

Letters

Dear Editor,

In the January 2007 issue of CCM, they printed a letter from Officer Michael Brown that criticized the position taken by JPFO's earlier article. The JPFO article was entitled, "Who Really Holds the Power?" The column is denominated "Licensed to Fear."

Officer Brown was upset because of one sentence in the article: "Yet all the time you know deep down: your 'public servants' are just waiting for the opportunity to destroy your life if they catch you in any questionable situation."

Officer Brown apparently did not realize the article describes the fear that gun owners feel. The article does not state that all public servants are waiting for the opportunity to destroy citizens' lives. The article describes gun owners' fear of officials with the "us vs. them" mentality.

Our article highlights this fear: that the cops and prosecutors will skin you alive if they find you in a questionable situation. That's our fear. What we fear may not happen in every case, but it is a real and rational fear.

The only way to defuse our fear is for the government, courts and police to fully recognize and protect our rights as fundamental. We must not have to beg for mercy when we exercise our rights. A citizen with a firearm should receive full benefit of the doubt and be presumed innocent.

Counter-arguing, Officer Brown offered one specific example in his career and some general remarks about his personal work to protect and uphold the legal right to self-defense. We salute Officer Brown's help in protecting self-defense rights.

Yet, we have seen a number of cases where the opposite has been true. Recall the man in New York who shot an

intruder in his home—an intruder who very likely had designs to rape, kidnap or otherwise harm his daughter? The police arrested the home defender; the prosecutor brought gun law charges.

Recall the female teacher in Virginia who had a permit for her firearm, but accidentally left it in her purse when she went to school. The teacher was arrested; the prosecutor brought federal gun law charges against her.

Where were the helpful, pro-citizen cops in these cases? Where was the kindness and reasonableness in the hearts of the prosecutors? None was to be found.

In any competent concealed carry permit course, the instructor will warn that you may have a permit to carry, but that many laws still hamstring your right to carry. Public buildings, school zones, public conveyances, etc. are all places where permit holders face arrest and prosecution.

Large numbers of gun owners dutifully lock up guns—even in their own homes—because of mandatory "safe storage" laws. Why would gun owners, who have no children in the home, still lock up their defense tools and maintain them in an unusable status? Because they are afraid of the laws and the law enforcers.

Officer Brown's position is basically that "many of us police officers would not arrest decent gun-owning citizens on minor gun law infractions. Don't paint us all with a broad brush of anti-gun zealotry."

That position is worrisome because it says citizens should feel comfortable because some police officers would fail to enforce the laws in certain cases. In other words, we should feel comfortable because of the good nature of some

officers despite the existence of the bad laws.

When a society is ruled by the ad hoc decisions of its individual law officers, that society is no longer ruled by laws—it is ruled by men. Officer Brown's argument is essentially that in cases where the officers agree with our points of view, we should trust the officers to be on our side, not on the side of their employer. Can we, the breakers of (in this case unjust) laws, rely upon the police to fail to enforce some laws? There are plenty of lawbreakers who would love a police philosophy like that—because bribe money can really help officers decide whom they like and which laws they want to enforce.

Our article ignited a discussion that must continue burning in the gun owner community. We gun owners live in legitimate fear of officers and prosecutors who decide to enforce "the laws on the books" against otherwise decent non-criminal citizens. Until our rights are deemed the law of the land, not something we have to beg for, not something we have to tippy-toe to exercise, we are going to remain fearful and suspicious of "law enforcement."

JPFO is not now and has never been anti-police. We admire the peacekeeping work of law officers. We deeply appreciate their protecting society from aggressors. We invite all peace officers to join us in recognizing the fundamental right of citizens to own, carry and use firearms for peaceful and defensive purposes.

JPFO Liberty Crew

Dear Editor,

I'm a "newbie" subscriber to *Concealed Carry Magazine*.

Having read your CD-archived issues (thanks for making them available), and just receiving my first "hard copy" issue (Jan '07), I have two comments.

1) The content is well worth the price of a subscription. Pertinent, useful, informative, thought-provoking articles/opinions/tips. So much for the accolade.

2) Better yet, your magazine format/articles don't require readers to "turn to page xx" to finish them. I suspect you know what I mean, and hope you can keep the current layout as you increase pages.

D. Helmick
Champion, PA

Due to volume received, not all letters can be answered. Letters may be edited for space and clarity.

Send your letters to:

*Concealed Carry Magazine, Attn: Editor,
4466 Hwy P - Suite 204 - Jackson, WI 53037.
Or use our contact form: <http://www.usconcealedcarry.com>*