

## LANDMARK ACCORD ON INTERNATIONAL GUN CONTROL: REDUCING THE POWER OF THE PEOPLE TO RESIST BEING COMPLETELY DISARMED! PUT THE POINTS TOGETHER!

Point #1: The communist goal of the United States becoming a member of the "International Gun Control Accord" has just been accomplished! *U.S. negotiators have stealthily placed American citizens under international gun control, but in a manner in which the people were led to believe that they are being protected by "concessions". Once enlisted as a member of this Accord, it will be a simple matter to drop the concessions said to have been won by U.S. negotiators "to protect the constitutional right of Americans to own arms."*

Point #2: The U.S. law that was passed in 1961 calling for general and complete disarmament (Public Law 87-297) is

*still the policy of U.S. government officials, and it requires the "elimination of armaments of all kinds". Gun owners know that use of such words includes guns owned by law-abiding citizens. In past years in order to placate the gun owners over this issue, the U.S. government and the National Rifle Association have both stated that "elimination of armaments of all kinds" applies only to weapons used by the military, but not to civilian guns. Their statements are not true at all!*

Point #3: Attached is a Washington Times article substantiating the fact that law-abiding citizens are subject to gun prohibition by definition

under P.L. 87-297! Note in the article that U.S. officials *themselves* state that the term military style weapons "*could be applied to every gun and rifle because all are based on military designs.*" This key statement reveals that the *true intent* of P.L. 87-297 is to completely disarm all American citizens. P.L. 87-297 actually is an authorization to disarm all law-abiding citizens because it uses the word *armaments*. The word *armament* is a military term. The people are the militia and they do own military style weapons and armaments! P.L. 87-297 has never been rescinded! Instead, it was reaffirmed under President George H. Bush! Federal officials who enacted P.L. 87-297:

(a) knew all the while that "every gun and rifle" is "based on military designs". In the Washington Times article they have admitted that we could lose all of our guns since the phrasing of the term military style weapons "*could be applied to every gun and rifle because all are based on military designs*"; and

(b) caught themselves in their own trap with P.L. 87-297, their prized law and quiet policy. It has been waiting for the day to come to prohibit all U.S. guns. Its wording can also wipe out the series of so-called protective "concessions" which negotiators today use as "people pacifiers". So there you have it! The concessions are not

there "to protect the constitutional right of Americans to own arms"!

Please note in the article that whenever it suits their need, government officials will admit that the Second Amendment *does* protect the right of the people to keep and bear arms, but whenever it suits their purpose, the meaning of the Second Amendment gets changed around to suit the occasion! In the Washington Times article, for once, *the truth* regarding the Second Amendment was told so that the negotiators would look good to the American public even though they signed into this dangerous Accord. The intent was to bamboozle the people because entry into the worldwide disarmament Accord was 'too telling' and bold a first step for allowing foreign-

ers to eliminate firearms of U.S. citizens.

Point #4: Legislators who enact domestic anti-gun laws are quietly assured that they are legitimized by P.L. 87-297. The D.O.J. has assisted anti-gun legislators nationwide in order to support enactment of domestic anti-gun laws.

When it is time to drop the concessions during the mop-up-second step, the meaning of the Second Amendment will *return* to the perverted interpretations that we have been hearing from the U.S. Department of Justice and others. At home the Second Amendment is given an opposite meaning than what is shown in the Washington Times article. For example, the U.S. Justice Department representatives, Ronnie L. Edelman,

and Seth P. Waxman have both issued their own statement which illustrates the point as follows:

(a) "*The current state of federal law does not recognize that the Second Amendment protects the right of private citizens to possess firearms of any type. Instead, the Second Amendment is deemed to be a collective right belonging to the state, not to an individual.... With this understanding in mind, the source of a citizen's authority to possess a handgun has never been particularly identified in American Law.*" (Ronnie L. Edelman, U.S. Dept. of Justice)

(b) "*.... it does not create a personal right to own or use a gun.... In light of the constitutional history, it must be considered as settled that there is no personal constitutional*

right under the Second Amendment to own or use a gun." (Seth P. Waxman, U.S. Dept. of Justice)

Point #5: Unfortunately, because gun owners do not know how to handle such double-dealing convolutions, the trap remains set for them and their right to arms. to soon fall into the hands of international communist dictators! There is no way that U.S. negotiators would have entered this Accord unless our own government could beguile the people!

Now you have all the points to put together on your own! Check over the attachments hereto.

Do you really believe that the federal government or the U.N. itself will allow only Americans worldwide to keep and bear arms?