing them of their right to amend their reports, the OIG found no evidence in 49% of electronic health records that the panels had provided such notice and disclosure.

In 25% of medical records reviewed, the OIG “found no evidence that patients were informed they had the right to request to amend or appeal” special orders restricting care of flagged patients.

There are undoubtedly patients in the system who may pose real threats. But the “problem with the process is that it is secret,” Krause explains at DisabledVeterans.org. “The review process is done in secret and the veteran will not know who sat on the committee or what the evidence presented was prior to the decision. Only after the decision is made are veterans informed of the outcome and given a chance to appeal the vague allegations. That seems like a due process violation if I have ever seen one.”

Army vet David Scott Strain of Virginia told me recently that he was a flagged veteran. “My grave sin?” says Strain. “I tried to report the abuse of a deaf, infirm, WWII veteran. He was approximately 95 years of age. A male nurse stood behind his waiting room chair and shouted down at the top of his head, ‘Hello! Hello! Hello! If you can hear me, you can come in now!’”

Strain describes how the elderly vet “could not hear this, and the nurse went through 3 iterations, while giggling and looking at the wait-room personnel as if we were a comedy club audience. It was one of the sickest displays I’ve ever seen.”

For blowing the whistle on VA elder abuse, Strain says, he was banned from all satellite clinics and only granted access to one main facility. VA flaggers can “manufacture tone, the content of what you’re saying, and will even ascribe actions

to you that you did not perform,” Strain warns. “The potential ‘red flag’ laws concern me deeply,” Strain told me. “Why any citizen would think it wise to let the government screw such handles to our backs, to threaten and wag us any which way, is beyond my understanding. However, I fully understand why politicians want it.”

Complain too much. Criticize the powers be. Ask too many questions. Boom! You’re a threat.

If such tyranny is allowed among those who volunteered to protect and serve our country in the name of safety, imagine how it will be implemented among the law-abiding, gun-owning general populace.

Michelle Malkin’s email address is  
MichelleMalkinInvestigates@protonmail.com.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE:

<https://www.bizpacreview.com/2019/08/07/michelle-malkin-the-va-already-red-flags-veteran-patriots-a-chilling-warning-on-how-it-works-782553>

# SAMPLE LETTER TO ELECTED OFFICIALS

Use this letter as a template to write to your Representative and both of your Senators. You can download a word document of this letter by visiting [tpp.us/redflagofficials](http://tpp.us/redflagofficials). You can print it out and fax, mail, or deliver it to their offices. Or, you can use all of the methods! Just be sure to replace the sections **in red** with the appropriate and correct information before you print or email! This letter can and should be sent to all of your members of Congress, whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

We also encourage you to send a copy of this letter to the White House. You can do so by visiting [whitehouse.gov/contact](http://whitehouse.gov/contact). Because this is an online form, simply copy and paste the body of the letter and leave out the address and heading.

<<Today's Date>>

The Honorable <<Elected Official's Name>>

<<Office Address>>

United States <<House of Representatives / Senate>>

Washington, DC <<Zip Code>>

Dear Representative/Senator <<Elected Official's Last Name>>:

My name is <<Your Name>>, and I live in <<City, State>>. I am your constituent. I am writing to urge you to oppose any and all "red flag" laws related to firearms.

At first glance, "red flag" laws appear, to the uninformed, to be a good solution to the problem of young men who turn to mass murder by gun, but they are NOT the answer. "Red flag" laws will not solve the problem AND they deprive law-abiding, innocent Americans of our 2nd Amendment, 5th Amendment, and 14th Amendment rights.

To sum up the major flaws, "red flag" laws are:

1. **Unconstitutional,**
2. **Don't work, and...**
3. **Will very likely make things worse, by frightening people away from mental health treatment for fear of losing their 2nd Amendment rights.**

**The crucial difference between existing laws and "red flag" laws are that the existing laws allow for due process rights to be exercised, and the burden of proof is on the party making**

THIS LETTER CONTINUES ON THE NEXT PAGE.

# SAMPLE LETTER TO ELECTED OFFICIALS (CONT.)

**the accusation, rather than on the accused.** This right to due process and presumed innocence has always been fundamental to US jurisprudence. This is how law and justice are supposed to work in America, and **no possible good promised by proponents of “red flag” laws is an excuse for trampling on the most-fundamental rights of citizens in a free society.**

**There is another, very real, highly-likely danger in “red flag” laws, and that is the abuse by political opponents who would weaponize these laws to punish people with whom they disagree.**

- As a society, we are already trying to deal with people who seek to oppress the freedom of speech of others because they don't like what they have to say, and they abuse and exploit existing laws and definitions to do so. We must not exacerbate this trend!!
- We've already seen the IRS weaponized against American citizens simply due to their political points of view.
- We also have an existing example of government “red flag” laws being exploited and abused within the VA system. Inspector General reports and other investigations have shown that our veterans, besides not getting the care they are promised and deserve, are put on secret lists for simply venting frustration about the delivery of service and wait times. These “disgruntled” and “disruptive” vets (as labeled by the VA) are put on “dangerous patient lists” for simply exercising their 1st Amendment rights – you know, the ones they defended for all of us through their military service.

**Many other solutions exist that would actually make a real difference and would respect the rights of innocent Americans.** For instance, we must make sure that the systems that we rely on to stop horrific would-be killers at the point of sale are updated regularly with the reports of ineligible, violent cases. The murders at First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, TX very probably could have been prevented had the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) federal database been updated with his court-martial records from the US Air Force.

*In the case of the murderer at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, there were years of actual “red flags,” including beating his adoptive mother, sending death threats to other students, holding a gun to someone's head, and other crimes, that could have been used to adjudicate him as mentally ill. In so many cases, investigations have shown that it was the failure of government entities that allowed these killers to legally purchase weapons. **You cannot, in good conscience, violate the rights of innocent Americans to cover up the fact that government agencies failed to use existing methods and laws to prevent mass murder.***

In nearly every single instance of a mass shooting, the incident takes place in a gun-free zone. ***It is time for gun-free zones to be eliminated,*** making it possible for trained and armed citizens to engage a would-be mass shooter before they can do so much damage. The police are usually too far away to

THIS LETTER CONTINUES ON THE NEXT PAGE.

# SAMPLE LETTER TO ELECTED OFFICIALS (CONT.)

stop them early enough to protect lives, and as a result, gun-free zones have become death traps. ***This single action is surely the MOST-IMPORTANT step you could take to reduce mass murder situations!***

You could (and SHOULD) also **allow background checks to access violent offenses from juvenile records during the regular background check initiated by a firearm purchase.** This would have caught the violent and unstable actions of the Dayton, OH shooter. ***This is probably the 2nd most-important step you could take!***

You could also **pass a law allowing for nationwide concealed carry, so that Americans traveling from state to state have their 2nd Amendment rights restored,** no matter which state they are in, and who could therefore use their concealed weapons to save lives, if necessary. There are dozens, even many HUNDREDS of examples of defensive uses of firearms by average civilians, with many such events saving lives.

Finally, you could **take seriously the danger that is caused by the destruction of our social and civil institutions.** Sadly, for many decades, the Democrat party has led the charge to disrupt and destroy the institutions that helped keep people prone to criminal activity in check. Institutions like the nuclear family, the Church, and civic organizations like the Boy Scouts, all are examples of social institutions that held society together. ***And now that those are crumbling, we are reaping the resulting whirlwind.***

**It seems that in Congress, the desire to “do something” frequently supersedes the desire to do the right thing.** As you are elected to protect and defend the Constitution, this rush to pass *anything* – especially as it won’t work and shreds our rights – is a violation of the oath you all take. And so, I repeat, **please oppose all “red flag” bills, as well as any other legislation that would infringe on my rights.**

Sincerely,

<<Your Name>>

<<Your Full Address>>

<<Your Email Address>>

# SAMPLE SCRIPT TO CALL ELECTED OFFICIALS

Call your Representative and both of your Senators, and call them whether they are Republicans or Democrats. Republicans need some backbone and Democrats need to know they will have a fight on their hands should they try to violate our rights. You will need to call three times, one for each of the officials you are calling.

**Main Capitol Switchboard Number: 1-202-224-3121**

- 1** Ask for your Elected Official's office.  
*(Note: Have your zip code available. The operator may ask for your zip code.)*
- 2** Your Elected Official's office assistant will answer the phone.
- 3** Identify yourself and explain why you are calling.

## SAMPLE SCRIPT

Hello, my name is **<<Your Name>>**, and I am calling from **<<City, State>>** to urge opposition to any "red flag" legislation or other bills that would violate my constitutional rights. They don't work, and they will likely make things worse by keeping people who may need treatment from seeking treatment for fear of being added to a "red flag" list.

There are many other solutions available to Congress and the White House that would work better and respect our rights, such as, eliminate gun-free zones, ensure the federal database used in background checks is updated quickly and frequently, and that people like the criminals in Parkland, FL and Dayton, OH who had violent histories as juveniles are either adjudicated as mentally ill under existing law or make their juvenile records available during a background check should they try to legally purchase a gun as an adult.

I've read about the VA system's "red flag" database where they add veterans to a secret list of "disgruntled" and "dangerous patients" for simply venting frustration about service or wait times! Members of Congress and the President took oaths to defend and protect the Constitution, and "red flag" laws violate multiple parts of our Constitution. Congress, the White House, and state legislatures do not have the authority to deprive innocent Americans of their constitutional rights.

Voters will be watching to see who supports real solutions AND our rights, and who doesn't. We don't need to "do something" when tragedy strikes. We need to do the right thing. Thank you.

**We also recommend calling the White House with the same message.** You can reach the White House at 202-456-1111.



# CONTENT FOR SOCIAL MEDIA

For social media posts, we recommend you use the sample that we have included, as well as post links to the three articles (and any other good ones you find). Additionally, you can copy and paste what we've included in the guide, as well as excerpts from the articles.



 [tpp.us/redflagfbshare](https://tpp.us/redflagfbshare)

 [tpp.us/redflagtwshare](https://tpp.us/redflagtwshare)

## Other links to share on social media

### **Rights Abridged: The Flawed Model for Red Flag Laws**

<https://spectator.org/rights-abridged-the-flawed-model-for-red-flag-laws>

### **Why Red Flag Laws Are Not A Good Solution To Mass Shootings**

<https://thefederalist.com/2019/08/06/red-flag-laws-not-good-solution-mass-shootings>

### **The VA already 'red-flags' veteran patriots. A chilling warning on how it works**

<https://www.bizpacreview.com/2019/08/07/michelle-malkin-the-va-already-red-flags-veteran-patriots-a-chilling-warning-on-how-it-works-782553>

### **'Red Flag' Laws Are the Wrong Solution to Mass Shootings**

<https://www.nationalreview.com/2019/08/red-flag-laws-are-the-wrong-solution-to-mass-shootings>

## People to follow on Twitter

Follow the people listed below on Twitter and "like" and "retweet" their posts so you can help amplify the messages they are sharing about this issue.

- [@JennyBethM](https://twitter.com/JennyBethM)
- [@TPPatriots](https://twitter.com/TPPatriots)
- [@DLoesch](https://twitter.com/DLoesch)
- [@RepThomasMassie](https://twitter.com/RepThomasMassie)
- [@AWRHawkins](https://twitter.com/AWRHawkins)



Want to help make an even bigger difference on social media, and particularly on Twitter? Join our Social Media Minutemen so that we can alert you instantly to a situation on Twitter that needs your help. We can help defend a conservative that is under attack, defend the President, and amplify the truth that the media tries to hide.

SIGN UP: [tpp.us/minutemen](https://tpp.us/minutemen)

# HOW TO WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR

## What is a Letter to the Editor?

A letter to the editor is a letter written to the Editor of a newspaper. The letter is an opportunity for you to express your opinion about a recent article published in the paper or an issue in the news.

Writing letters to the editor is an important engagement tool for activists. They allow activists to do the following:



**1) Reach a broader audience than you normally would have;**



**2) Hold your local journalists accountable;**



**3) Present alternative views on political issues.**

Letters to the editor are usually found in the first section of the newspaper or on the editorial page.



## GUIDELINES FOR GETTING A LETTER TO THE EDITOR PUBLISHED

Most newspapers publish guidelines with their specific requirements for getting a letter published, but here are some general rules that will help you get your letter to the editor published.

- **Include your name and address and a telephone number** where you can be reached.
- **Be respectful and courteous**, even when disagreeing with the Editorial Board about a specific issue.
- **Be specific.** If you are opposed to Obamacare, mention the specific reasons why. Provide examples.
- **Cite your sources.** If you include any quoted material, be sure to correctly cite your source or attribute the quote.
- **Use proper grammar.** Spellcheck your letter and be sure to use proper grammar. Refer to *The Elements of Style* for a great overview of effective writing.
- **Be concise.** Letters to the editor are much more likely to be published if they are 300 words or less. Make your point as clearly and concisely as possible.

# SAMPLE LETTER TO THE EDITOR

---

You can download a Microsoft Word document of this letter by visiting [tpp.us/redflageditor](http://tpp.us/redflageditor). Feel free to print it out and fax, mail, or deliver it to your local newspaper. Just be sure to replace the sections **in red** with the appropriate and correct information before you print or email!

Dear Editor,

After a tragedy, the impulse of politicians is always to “do something,” rather than to do the right thing.

“Red flag” laws are an example of this urge to “do something” instead of the right thing.

Simply put, “red flag” laws are unconstitutional, they won’t work, and they will likely make things worse by keeping those who need treatment from seeking treatment out of fear of being added to a “red flag” list.

We already have laws that allow for a person to be adjudicated as mentally ill, after which they could not legally purchase or possess a gun. Existing laws are superior to “red flag” laws because they protect due process and the presumption of innocence, whereas “red flag” laws do not.

A free society is based on certain bedrock principles, and we shouldn’t abandon them just because we are scared or heartbroken.

In Parkland, FL, the Sherriff could have used existing laws to keep the killer from legally purchasing weapons based on his prior violent behavior, such as beating up his adoptive mother and sending death threats to other students. But the Sherriff chose not to do this for political reasons.

The man who killed 26 people at First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, TX had a court-martial on his Air Force record, but the national database was never updated with this information.

“Red flag” laws would allow tricksters and trolls, domestic abusers and stalkers, and the politically motivated to immediately curtail a fundamental constitutional right with almost no recourse for the accused. Americans of all stripes should reject any laws that deprive innocent people of their constitutional rights, and we should set our sights high enough to demand solutions that actually work and don’t violate our rights.

<<Your Name>>

<<Your City>>

# CONSTITUTIONAL, ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

---

Included in this guide are 5 solutions that you can suggest to anyone who tries to tell you that we have to “do something.” You can tell them no, we have to do the *right thing*, and here are some examples of that. This is not an exhaustive list, but will help you overcome the inevitable, “do something” hysteria from your friends and from your Republican member of Congress. Additionally, we must also work to advance liberty, rather than just simply defend against tyranny. Note that these are not listed in any particular order.

## Eliminate gun-free zones.

Nearly every mass shooting occurs in a gun-free zone. From *The American Spectator* (emphasis added):

According to the Crime Prevention Research Center, **between 1950 and 2018 97.8 percent of all mass public shootings occurred in gun-free zones.**<sup>5</sup> Similarly, in the 20 states that allow teachers to be armed, there have been no school shootings (as well as no accidents or injuries caused by firearms possessed by teachers).<sup>6</sup>

More:

Given this record, anyone concerned with eliminating — or at least substantially reducing — mass public shootings must ask whether or not gun-free zones pose a danger to the public by attracting killers who prefer an unarmed victim pool and should give serious consideration to the following propositions:

1. First, however well-intended, gun-free zones do not work. While they might provide symbolic or emotional comfort to those who fear firearms, they have no real-world practical effect other than to encourage law-abiding armed citizens to stay away.
2. Mass casualty shooters have overwhelmingly elected to carry out their attacks in gun-free zones.
3. Relative to all of the other proposed solutions to the problem of mass public shootings, the elimination of gun-free zones would be comparatively simple and inexpensive.
4. Eliminating the demonstrably ineffective gun-free zones would cause no permanent or substantial damage or loss to owners of such properties.

<sup>6</sup><https://crimeresearch.org/2018/06/more-misleading-information-from-bloombergs-everytown-for-gun-safety-on-guns-analysis-of-recent-mass-shootings>

<sup>7</sup>[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3377801](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3377801)

<sup>8</sup><https://spectator.org/mass-shootings-in-gun-free-zones>

# CONSTITUTIONAL, ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (CONT.)

---

## Repair our broken culture and social institutions.

Another common factor in mass murders is brokenness. Most of these men (and they're usually young men), come from broken families – single parent, fatherless families, and are maligned and ignored by a culture that now breeds hedonism, licentiousness, animosity, and hate instead of holding up boundaries and common purpose.

From *PJ Media* (emphasis added):

Mass shootings are a special form of suicide. The shooter never expects to survive. But the shooter combines self-hatred with group hatred. Hate becomes so melded with the shooter's identity that he determines to take as many people as he can with him. They are of the same order as the pilot who crashed a Germanwings airliner into the Alps in 2015.

Emil Durkheim's 1897 diagnosis of "anomic suicide" describes the Columbine perpetrators as well as the 2016 San Bernardino attack by Muslim fanatics, the "right-wing" shooter in El Paso and the "left-wing" shooter in Dayton. They are individuals cut off from society, destabilized by change and despairing of their own place in the world. **Such monsters always have been among us. But now we are cultivating such monsters by destroying the ties that bind us to each other, to our past and to our future.**

And from *The Federalist*:

We have created a society that now offers almost none of the things that make people truly happy. Family, community, spiritual belonging — these are the foundational and primal building blocks of human happiness, and they are rapidly disappearing.

With the destruction of the family, the church, and the community, the reasons people have traditionally had for their very existence are in danger of receding into the past. And the outcome is predictable: isolation, depression, anxiety, despondency, drug abuse, and death.

When we talk about gun violence, just about no one talks about these root causes. It is not as if we haven't had large numbers of powerful semi-automatic weapons in this country for many decades. In fact, when I was in high school, my classmates regularly kept rifles in their truck gun racks in the school parking lot.

## CONSTITUTIONAL, ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (CONT.)

---

In light of these facts, the only sensible question to ask is, what has changed? Instead, politicians and pundits ask all the wrong questions. Do we have too many guns? (We always have.) Are video games and movies too violent? (They always have been.) Do we need more laws? (We have more than we can keep track of.)

No, the thing that has fundamentally changed is that we have discarded those regulating social institutions that have helped people understand their value and place in this world for thousands of years. Their decline is not just mirrored in the rise of mass shootings, but more broadly in a host of statistics that reveal an epidemic of despair.

Both the *PJ Media* and *Federalist* articles are absolute must-reads, and you can find the URL's in the footnotes. Someone may ask you, "what can we do about this?" There are many reasons why our culture has disintegrated. Some of it can't be solved by government action. Some of it is work we all have to do in our own private lives and families. But some things, such as decreasing the size and burden of government and therefore the taxes it requires to function, could allow one parent to stay home again, allowing families a greater chance of survival.

Most importantly, this factor must be a part of the "national conversation," because we will never even begin to solve this problem if we don't investigate the root causes. If we only focus on political goals like the left's burning desire to confiscate guns and gut the 2nd Amendment, we will never find the right solution. We have to ask why mass shootings happen, not just how.

### Regularly update the federal background check database.

This is one of the most simple, obvious solutions available. As mentioned earlier in this guide, the Sutherland Springs, TX shooter had been court-martialed in the Airforce for domestic assault, but the Airforce failed to report this to the federal database. Had the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database been updated with the information of the court martial (the database is checked during a background check at the point of sale when purchasing a firearm), the First Baptist Church shooter would have been prohibited from legally purchasing any firearms.

Proponents of more government and more laws to restrict access to guns fail to address the fact that the existing laws aren't used properly already. Why should the rest of us innocents give up more of our rights for additional laws that government agencies may still use incorrectly and negligently? There is no reason to add laws that infringe on our rights because existing laws and databases can be used correctly to stop many would-be killers, without oppressing the rest of us.

# CONSTITUTIONAL, ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (CONT.)

---

## Use existing laws to adjudicate the mentally ill.

Again, as mentioned earlier in this guide, the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooter had a substantial history of violence, instability, and mental illness that current laws could have been applied to stop him from legally purchasing or carrying a gun.

More from Dana Loesh:

**The murderers in Parkland, Florida and Dayton, Ohio, are two recent examples. These two monsters were walking red flags with access to firearms and yet, with all of the laws available to adjudicate them ineligible to carry or purchase guns, they continued unabated until the unthinkable. They weren't stopped.**

**In fact, the Parkland murderer was coddled by a school district that pretended a refusal to report crime (thereby suppressing their criminal statistics) was the same thing as reducing crime, and they received federal dollars for it. That murderer's violent behavior (beating his adoptive mother, sending death threats to fellow students, and putting a gun to another person's head, to list a few offenses) was so well known, teachers had a backup plan in case he decided to become threatening, and he was searched every morning after arriving at school.**

**We didn't need red flag laws to get either of these individuals before they committed their crimes. According to numerous local reports, had the previous Broward County sheriff performed his duties, case number 18-1958 would not have been able to legally purchase the rifle he used to carry out his evil. From everything reported on the Dayton murderer, it seems barring him from legal purchase or possession of firearms by adjudicating him mentally unfit was entirely possible.**

Educate the people you are speaking with about the failures of government officials and agencies to use the existing laws to prevent these tragedies. Help them understand that we don't need more laws, but rather we need the laws that exist to be utilized before it's too late.

## Harden soft targets.

This, again, is one of the most obvious solutions. The El Paso shooter specifically noted that to carry out a mass shooting most effectively, one must choose a "soft" target. Basically, a "soft" target is one that is not protected or defended by good guys and gals with guns (i.e., it's a gun-free zone). As noted earlier, in the first solution, "Eliminate gun-free zones," over 97% of mass shoot-

# CONSTITUTIONAL, ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (CONT.)

---

ings target soft targets. Why? Because killers know that they can inflict maximum damage before the police show up to stop them. On average, it can take 18 minutes for police to arrive at the site of an active shooter! But, if a responsible, law-abiding citizen carrying a firearm is present, it drastically reduces deaths and injuries.

“Hardening” a soft target means increasing the number of guns in any given location by allowing law-abiding people to carry firearms with the intent that they can serve as security against a would-be mass shooter. It can also mean adding other secondary types of security like metal detectors and secure entrances. Schools, stores, shopping centers, offices – anywhere – can be hardened as a deliberate act by the people that manage and run these locations, but it can also be achieved with more law-abiding people carrying their own personal firearms.

**Passing a national right-to-carry law would go a long way in helping law-abiding citizens to carry regardless of the state they are living in or visiting.**

Furthermore, in the 20 states that allow teachers to be armed, there have been *no school shootings!*

From a 2018 article by The Heritage Foundation:

Between 2007 and 2015, murder rates dropped 16 percent and violent crime rates dropped 18 percent, even though the percentage of adults with concealed carry permits rose by 190 percent.

Regression estimates show a significant association between increased permit ownership and a drop in murder and violent crime rates. Each percentage point increase in rates of permit-holding is associated with a roughly 2.5 percent drop in the murder rate.

Concealed carry permit holders are often “the good guy with a gun,” even though they rarely receive the attention of the national media. Concealed carry permit holders were credited with saving multiple lives in:

- Rockledge, Florida (2017);
- Antioch, Tennessee (2017);
- Arlington, Texas (2017);
- Lyman, South Carolina (2016);
- Winton, Ohio (2015);
- Conyers, Georgia (2015);
- New Holland, South Carolina (2015);

# CONSTITUTIONAL, ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (CONT.)

---

- Chicago, Illinois (2015);
- Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (2015);
- Darby, Pennsylvania (2015);
- Chicago, Illinois (2014);
- Portland, Oregon (2014); and
- Spartanburg, South Carolina (2012).

Ask people why it's ok for celebrities, politicians, and other wealthy or famous people to be protected by guns, but not the rest of us. Why are our kids not worthy of the same protection as their kids? Why are we not worthy of that same protection as they are when we go shopping? Why do they get have the inner tranquility of knowing that they will likely return to their families after going out for the day because they are guarded by guns?

Actress Gillian Anderson responded to a question posed in the documentary *Not Evil, Just Wrong* about her hypocrisy in flying overseas to attend a conference on global warming. Her response was, "Sometimes, some people have to fly." It is likely the same arrogance that leads celebrities and politicians who can afford or are given security details to demand the rest of us give up the only means we have of protecting ourselves and our families.

These alternative solutions to gun control not only respect our God-given right to self-defense and sovereignty, but they would also be more effective in decreasing the number of deaths and injuries from mass shootings, as well as decreasing the number of mass shootings overall.

Right now, people are scared, and that includes the GOP. They are scared that they must be seen as part of the "do something" crowd. Use this guide to help them see that they can "do something" by doing the *right thing*.



Tea Party Patriots Action's mission is to equip Americans with the resources and training they need to be engaged citizens and effective activists. Our vision is for a nation where individual liberty is cherished and maximized, where the Constitution is revered and upheld, and where Americans are free to pursue their American Dream.



TEA PARTY  
PATRIOTS  
ACTION

80 M ST ME, FIRST FLOOR, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003

[www.teapartypatriotsaction.org](http://www.teapartypatriotsaction.org)