



Department of Political Science  
Master's Degree in International Relations  
Chair of History of the Americas

**The Right to Keep and Bear Arms Dilemma.  
The Second Amendment between Constitution, History and Politics.**

**ABSTRACT**

SUPERVISOR  
Prof. Gregory Alegi  
ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR  
Prof. Andrea Ungari

CANDIDATE  
Francesca Greco  
Student ID 621072

ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/2014

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	8
Chapter I - The Origins of the Amendment.....	12
1. <i>Starring of the Debate</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 13
2. <i>Back to the Mother-Country: Britain, Militia and Arms</i> <b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	<b>16</b>
3. <i>To have Arms: From duty to right</i> .....	19
4. <i>Militia and Arms in the Colonies</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 22
5. <i>Redskins and Blacks</i> .....	24
6. <i>The Boston turning point</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 28
7. <i>Building the Amendment</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 32
8. <i>The destiny of the militia</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 39
Chapter II - The Amendment in Courts and Codes .....	44
1. <i>A difficult comprehension (or Much Ado about...a comma)</i> <b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	<b>45</b>
2. <i>The Supreme Court Rulings</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 49
2.1 <i>UNITED STATES v. CRUIKSHANK AND PRESSER v. ILLINOIS</i> <b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	<b>50</b>
2.2 <i>UNITED STATES v. MILLER AND OTHER 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY CASES</i> .....	54
2.3 <i>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA v. HELLER</i> <b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	<b>58</b>
2.4 <i>MCDONALD v. CHICAGO</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 62
3. <i>States' Right to Keep and Bear Arms</i> .....	64
4. <i>The five Ws of firearms</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 69
5.1 <i>Right to Carry Laws</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 73
Chapter III - Reds vs. Blues on Gun Rights .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>
1. <i>The Democratic Party</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 80
1.1 <i>Now is The Time</i> .....	86
2. <i>The Grand Old Party</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 91
2.1 <i>James Brady, a Republican against guns</i> . <b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	<b>97</b>
3. <i>Organizing for Guns</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 99
3.1 <i>The National Rifle Association</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b> 101
3.1 <i>Mayors Against Illegal Guns</i> .....	105

Chapter IV - The Dark Side of the Second Amendment	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	108
1. <i>Guns in Numbers</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	110
2. <i>A Bloody 21<sup>st</sup> century</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	114
3. <i>Sandy Hook Elementary School</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	117
4. <i>Searching for rationale...and scapegoats</i>	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	120
5. <i>Where is the problem?</i> .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	122
5.1 Background Checks and Gun Shows .....		125
5.2 Keeping firearms at home .....		129
5.3 Assault Weapons: from trenches to houses	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	133
Conclusion .....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	138
Appendix I - Firearms Glossary .....		145
Appendix II - School Shootings in the United States of America (1990-2014).	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	151
Appendix III - Firearms Used in the Shootings.	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	162
Appendix IV - Firearms Regulation in Italy.....	<b>Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.</b>	167
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....		1671

On December 14, 2012 in Newtown, CT, something happened that shocked the United States of America and the world. An armed 20-year-old boy, after having killed his own mother, entered in Sandy Hook Elementary School and fatally shot twenty children and six adults working at the school. It all happened in a rush. Five minutes of hell. Then, Adam Lanza killed himself. The firearms used in the massacre have been legally purchased by his mother were kept at home, accessible to the young boy with mental problems.

After the Virginia Tech massacre in 2007, where Seung-Hui Cho, 23, killed 32 students before committing suicide, Newtown is the deadliest school shooting in U.S. history and it holds the record for number of young victims. There are three shared features between the two cases: a) the disturbed personality of the perpetrators, b) the extremely easy access they had to firearms, c) the handful of seconds it took to accomplish both the massacres – 11 minutes per 30 people and 5 minutes per 26 – something made possible by the semi-automatic arms used by Adam and Cho.

Unfortunately, those of Blacksburg and Newtown are not isolated episodes of madness resulting in this type of violence. Statistics report that there have been more than 200 school shootings in the United States since 1990 – 74 of which after Sandy Hook. The most interesting figure is that in the 59% of cases, perpetrators were aged between 10 and 19 – which means that in many circumstances they had not the legal age to possess a firearm – while the 69% of victims were aged between 10 and 19.

The Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, recognizes to American citizens the individual right to keep and bear arms. However, these numbers together with horrific cases of last 15 years culminated in the senseless slaughter of defenseless children in Newtown renewed and gave new strength to a fifty-year long debate on gun control and to the call for restrictions over the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. In particular, Americans wonder what kind of arms the Second Amendment gives the right to *keep and bear* and complain

the effectiveness of Federal control on the purchase of arms. The outcome has been a fight between gun enthusiasts and gun control advocates that invested both the political and the legal field, giving the Amendment a new relevance and putting it under the spotlight.

Due to the renewed attention on the right to keep and bear arms in the U.S., the purpose of this thesis is to observe the evolution of the Second Amendment since its adoption, walking through its legal path and its role in the political debate. Subsequently focusing on the effects of the – almost unrestricted – right, the reasoning will try to show that today the Amendment is one of the greatest anachronism in American society. It has been voided of its initial significance and vested of a purely political meaning, ignoring what could be the consequences suffered by innocent people.

The Second Amendment, one of the ten composing the Bill of Rights, states, “A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.” On closer view, it is clear that the amendment is composed by two separate parts, apparently unmatched. The first one protects a collective right (i.e. the right of the states to maintain a well-regulated militia), the other recognizes an individual right to possess and use arms. Two different subjects, two different objectives. What was the real intent of the Framers? Is it an individual or collective right? If so, who can really keep arms and to what kind of arms the amendment refers? The most notably ancestor of the right contained in the Second Amendment is the historical evolution of the militia in the mother country and the statement of the right to keep arms in the English Bill of Rights of 1689. This document read in the second part “That the Subjects, which are Protestants, may provide and keep Arms for their common Defence.” Instead of the assertion that Protestants “*should* provide and keep arms”, the Bill states that Protestants “*may* provide and keep arms”. Although superficially identical, this change was substantial. It meant that keeping arms was no longer a positive *duty* but a *right*. As Protestants began to sail toward the New World, they brought with them a heritage that would have taken roots overseas.

In 1776 The thirteen colonies were summoned to participate to the first Continental Congress and were asked to adopt Constitutions or Bill of Rights. Not all of them did so. The most notable works, useful for this analysis, that became the models on which the framers would rely upon in 1791, were the documents adopted in Virginia, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. The different points of view and preeminence they gave the militia either the right to have arms influenced the final writing of the amendment. In Virginia, George Mason preferred to preserve the role of Militia, rejecting the proposal of Thomas Jefferson for an individual right to keep arms. This idea was adopted, instead, in Pennsylvania Bill of Rights where people were recognized a right to bear arms “for the defense of themselves and the State”. This meant that individuals were entitled to carry arms for personal protection. The term “bear arms” was not limited to bearing arms in a military force. Bearing arms for self-defense is “a right” of “the people”, while bearing arms in a military unit was not “a right”. In Massachusetts, John Adams, main drafter of the state’s Bill of Rights, chose a different manner to cope with the issue of arms and militia by recognizing for the first time a right to “keep” as well as to “bear” arms. It seems that by using both the verbs, Adams wanted to grant at the same time a right of both the people and the militia. Adams’ mistake that brought to reject his proposal was to qualify the entire provision by recognizing it only for “common defense”, which was a limitation nullifying any individual right.

Once the Constitution had been drafted, the ratification by the thirteen states was the next necessary step. However, the Anti-Federalist components in Virginia and New York – the two major states in America – made it impossible for the new text to enter into force. They accepted only thanks to the promise of a Bill of Rights, to be drafted after the ratification. The first amendment proposed by James Madison in 1789 was about the right to keep and bear arms and the militia, indeed. He proposed a solution that put together both provisions, being aware that the militia statement alone would be unacceptable for groups claiming an individual right and that an

amendment proposing the sole individual right to keep and bear arms would have not been accepted by militia supporters. Hence, the Second Amendment was the outcome of an attempt to please both Federalists and Anti-Federalists, Radicals and Conservatives, Northerners and Southerners. To consider the two parts as a single piece would not enable us to understand its real intentions. Thinking of them as depending on each other would be an error. In particular, to take the right to arms subsumed within militia recognition would annihilate what was intended as an individual right. The Second Amendment represented a bridge between the declining past of domination and the liberal democracy of the future.

However, now that the United States of America has become the liberal democracy par excellence, now that the bridge has been crossed, how do we have to consider the Second Amendment?

Since the adoption of the Second Amendment, in fact, history has gone forward and society and culture developed. The context in which the right to keep and bear arms can be exercised by American citizens has completely changed. Nevertheless, the Second Amendment still stands with its uncertainties and syntactical misunderstandings. Decade after decade, conflicting interpretations came out. Is it a State right? Of the people? And if so, which people? What can they keep and bear? Americans in the twentieth century have wondered what right was actually described in those two lines, detecting the intentions of Founding Fathers and at the same time trying to understand the complex syntax of the amendment. The Supreme Court played a fundamental role during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century in orienting the understanding of the amendment, even though groping in the darkness of uncertainty for too long. After important cases related to the Second Amendment like *Cruikshank*, *Presser* and *Miller*, the SC came to a clear and univocal interpretation just in 2008 in the case *District of Columbia v. Heller*. In D.C., a 1976 Firearms Control Regulation Act (FCRA) was approved that banned handguns and semiautomatic weapons and imposed the registration of

all already owned firearms. After 30 years, this Act came under the attention of the Supreme Court thanks to Dick Anthony Heller challenging its constitutionality. Heller, a licensed Police Officer in the Federal District, who could carry a gun in federal buildings for his job, was not permitted to register or obtain a license to keep a handgun at home for self-defense, what was considered a violation of the Second Amendment. In April 2008, the Heller case was brought before the Supreme Court, which declared the FCRA unconstitutional. Senior Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, the longest-serving justice and anchor of the Court's conservative wing made a long and detailed analysis in order to prove that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to keep and bear arms. Highlighting lexical and historical evidences of the individual character of the right, he was able to prove his point in such a way that with a vote of 5 to 4 the SCOTUS for the first time declared that the right enshrined in the Amendment is individual and as such Federal law cannot violate it.

The legal path of the right to keep and bear arms continued after *Heller* with another important case in 2010, *McDonald v. Chicago*. In 1982, Chicago became the only city in the 20<sup>th</sup> century to follow the example of the District of Columbia by passing a law banning handgun possession. After the landmark decision in *Heller*, the 1982 law came under attention thanks to some Chicago residents. Among these, Otis McDonald, a 76 year-old man, who after having suffered several robberies decided to purchase a handgun for self-defense, what was prohibited by the 1982 law. Similarly to Heller, the case reached the Supreme Court. This time the question was if the guarantee contained in the Constitution was applicable also to state and local government. In a 5 to 4 decision, again the Federal Court ruled in favor of the plaintiff, declaring the Second Amendment incorporated in the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause. After *McDonald*, all the states had to adapt their constitutions to the decision, recognizing the individual right of the citizens – for



example in Kansas, the only state where the right to keep and bear arms was still recognized only for “common defense”.

After having seen the origins of the Amendment and how it was officially recognized as an individual right, is possible to move on a practical field in order to understand *what* kind of weapons American citizens can own and *who* can purchase firearms and *where* they can be brought. The 1934 National Firearms Act (NFA) and the 1968 Gun Control Act (GCA), respectively Title II and Title I of Federal firearms law, define the term “firearms” as machine guns, rifles, shotguns, silencers, destructive devices (DDs) and any other weapon (AOW). The GCA added two further categories of firearms, i.e. short-barreled shotguns (SBSs), short-barreled rifles (SBRs). Today machineguns, silencers, DDs, SBSs, SBRs and AOW, referred to as “NFA weapons” or “Title II” weapons, encounter several restrictions at Federal level as they require registration with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE), a background check of the applicant and the payment of a \$200 tax for making and transferring. In 1986, the Firearms Owners’ Protection Act (FOPA) banned civilians from owning and transferring new machineguns. Nevertheless, according to the FOPA, an unlicensed civilian may acquire a machine gun with the approval of the BATF, paying the required tax. About “who” can possess firearms, the GCA rules that it is unlawful purchase any firearms or ammunition to any person which (a) is under indictment or has been convicted of, a crime punishable with imprisonment; (b) is a fugitive from justice; (c) is an unlawful user of or addicted to marihuana or any depressant or drug; or (d) has been adjudicated as a mental defective or has been committed to any mental institution. In order to verify if a person is eligible for the ownership of a firearm, he or she has to submit to a Federal background check in order to prove that he or she does not belong to any of these categories.

Last thing to explain is where firearms can be brought. Each state has its own regulations about areas in which arms are not allowed. Most of the U.S. colleges prohibit carrying guns in their

premises. Nevertheless, there are some states where students and personnel are permitted to bring firearms in classrooms, campus grounds, dormitories or parking lots. Only in eleven states, the law prohibits to carry guns on campuses.

Another aspect to consider is *how* to keep and bear arms. In fact, weapons can be carried concealed or openly. Individual states regulate in a different manner the right to carry a concealed weapon, depending on whether a permit/license is required and whether the issuing authorities *shall* or *may* grant it. In particular, states can be guarded as “Shall-issue” – meaning that upon completion of specified requirements, a law-abiding person shall be granted a permit to carry concealed firearms – “May-issue” – meaning the authorities have some discretion over the issuance of a carry permit – “No-issue” – where State law completely prohibits carrying firearms for personal protection outside the home or place of business. The majority of states are Shall-issue states (36). Open carry, instead, often requires a permit and it may be restricted only to some specific areas and in several states where carrying a weapon in plain sight is illegal. Opinion over open carry, indeed, is heavily divided. The dispute between concealed and open carry is over which one is more effective in deterring crime. Open-carry supporters stand that a criminal could be more easily discouraged in committing a crime if aware that the potential target is armed. Nowadays, however, concealed carry is the basic right-to-carry-law as long as considered more effective in reducing crime and violence. Nevertheless, concealed or in plain sight, recent events proved that Americans can easily own a gun and either option seems not to discourage criminals and psychopaths from grabbing whatever type of firearm and perpetrate the heinous crimes that in last years have shocked the United States and the world.

Indeed, the massacres occurred in last 15 years, renewed the debate over the right to keep and bear arms, especially at national level. The right represents, indeed, one of the main topic of modern political debate between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. The two major U.S.

parties showed different position on the matter since the 1968, year of the adoption of the Gun Control Act and, thus, the year in which the right of the Second Amendment began to be a recurrent protagonist of the parties' platforms. The Democratic Party has always been on the side of the gun control advocates, fighting especially for restriction on assault weapons and for the registration of firearms. Two elements the conservative party opposed, especially the latter. Barack Obama two presidential elections came in particular moments in the timeline of gun massacres in the U.S.A. Few months after the Virginia Tech massacre the first, few after Aurora Movie Theater bloodbath the second. Gun control has always been a main objective of the 44<sup>th</sup> President of the U.S.A. His commitment improved even more after the Sandy Hook massacre in December 2012. With the program "Now Is The Time", Obama showed several problem raised by the increasing in numbers of school shooting in the U.S. and put important objectives in gun control that were traduced in 23 *executive* actions that should have been transformed in *legislative* ones.

Indeed, the first attempt was made in March 2013 with the introduction in the Congress of a proposal for the renewal of the ban on assault weapon – expired and not repeated in 2004. However, it was actually a harsh defeat for the Presidency and the Democratic Party, since the ban failed to pass in the Senate in April. President Obama blamed the National Rifle Association for the defeat, accusing the pro-gun organization to have lied about the proposed ban, convincing conservative Senators to vote against it. The NRA is the greatest and most powerful interest group in the United States of America. Founded in 1871, the NRA's goal was to improve the marksmanship of its members. Then, after the WWII the power of the organization incredibly increased and after the approval of the 1968 GCA it began to assume also a political role. In 1975, it created the Institute for Legislative Action (ILA), the lobbying group of the NRA, which set forth the entrance in politics of the organization. With the election of George W. Bush, the most pro-gun President, it reached the peak of its political power. It works especially to block any type of gun control measure.

To this aim, for six years it successfully blocked the passage of the Brady Act (Handgun Violence Prevention Act), which was finally approved by Clinton in 1993, representing a big defeat for the conservative organization. On the other hand, the latest success has been the failure of the ban on assault weapon in 2013.

The NRA is biggest star in the constellation of national organizations focusing on the right to keep and bear arms. Some are pro-gun, other fight for control measures. An example is the organization Mayors Against Illegal Guns that created by the former mayor of New York, Bloomberg that gathers mayors all around the United States. Those who decide to adhere, have to pursue a program aiming at reducing crime through the adoption of measures like the extension of background check requirements to online sales and gun shows and support local state and federal legislation that targets illegal guns.

The large number of organizations gathering groups pro or against gun rights, help understand the importance of the right to keep and bear arms for American society. But what is the price of this fight compromising possibilities of legislative actions?

Reports of murders are in the news every day, everywhere. Crimes committed through any type of weapon, knives, hammers, and baseball bats, objects killers can easily find at home, in the kitchen or in a closet. One or two persons are the victims. Nevertheless, what if the weapon that the murderer can *easily find at home*, in a drawer, under the bed or in the wardrobe is a handgun or a carbine rifle and targets are defenseless children and students? In the U.S., the average number of civilian firearms is 270,000,000 out of a population around 305,000,000 (2005). Gun owners are around 85,000,000, which means that 3 in 4 Americans have two or more guns. Repeated studies have shown that the presence of a gun boosts the risk of gun-related violence and incidents in the home. Like the one that occurred in Detroit, MI on January, 2014 when a 4-year-old girl playing in the back bedroom of a home with her equal-in-age cousin found a rifle – loaded and unlocked –

underneath the bed. She took it, pointed at the young boy and pulled the trigger killing him. That of Detroit is just one of the more recent gun-related death news.

In last 15 years there have been three different cases shocking the U.S.A. The first one was that of Columbine High School in 1999, when Eric Harris (18) and Dylan Klebold (17) armed with semi-automatic firearms and explosives entered in the school and killed 13 students before committing suicide. In 2007, Seung-Hui Cho, 23, armed with a Glock 9mm and a .22 caliber handgun, slaughtered 32 students at Virginia Tech in April 2007. Then, in December 2012, there was the last shocking case occurred in Newtown.

These three cases highlight fundamental flaws in the American system that are the ineffectiveness of the background check system and the easy way in which they came in possess with the weapons they used in the massacres. In fact, while Eric and Dylan had not the legal age to purchase firearms – and resorted to a straw purchase – both Cho and Adam were diagnosed with mental problems, thus ineligible to lawfully possess arms. Indeed, the former was also able to pass the background check and legally purchase his two handguns, while Lanza had an indisputable free access to any kind of weapon collected by his mother and stored at home.

Hence, background check system, the type of firearms that civilians can own and the possibility to store them at home can be considered the main problems in the American system leading to so many horrific massacres.

What seems to be very clear from this analysis is how deeply rooted the foundations of the dispute are and how this issue has assumed such characteristics that it seems nearly impossible to overcome. what seems very clear is that the Second Amendment's meaning has radically changed. It is no more the symbol of the freedom and of the fight against the oppressor it used to be in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is rather a shield protecting a form of silent anarchy. The fight for the defense of gun rights, indeed, shows a mistrust towards the Federal Government and makes people reluctant

to give up their right. They prefer to provide for their own defense rather than rely on something far and unknown like a central regime. Another important aspect resulting from this study is the fact that the Amendment has lost his historical value in favor of a complete politicization. In the last fifty years, the right to keep and bear arms became important protagonist of political debate, to such an extent as to become a key feature in the profile of politicians. The powerful forces it is able to move, like the NRA, and the influence this issue can exercises makes the Second Amendment an important piece on the table of political game. At this point, one could wonder what would have happened if in 2008 the Supreme Court would have counted five Democrat Justices and four Republicans, instead of the contrary.

However, the outcome is that now American citizens are legally recognized the right to have arms for their defense. But this is not the only way they can use their *legal* arms. Indeed, the main problem is that all the massacres happened in last years have been committed with arms legally purchased by people that should not have been in possess of firearms. It is true what they say, “guns do not kill people; people with guns do it.” But it is also true that American system, with all its gaps and compromises, makes it so much easier.

Actually, an aspect that leaps out from this analysis is the powerlessness of the Federal government to manage the difficult situation related to firearms. Due to the preemptive power of the states, the central government’s possibilities to curtail the problem of background check, for example, are very little. The decision to collaborate or not with FBI, in fact, is up to the states. However, even in this case the suspicion against the real intentions of Federal enclaves discourage states to give them important information that could save lives.

The Second Amendment is one of the most dangerous anachronisms in American history. It has been violently uprooted from its original context and decade after decade it has been given new meanings to adapt to different situations, becoming at the end what it is today, an individual right

like those of speech, of religion or to assemble declared by the First Amendment. America has always been a country at the forefront, the republic of freedom, leader of the democratic world, and yet it is stuck in a historical legacy from which it cannot get away.

The dilemma raised by the Second Amendment proves that the United States has one foot forward and one rooted in the past.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Bills, Constitutions, Code and Cases

102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, *Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement of 1994 - H.R.3355*, Title XI, section 110102 Consolidated Appropriations Act 2010, Pub. L. No. 111–117, 123 Stat. 3128-3129 (2009)

103<sup>rd</sup> Congress, *Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act - H.R. 4296*, Sec. 2, b. May 16, 1994.

109<sup>th</sup> Congress, *Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act - S.397*, Section 5. “Child Safety Locks”, February 15, 2005

111<sup>th</sup> Congress, *Ammunition Management for More Obtainability Act of 2013 – S. 843*, April 25, 2013

111<sup>th</sup> Congress, *To repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force H.R. 2324*, June 11, 2013

112<sup>th</sup> Congress, *Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act - H.R.1025*, section 02, November 29, 1993

Alabama Constitution, Article I, section 26

Bill of Rights of the United States of America, 1791

California Penal Code, Title 3, Division 10, Ch. 2 §30500 et sq.

Chicago, IL, Municipal Code, section 8-20-040 (a) 2009, cited in Rose, V. “Summary of the recent McDonald v. Chicago gun case”

*Commonwealth v. Depina*, 922 N.E. 2d 778 (2010)

Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Article XVII

Constitution of the United States of America, 1789

Council Directive 91/477/EEC of 18 June 1991 on control of the acquisition and possession of weapons”, September 9, 1991

*District of Columbia v. Heller*, Supreme Court, 554 U.S.

English Bill of Rights, 1689, The Avalon Project, Yale Law School,



Firearms Directive, February 6, 2014, *European Commission – Enterprises and Industries*.

Firearms Owners Protection Act, Public Law 99-308, 1986

Gun Control Act, U.S.C. Ch. 44 (1968)

Hawaii Constitution, Article 1, section 17, 1959

Hening's Statutes at Large: Laws of Virginia, vol. 05

*Kansas Bill of Rights*, Kansas State Library

Minnesota State Firearms Laws, August 1994

National Firearms Act, 26 U.S.C. Ch. 53 (1934)

Ohio Constitution, Art. VIII, section 20, 1802; Pennsylvania Constitution, Art.1, section 21, 1790

Supreme Court of the United States, *McDonald v. Chicago* 561 U.S. 742 (2010)

Supreme Court of the United States, *Presser v. Illinois*, 116 U.S. 252 (1879)

Supreme Court of the United States, *United States v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

Supreme Court of the United States, *United States v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 174 (1939)

*The Grand Remonstrance*, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1641

The Militia Act, May 2, 1792

### Books

Amar, Akhil R., *America's Constitution: a Biography*. New York: Random House, 2005

Boorstin, Daniel J., *The Americans--The Colonial Experience*, n.p.: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2010

Carter, Gregg L., *Guns in American Society: An Encyclopedia of History, Politics, Culture and Law – Second Edition*, Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2012

Charles Lane, *The Day Freedom Died: The Colfax Massacre, the Supreme Court, and the Betrayal of Reconstruction*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2008

Charles, Patrick J., *The Second Amendment: the intent and its interpretation by states and the Supreme Court*, Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company Inc., Publishers, 2009

Cogan, Neal H., ed. *The complete Bill of Rights: The Drafts, Debates, Sources, & Origins*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997

Cooper, Jerry, *The Rise of the National Guard: The Evolution of the American Militia, 1865-1920*, University of Nebraska Press, 1997

Corey – Fairbank, eds. *Statutes of Ohio and of the Northwestern Territory adopted or enacted from 1788 to 1833, vol.I*, Cincinnati, 1833

Cottrol, Robert J., *Gun Control and the Constitution. Sources and Explorations on the Second Amendment*, New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1994

Cushing, H. A., ed. *Writings of Samuel Adams*, vol. 1, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904

Dinan, John, "State Constitutional Development", *The Book of the States 2011*, Council of State Governments, 2011

Doubler, Michael D., *The National Guard: an illustrated history of Americas citizen-soldiers*, Dulles: Potomac Books, Inc., 2007

Elliot, Johnatan, *The debates in the several state conventions on the adoption of the Constitution*, Washington, 1836

Finkelman, Paul, *The Slavery and the Founder: Race and Liberty in the Age of Jefferson*, New York: M.E. Shape, Inc., 2001

Halbrook, Stephen P., *The Founders' Second Amendment, Origins of the Right to Bear Arms*, Oakland, California: The Independent Institute, 2012

Hasday, Judy L., *Forty-Nine Minutes of Madness: The Columbine High School Shooting*, Melrose Park: Enslow Publishers, Inc., 2013

Hibbert, C., *Cavaliers and Roundheads*, New York: HarperCollins, 1994

Jones, Maldwyn A., *The Limits of Liberty*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997

Kates, Don B. Jr., "Handgun Prohibition and the Original Meaning of the Second Amendment", *Gun Control and the Constitution*, Cottrol, Robert J., ed. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1994

Kessler, Ron, *In the President's Secret Service*, New York: Crown Publishers, 2009

Machiavelli, N., *The Prince*, translated by Marriott W.K., London: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952-1954

Malcom, Joyce L., *To Keep and Bear Arms: The Origins of an Anglo-American Right*, Harvard University Press, 1996

Nixon, Richard, *Seize the Moment*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992

Poore, Perley, *The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and other Organic laws of the United States*, Washington: Union: Lawbook Exchange Ltd, 2003, vol.1

Schulman, Neil J., "The Unabridged Second Amendment", The New Gun Week and Second Amendment Foundation, 1991

Skeen, Carl Edward, *Citizen Soldiers in the War of 1812*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999

Streissguth, T. *District of Columbia V. Heller: The Right to Bear Arms Case*, Melrose Park: Lake Book Manufacturing, Inc., 2011

Welford, Charles F. et al., *Firearms and Violence: A Critical Review*, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2004

Wilson, Harry L., "Open Carry Laws", in Carter, Gregg L., *Guns in American Society*, 2012

### Academic Journals

Baron, Dennis, Guns and Grammar: The Linguistic of The Second Amendment, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the The Law and Society Association, Grand Hyatt, Denver, Colorado, May 25, 2009

Feller, P.B – Gotting, K.L., "The Second Amendment: a Second Look". *Northwestern University Law Review* 46, (1966-1967)

Fields, W.S., Hardy, D.T., "The Militia and the Constitution: A Legal History" *Military Law Review* 136 , 1992

Frye, Brian L., "The peculiar case of United States v. Miller", *N.Y.U. Journal of Law & Liberty*, 2008

Hardy, David T., "The Second Amendment and the Historiography of the Bill of Rights", *4 Journal of Law & Politics*, 1987

Kopel, D., Cramer, C., "State Court Standards of Review for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms", *50 Santa Clara Law Review*, Santa Clara University, 2010

Kopel, David B., The Supreme Court thirty-five other gun cases: what Supreme Court has said about the Second Amendment, *Saint Louis University Public Review*, 1999

Lawrence, Michael A., Second Amendment Incorporation through the Fourteenth Amendment Privileges or Immunities and Due Process Clauses, *Missouri Law Review*, 2007

Malcom, Joyce L., The Supreme Court and the Uses of History: *District of Columbia v. Heller*, *56 UCLA Law Review*, 2009: 1388

Vandercay, David E., "The History of the Second Amendment", *Valparaiso Univ. Law Review*, 1994

## Reports and Programs

“Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics”, *U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation* at: <http://www.ucrdatatool.gov/Search/Crime/State/RunCrimeStatebyState.cfm>

European Commission, Possible advantages and disadvantages of reducing the classification to two categories of firearms (prohibited or authorized) with a view to improving the functioning of the internal market for the products in question through simplification, Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, Brussels 2012.

GAO, *Gun Control. Sharing Promising Practices and Assessing Incentives Could Better Position Justice to Assist States in Providing Records for Background Checks*, July 2012

Mass Shooting at Virginia Tech, April 16, 2007. Report of the Review Panel Presented to Governor Kaine, Commonwealth of Virginia, August 2007

Mayors Against Illegal Guns, *Analysis of Recent Mass Shootings*, January 2013. Accessed on August 21, 2014 at: <http://s3.amazonaws.com/s3.mayorsagainstillegalguns.org/images/analysis-of-recent-mass-shootings.pdf>

Office of the State’s Attorney Judicial District of Danbury, Report of the State’s Attorney for the Judicial District of Danbury on the Shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School and 36 Yogananda Street, Newtown, Connecticut on December 14, 2012, November 25, 2013

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Columbine High School Massacre: The FBI Files*, 2007

The White House, Now is the Time: The President’s Plan to Protect Our Children and Our Communities by Reducing Gun Violence 10, Jan. 16, 2013

The Republican Party Platform of 1960, July 25, 1960, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25839>

The Democratic Party Platform of 1972, July 10, 1972, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29605>

The Republican Party Platform of 1972, August 21, 1972, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25842>

The Democratic Party Platform of 1976, July 12, 1976, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29606>

The Republican Party Platform of 1976, August 18, 1976, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=>

The Republican Party Platform of 1980, July 15, 1980, *American Presidency Project* at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25844>

The Democratic Party Platform of 1984, July 16, 1984, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29608>

The Republican Party Platform of 1984, August 16, 1988, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25846>

The Democratic Party Platform of 1992, July 13, 1992, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29610>

The Republican Party Platform of 1996, August 16, 1996, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25848>

The Republican Party Platform of 2000, July 31, 2000, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25849>

The Democratic Party Platform of 2000, August 14, 2000, *American Presidency Project* at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=2961>

The Republican Party Platform of 2004, August 30, 2004, *American Presidency Project*, at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25850>

The Democratic Party Platform of 2008, August 25, 2008, *American Presidency Project* at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=78283>

The Democratic Party Platform of 2012, September 3, 2012, *American Presidency Project* at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=101962>

### Newspapers

“Child killer gun charges brought”, March 3, 2000, *BBC News*, at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/664341.stm>

“Everytown for gun safety”, *Mike Bloomberg*, at: <http://www.mikebloomberg.com/index.cfm?objectid=BF28B050-C29C-7CA2-F414FC3F9EC99945>

“Georgia Republican Says New 'Guns Everywhere' Law A 'God-Given' Right”, February 7, 2014, *Huffington Post*. Accessed on September 10, 2014 at: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/07/02/paul-broun-guns\\_n\\_5551757.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/07/02/paul-broun-guns_n_5551757.html)

“Gun Show Rules and Gun Laws”, n.d., *About.com*, at: <http://usgovinfo.about.com/blgunshow.htm>

“Guns in America: the impact of having more guns in our society”, February 12, 2013 *Numbersleuth*, at: <http://www.numbersleuth.org/guns/>

“H.R. 2324: Worse than S.843?”, May 11, 2009, *NRA-ILA*, at: <http://www.nraila.org/news-issues/fact-sheets/2009/hr-2324-worse-than-s-843.aspx>

“How they were equipped that day”, November 25, 2009, *CNN*, at:  
[http://edition.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2000/columbine.cd/Pages/EQUIPMENT\\_TEXT.htm](http://edition.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2000/columbine.cd/Pages/EQUIPMENT_TEXT.htm)

“John Kerry on Gun Control”, August 8, 2014, *OnTheIssue*, at:  
[http://www.ontheissues.org/domestic/John\\_Kerry\\_Gun\\_Control.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/domestic/John_Kerry_Gun_Control.htm)

“Killer’s manifesto: ‘You forced me into a corner’”, April 18, 2007, *CNN*, at:  
<http://edition.cnn.com/2007/US/04/18/vtech.shooting/>

“Mayors Against the Thune Amendment”, July 20, 2009, *Mike Bloomberg*, at:  
<http://www.mikebloomberg.com/index.cfm?objectid=F801FB8F-C29C-7CA2-F80CE3504D02DFE3>

“Protests in Denver Over Marilyn Manson Gig”, June 21, 2001 *abc News*, at:  
<http://abcnews.go.com/Entertainment/story?id=104105>

“Safe Storage & Gun Locks Policy Summary”, September 1, 2013, *Smart Gun Laws*, at:  
<http://smartgunlaws.org/safe-storage-gun-locks-policy-summary/>

“Sandy Hook shooting: What happened?”, December 18, 2012, *CNN*, at:  
<http://edition.cnn.com/interactive/2012/12/us/sandy-hook-timeline/>

“Santana School Shooter”, March 1, 2003, *abc News*, at:  
<http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/story?id=132072&page=1&singlePage=true>

“School Shootings in America since Sandy Hook” June 6, 2014, *Every Town for gun safety*. at:  
<http://everytown.org/article/schoolshootings/>

“The Eddie Eagle GunSafe”, October 30, 2003, *NRA Programs*, 2014 at: <http://eddieeagle.nra.org/>

“Thune Offers Concealed Carry Amendment to Defense Authorization Bill”, July 20, 2009, *John Thune – Press Release*, at: <http://www.thune.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/press-releases?ID=26677f6a-9285-43c0-8659-f390c282867e>

Alpers, Philip and Marcus Wilson, “2014. Japan Gun Facts, Figures and the Law” Sydney School of Public Health, The University of Sydney, *GunPolicy.org*, July 16, 2014, at:  
<http://www.gunpolicy.org/firearms/region/japan>

Associated Press, “NRA Defends Vitriol Towards Federal Agents/ Letter calls them ‘jack-booted thugs’”, May 1, 1995, *San Francisco Chronicle*, at: <http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/NRA-Defends-Vitriol-Toward-Federal-Agents-3034757.php>

Avlon, J. “What changed after the Reagan shooting”, March 30, 2011, *CNN*. Accessed on September 10, 2014 at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2011/OPINION/03/30/avlon.reagan.shooting>

Brown, D. L., “A 6-Year-Old Killer Who Had No Place To Call Home”, March 21, 2000, *Washington Post*, at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPcap/2000-03/21/085r-032100-idx.html>

CNN/ORC Poll, *December 17-18*, December 2012, at:  
<http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2012/images/12/19/cnnpoll.december19.4p.pdf>

Cocca, C., Khan, S., “‘Mass Murder’ Rampage near UC Santa Barbara”, May 25, 2014, *NBC Los Angeles*, at: <http://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/shooting-isla-vista-uc-santa-barbara-260505021.html>

Damron G., Zaniewski A., “4-year-old boy shot by 4-year-old cousin in Detroit”, January 17, 2014, *Detroit Free Press* at: <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/17/boy-fatally-shot-by-girl-cousin/4566727/>

E.B., “Lies, damned lies and statistics”, June 1, 2014, *The Economist*, at: <http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2014/06/gun-control-america>

Flegenheimer, M., “Final Report on Sandy Hook Killings Sheds New Light on Gunman’s Isolation”, December 27, 2013, *NY Times*, at [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/28/nyregion/with-release-of-final-sandy-hook-shooting-report-investigation-is-said-to-be-over.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/28/nyregion/with-release-of-final-sandy-hook-shooting-report-investigation-is-said-to-be-over.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0)

Garret, B. “Gun Shows”, n.d., *About news*, at: <http://civilliberty.about.com/od/guncontrol/a/Gun-Shows.htm>

Goode, E., “Even Defining ‘Assault Rifles’ is Complicated”, January 16, 2013, *NY Times*, at: [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/17/us/even-defining-assault-weapons-is-complicated.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/17/us/even-defining-assault-weapons-is-complicated.html?_r=0)

Hanson, Jason R., “How to Carry Concealed in a Restaurant”, *USACarry.com*, 2 August 2012 at: <http://www.usacarry.com/how-carry-concealed-restaurant/>

Heston, Charlton, “Charlton Heston My Cold DEAD Hands NRA Speech Low”, 26, July, 2000 at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BWCzEwWNNIc>

Jaslow, R. “Violent video games and mass violence: a complex link”, February 18, 2013, *CBS News*, at: <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/violent-video-games-and-mass-violence-a-complex-link/>

Jerreat, J., “Disturbing photo of toddler boy gnawing on handgun and Nancy Lanza's huge arsenal of weapons revealed”, December 28, 2013, *Daily Mail*, at: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2530239/Police-files-reveal-picture-gun-obsessed-mother-son-communicated-email-loved-shooting-together.html>

Kocieniewski, D., Gaetely, G., “Man Shoots 11, Killing 5 Girls, in Amish School”, October 3, 2006, *NY Times*, at: [http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/03/us/03amish.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/03/us/03amish.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0)

Krouse, William J., “Gun Control Legislation in 113rd Congress”, August 1, 2014, *Congressional Research Service*, at: <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42987.pdf>

Lane, H. “George W. Bush: Gun Control”, n.d., *HighBeam*, at: <http://www.highbeam.com/topics/george-w-bush-gun-control-t10126>

LaPierre, Wayne, “Remarks from the NRA press conference on Sandy Hooks school shooting, delivered Dec. 21, 2012 (transcript)”, December 21, 2012, *Washington Post*, at: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/remarks-from-the-nra-press-conference-on-sandy-hook-school-shooting-delivered-on-dec-21-2012-transcript/2012/12/21/bd1841fe-4b88-11e2-a6a6-aabac85e8036\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/remarks-from-the-nra-press-conference-on-sandy-hook-school-shooting-delivered-on-dec-21-2012-transcript/2012/12/21/bd1841fe-4b88-11e2-a6a6-aabac85e8036_story.html)

Love, David A., "Does Slavery have any Place in the Gun Control Debate", theGrio 23 January 2013 at: <http://thegrio.com/2013/01/23/does-slavery-have-any-place-in-the-gun-control-debate/>

Luo, M., "Mental Health and Guns: Do Background Check Do Enough?", April 19, 2007, *NY Times*, at: [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/19/us/19weapons.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/19/us/19weapons.html?_r=0)

Massachusetts Historical Society, *Boston Gazette*, September 26, 1768, p. 3, cols 1-2. At: [www.masshist.org/dorr/volume/2/sequence/271](http://www.masshist.org/dorr/volume/2/sequence/271)

McCaffrey, R. et al., "Five Killed at Pa. Amish School", October 3, 2006, *Washington Post*, at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/03/AR2006100300229.html>

Obama, Barack, "NRA Willfully lied", April 16, 2013, at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQGoyQ-TXwo>

Pankratz H., Simpson K., "Judge Gives Manes 6 years", November 13, 1999, *Denver Post*, <http://extras.denverpost.com/news/shot1113.htm>

Peters, J.W., "Bloomberg Plans a \$50 Million Challenge to the N.R.A.", April 15, 2014, *NY Times*, at: [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/16/us/bloomberg-plans-a-50-million-challenge-to-the-nra.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/16/us/bloomberg-plans-a-50-million-challenge-to-the-nra.html?_r=0)

Pitaniello, L., "George H.W. Bush: Gun Control", n.d., *HighBeam*, at: <http://www.highbeam.com/topics/george-hw-bush-gun-control-t10740>

Randall, K., "Minnesota: Ten killed in deadliest school shooting since Columbine massacre", March 23, 2005, *World Socialist Web Site (WSWS)*, at: <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2005/03/minn-m23.html>

Rose, V., "Summary of the recent McDonald v. Chicago gun case", August 20, 2010. Connecticut General Assembly at: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/>

Rosenblatt, R., "The killing of Kayla", March 5, 2000, *Time*, at: <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,40342,00.html>

Ross, B., Esposito, R., "First Gun Bought March, 13; No 'Spur of the Moment' Crime", April 17, 2007, *abc News*, at: [http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/headlines/2007/04/first\\_gun\\_bough/](http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/headlines/2007/04/first_gun_bough/)

Safire, W., "An Appeal for Repeal", June 10, 1999, *NY Times*, at: <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/06/10/opinion/essay-an-appeal-for-repeal.html>

Schmitt, R., "Badly flawed background check system fails to contain firearms sales", June 23, 2011, *The Center for Public Integrity*, at: <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2011/06/23/4982/badly-flawed-background-check-system-fails-contain-firearms-sales>

Stuckey, M., "College shooter's deadly rampage baffles friends", February 16, 2008, *NBC News*, at: [http://www.nbcnews.com/id/23171567/ns/us\\_news-crime\\_and\\_courts/t/college-shooters-deadly-rampage-baffles-friends/#.U-ZWSaOrMrQ](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/23171567/ns/us_news-crime_and_courts/t/college-shooters-deadly-rampage-baffles-friends/#.U-ZWSaOrMrQ)

Talmadge, E., "From Brazil to Japan: gun laws around the world", January 28, 2013, *The Christian Science Monitor*, at: <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Latest-News-Wires/2013/0128/From-Brazil-to-Japan-gun-laws-around-the-world>



Thurber, J., “James S. Brady, Reagan’s press secretary and survivor of 1981 shooting, dies at 73”, August 4, 2014, *The Washington Post*, at: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/james-s-brady-reagans-press-secretary-and-survivor-of-1981-shooting-dies-at-73/2014/08/04/4af0af70-c5da-11df-94e1-c5afa35a9e59\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/james-s-brady-reagans-press-secretary-and-survivor-of-1981-shooting-dies-at-73/2014/08/04/4af0af70-c5da-11df-94e1-c5afa35a9e59_story.html)

Ungar R., “Here Are The 23 Executive Orders On Gun Safety Signed Today By The President”, January 16, 2013, *Forbes*, at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/rickungar/2013/01/16/here-are-the-23-executive-orders-on-gun-safety-signed-today-by-the-president/>

### Websites

Assault Weapon Watch, at: <http://www.assaultweaponwatch.com/>

Brady Campaign, at: <http://www.bradycampaign.org/our-history>

Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, at: <http://www.csgv.org/>

Common Sense about Kids and Guns, at: <http://www.kidsandguns.org/>

Gun Control|Cato Institute, at: <http://www.cato.org/research/gun-control>

Gun Free Kids, at: <http://www.gunfreekids.org/>

Gun Law and Policy, at: [www.gunpolicy.org](http://www.gunpolicy.org)

Gun Owners of America, at: <http://www.gunowners.org/>

Handgunlaw.us, n.d., at: [www.Handgunlaw.us](http://www.Handgunlaw.us)

National Shooting Sports Foundation, at: <http://www.nssf.org/>

NRA Museum, at: <http://www.nramuseum.com/nra-gun-gurus.aspx>

NRA-ILA, n.d. at: <http://www.nraila.org/gun-laws.aspx>

OpenCarry.org, at: <http://www.opencarry.org/>

OpenCarry.org, at: [www.OpenCarry.org](http://www.OpenCarry.org)

Polizia di Stato, at [www.poliziadistato.it](http://www.poliziadistato.it)

Protest Easy Guns, at: <http://www.protesteasyguns.com>

Second Amendment Police Department, at: <http://www.2ampd.net/>

Second Amendment Sisters: Armed Informed Mothers March, at: <http://www.2asisters.org/>

Smart Gun Laws, at: <http://smartgunlaws.org/>

The National Rifle Association, at: <http://home.nra.org/home>

Women's Firearms Network, at: <http://www.womensshooters.com/>