

Gun-free zones fail; concealed carry works

F. Paul Valone
President, GRNC
(reprinted with permission)



If your state lawmakers killed legislation to protect students from slaughter, would you celebrate by saying, "I'm sure the university community is appreciative of the General Assembly's actions because this will help parents, students, faculty and visitors feel safe on our campus"?

This 2006 hubris was courtesy of Virginia Tech spokesman Larry Hincker¹; the legislation killed was House Bill 1572, which could have enabled concealed handgun permit-holders to protect themselves on college campuses; and harsh reality trumped Hincker's "feeling" of safety when Cho Seung-Hui murdered thirty-two at Virginia Tech.

When gun control advocates peddle their oft-failed schemes as solutions, they avoid mentioning details of three other school shootings where armed intervention saved lives without additional shots fired:

In Pearl, Mississippi,

assistant principal Joel Myrick stopped triple murderer Luke Woodham using a handgun retrieved from his car.²

In Edinboro, Pennsylvania, the 14-year-old who killed a teacher at an off-campus dance was captured by shotgun-wielding James Strand.³

And at Virginia's own Appalachian School of Law, student Tracy Bridges used his pistol to detain murderer Peter Odighizuwa.⁴

Beyond anecdotes, researchers John Lott and William Landes, then at Yale and the University of Chicago, respectively, studied multiple victim public shootings. Examining data from 1976 to 1995, they discovered the number of shootings in states which adopted concealed handgun laws declined by 84%, deaths plummeted by 90% and injuries by 82.5%.⁵

Crediting the reductions to deterrence (even suicidal maniacs avoid victims who shoot back), Lott and Landes called their findings "dramatic," concluding: "[T]he only policy factor to have a consistently significant influence on multiple victim public shootings is the passage of concealed

handgun laws."⁶

Like North Carolina, Virginia prohibits guns on campuses. But policies purporting to create "gun-free" zones actually increase victimization, found the researchers: "...states with the fewest gun free zones have the greatest reductions [in] killings, injuries, and attacks."⁷

Indeed, of eight major school rampages tracked by *The New York Times*, six occurred after enactment of the federal "Gun Free School Zones Act" in 1996.⁸

Said Lott, "Gun prohibitionists concede that banning guns around schools has not quite worked as intended—but their response has been to call for more regulation of guns. Yet what might appear to be the most obvious policy may actually cost lives. When gun-control laws are passed, it is law-abiding citizens, not would-be criminals, who adhere to them."⁹

Concealed carry in schools, while novel, is not untested: Utah has permitted it since 1995, further expanding it in 2004.^{10, 11} If you Google "Utah school shootings," you will find exactly none. Last week, the Tennessee state house voted to join them.¹²

Lest you picture drunken freshman shooting into the air at football games, understand that FBI background checks ensure permit-holders are age twenty-one and free of felonies, violent misdemeanors and demonstrated substance abuse. After twelve years under North Carolina's concealed handgun law, permit-holders have proven themselves sane, sober and law-abiding. Revocations run less the one tenth of one percent, most for reasons unrelated to guns.¹³

Moreover, the concept has support among academics: After the recent murders, Virginia Tech graduate research assistant Brad Wiles says, "My fears have been realized." He then quotes his unsuccessful appeal to the school's president last August: "The policy that forbids students who are legally licensed to carry in Virginia needs to be changed. I am qualified and capable of carrying a concealed handgun and urge you to work with me to allow my most basic right of self-defense, and eliminate entrusting my safety and the safety of my classmates to the government."¹⁴

When Wiles advocated

See CARRY on page 10

Is OSHA trying to kill the ammo industry?

Is OSHA trying to stop the public's ability to obtain to ammunition? Recently, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration announced a proposal to adopt some seemingly innocuous new regulations, which could have a

chilling impact on the manufacture and distribution of ammunition. OSHA intends to reclassify small arms ammunition as "explosives" and use the much more restrictive regulations regarding explosives to regulate the making

and shipping of all ammunition. If adopted as written, it would affect all ammunition manufacturers, shipping companies (such as UPS and FedEx) as well as small gun stores, big box stores, gun ranges and private reloading. Employers would be required to follow these proposed new regulations any time ammunition, percussion caps or powder is stored, manufactured, bought, sold or shipped. On July 6th, 2007 GrassRoots GunRights of SC sent out an Action Alert email to thousands of gun rights activists about this back door

attempt at gun control. Here are some of the points we made in our alert about these proposed new regulations:

The increased cost associated with compliance will force most businesses to stop selling ammunition and reloading supplies altogether, and may drive many ammunition manufacturers out of business. A few excerpts from the proposed new OSHA regulations are as follows:

§ 1910.109 Explosives.

Explosive means any device, or liquid or solid chemical compound or mixture, the primary or common purpose of which is to function by explosion. (i) The term "explosive" includes all material included as a Class 1 explosive by DOT in accordance with 49 CFR chapter I. The term includes, but is not limited to, dynamite, black powder, pellet powders, detonators, blasting agents, initiating explosives, blasting caps, safety fuse, fuse lighters, fuse igniters, squibs, cordeau detonant fuse, instantaneous fuse, igniter cord, igniters, pyrotechnics, special industrial explosive materials, small arms ammunition, small arms ammunition

See OSHA on page 4

Inside this Issue...

<i>Is OSHA trying to kill the ammo industry?</i>	1
<i>Gun-free zones fail; concealed carry works</i>	1
<i>President's Message</i>	2
<i>House Judiciary Committee Meets on H3964</i>	3
<i>Down Range</i>	4
<i>Lowcountry Goodwill Industries lacks good will</i>	5
<i>The "Zumbo Effect"</i>	6
<i>SC Legislation Watch 2007-2008</i>	8
<i>House Judiciary Subcommittee Meets on H3212</i>	10
<i>House Judiciary Subcommittee Meets on H3964</i>	11
<i>Criminal Justice Taskforce Meets</i>	13
<i>GrassRoots Instructor Program</i>	14
<i>GunRights PAC Update</i>	15
<i>Personal Protection Outside the Home</i>	16
<i>An Apology from GrassRoots Leadership</i>	17
<i>List of Merchants who carry GrassRoots Flyers</i>	18
<i>Reciprocity List</i>	19
<i>GrassRoots Membership Application Form</i>	19
<i>GrassRoots Instructors List</i>	19
<i>2007 Gun Show Schedule</i>	20

NON-PROFIT ORG
US POSTAGE
P-A-I-D
COLUMBIA, SC
PERMIT #487

GrassRoots South Carolina, Inc.
PO Box 2446
Lexington, SC 29071

President's Message



any of these isn't "grassroots", no matter what you call it.

First and foremost, individual **members** provide the **thrust** of a grassroots organization. Individuals must join together in a common goal to multiply their power. But, mere numbers isn't enough. To increase the **power** of an organization you must increase the number of members **working**, and the **amount** of work each one does. This is the job of leadership.

Leadership initially enlists individuals as members by showing them a worthy, attainable, desirable goal. Good leadership will then encourage members to work, and make them *want* to work harder. At *GrassRoots*, we provide leadership by example - the example of people working together to make things better.

Also, **communications** is essential to any grassroots organization. Good, two-way communication is the glue that cements members and leaders into a single, strong, focused team. It's like Natural Point of Aim in rifle marksmanship. If the rifle isn't naturally aligned with the target when you hold it, you can muscle the sights on to the target, but you'll be working against the rifle and more likely to miss.

Similarly, without good two-way communication between members and leaders, they won't be focused on the same target.

Ultimately, the **effectiveness** of a grassroots organization comes from directing the **power** of many individual members at the proper target. At *GrassRoots*, we've listened as CWP holders across the state told us of problems they've had, what they want and what our aims should be. We've studied the current laws. We've found methods to make change that are geared to our main strength - the members of *GrassRoots*. We're keeping our members informed (and motivated) on what we're doing, and why. And, because *GrassRoots* is a team effort, *GrassRoots* members rally behind their leadership and really put their backs into it. And it shows! How do you think *GrassRoots* measures up? Compare us with other groups and let us know. We want to learn and be the best! That's why I'm writing this. Tell us.

One final thing about grassroots, just like grass, it's most effective when there's a good, thick carpet of it. That's why *GrassRoots* needs to grow. We need your help to do that. We want to lead by example - and *your* example is needed! Good folks,

doing good work will get noticed and encourage others to do the same. Contact Bill Rentiers, tell him you'd like to do more in your area. He'll get you together with other *GrassRoots* members near you. You can then meet with good people of like mind to organize local activities such as: work at gun shows, report local businesses that post against CWP and monitor local county and city council meetings to watch and report things that will hurt our right to keep and bear arms. If *GrassRoots* goal: "That good citizens may carry firearms wherever and whenever they choose in South Carolina", is *your* goal, tell others about *GrassRoots* and ask them to join in.

We're working to make *GrassRoots* more effective than it has ever been - and we need **your** help! Do the math! What will get us more: 10 guys working 80 hours a week, and eventually burning out? Or, 10,000 good men and women working 1 hour a week? (Hint: 800 hours vs 10,000 hours) Please get involved. We have the goal, we have the leadership, we have the organization, and we have the plan that's gotten us much in the past.

We're **GrassRoots South Carolina** and we're sticking to our guns!

What makes an organization "grassroots"?

Riddle: "If you call a tail a leg, how many legs does a cow have?"

Answer: "Four! Calling a tail a leg doesn't make it one"

It's the same with grassroots organizations. It's easy to talk the talk, but talk alone doesn't change much. Let me share with you a few thoughts on "grassroots" to help us better walk the walk! Briefly, any grassroots organization **must** have: hard working, motivated **members**; dedicated, principled **leaders**; good, two-way **communications** between them; and a **common goal** to unite them. A group that lacks

Do you enjoy writing?

Why not use your skills to help the pro-gun community in your state? GrassRoots is seeking volunteers to help out on The Defender newspaper staff.

If you are interested in researching stories, writing articles, proofreading, doing layout, design, selling advertising, etc., GrassRoots could use your help. Not only will you be able to see each issue of the Defender before anyone else, but you'll be able to help polish it into its final form.

If you are interested, please contact Bill Rentiers at ExecOfficer@SCFirearms.org or 803-233-9295.

Please make a contribution to GunRights PAC today!

Send donations to:

GunRights PAC
220 Isobel Ct.
Lexington, SC 29072

Make a donation today to the

GrassRoots Legal Defense Fund

P.O. Box 2446
Lexington, SC 29071

GrassRoots South Carolina, Inc.
P.O. Box 2446
Lexington, SC 29071
www.scfirearms.org

GrassRoots South Carolina, Inc. is a South Carolina 501(c)4 non-profit corporation. Our mission is to educate and promote acceptance of responsible firearms ownership within the State of South Carolina and to protect the rights of gun owners. Our objectives are to improve all aspects of lawful ownership and carrying of firearms in South Carolina.

GrassRoots South Carolina, Inc. members contact their elected representatives to promote or oppose legislation concerning all gun owners and issues surrounding the Right to Keep and Bear Arms in South Carolina.

GrassRoots South Carolina, Inc.

Officers and Staff

President.....	Ed Kelleher	803-796-8858	Pres@SCFirearms.org
Vice President	Robert D. Butler, JD	803-957-3959	VP@SCFirearms.org
Executive Officer	Bill Rentiers	803-233-9295	ExecOfficer@SCFirearms.org
Treasurer	Robert Holliday, CPA.....	803-957-5181	Treas@SCFirearms.org
Merchant Issues Coordinator	Terry Hicks.....	803-429-8970	Merchants@SCFirearms.org
Gun Shows	Mike Walguarnery.....	803-781-1360	Gunshows@SCFirearms.org
Instructor Program	Frank Headley	803-920-2673	InstProg@SCFirearms.org
Office.....	Bill Rentiers	803-233-9295	ExecOfficer@SCFirearms.org
Publisher, The Defender.....			Newspaper@scfirearms.org

The GrassRoots South Carolina newspaper, The Defender, is distributed quarterly to the membership of GrassRoots. Submissions can be sent by email to Editor c/o GrassRoots South Carolina, PO Box 2446, Lexington, SC 29071, or electronically to Newspaper@SCFirearms.org. Original material on local issues will be given highest priority, and since permission must be received to reprint previously published materials, items without an author and source will not be considered for publication. Changes of address and questions regarding membership status should be sent to Bill Rentiers at the above PO box or email address. Copyright © 2007 GrassRoots South Carolina, Inc.

House Judiciary Committee Meets on H3964

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The following letter was faxed to all members of the House Judiciary Committee prior to their meeting on May 21, 2007 in support of H. 3964. It was also read at the meeting by Dr. Robert Butler, Vice President of GrassRoots GunRights. It is being printed here in article form in order to conserve space.]

The issue of allowing concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders to possess guns in schools is an emotion-laden issue. However, in addressing this issue, our top priority must be the protection of our children. Partisan politics, the pursuits of special interest groups, and emotional fear mongering must be set aside.

1. **Self-defense and defense of others is supported by virtually all religions. Children are not able to defend themselves. Thus, it is our moral responsibility to protect our children.**
2. **CWP holders have a proven record of safety everywhere they are allowed to carry, including schools. SC CWP holders carried in schools prior to 1996 without incident.**
3. **There are cases of private citizens stopping an active school shooter before the police could arrive. But, there are *no* cases of a CWP holder being a school shooter.**
4. **Police officers who properly follow standard operating procedures will not have any problems out of CWP holders when the police eventually arrive at the crime scene.**
5. **Virginia Tech was proud of helping kill a bill similar to H. 3964 because being a "gun free" zone made them feel safe. But, feeling safer and being safer are two very different things.**
6. **The federal "Gun Free School Zones Act" allows SC CWP holders to legally carry in SC schools. For the safety of our children and the benefit of society, SC law should mirror the federal law on school carry.**

Below are some points that explain why H. 3964 is a good bill that would help provide a safer environment for our children, and therefore should be enacted into law as soon as possible.

Point 1. The courts have consistently ruled *the police have NO legal duty to protect us!* While the police may have good intentions, the only real duty to protect others comes from a moral duty to do so. This moral duty to protect is not only vested in police officers, it is invested in each

of us by our creator. To take the ability to perform this God given duty away from law abiding CWP holders is morally wrong.

Point 2. Prior to 1996, SC CWP holders were allowed to carry in schools, and did so without incident. The Associated Press reports that over 25% of states currently allow CWP holders to carry in schools, and they were not able to point to any problems at schools related to CWP holders. The best available research shows liberal CWP laws work to lower violent crime rates for all people, not just CWP holders. The following facts show a completely different picture than the fear mongers want you to see:

"The benefits of concealed handguns are not limited to those who use them in self defense. ... Citizens who have no intention of ever carrying concealed handguns in a sense get a 'free ride' from the crime-fighting efforts of their fellow citizens. However, the 'halo' effect created by these laws is apparently not limited to people who share the characteristics of those who carry the guns. The most obvious example is the drop in murders of children following the adoption of nondiscretionary laws. *Arming older people not only may provide direct protection to these children, but also causes criminals to leave the area.*" John R. Lott, Jr., More Guns, Less Crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control Laws 161 (2nd ed., 2000).

Years ago, Israel was suffering from terrorist attacks upon their schools and children. Israel decided to allow armed citizens to congregate at schools. Armed grandparents would go to schools and play games to pass the time while the children attended classes.

The terrorist attacks upon their schools stopped.

It is unreasonable to believe historically law abiding people who step onto school property will suddenly turn into deranged murderers or reckless shooters of our children. This is especially true when one considers the only CWP holders who would have any reason to be at the schools would be the parents and teachers of the children. It is logically inconsistent to entrust our children to these teachers, but still believe these teachers would kill our children. It is especially absurd to think this of the parents.

Point 3. The fear mongers are at their worst when they start crying about how CWP holders

with concealed sidearms are a threat to the safety of our children. There are absolutely NO cases of CWP holders shooting any children at schools. But, there are a number of documented cases of private citizens using firearms to stop an active school shooter from killing even more innocent children.

In Pearl, MS, assistant principal Joel Myrick heard gun shots at his school and ran to his car to grab a handgun. Myrick returned to find the shooter trying to make his escape from one school so as to go to another school to kill even more children. Myrick used his handgun to force the killer to surrender. The police showed up 5 minutes later.

In Edinboro, PA, James Strand - the business owner of where a school dance was being held - heard gun shots at the dance and grabbed his shotgun. Strand caught the active shooter just as the shooter had finished reloading his gun. Strand pointed his shotgun at the shooter and held him until the police arrived 11 minutes later.

In Grundy, VA, two students - Tracy Bridges and Mikael Gross - at the Appalachian School of Law heard gun shots at their school and ran to their respective vehicles and grabbed their own handguns. They confronted the active shooter from different angles and demanded he drop his weapon. Once the shooter dropped his gun, another student jumped on the shooter. The police arrived some time later, and well after the shooting had stopped.

Lets compare these cases of private citizens quickly stopping an active school shooter with the cases where the safety of our children is dependent upon waiting for the police to arrive and handle things.

In Littleton, CO, two school shooters were allowed to continue shooting innocent children even after the police arrived at the scene until the police finally decided to enter the school hours later after the shooting had already stopped. One teacher died from loss of blood, but it is thought he would have survived if the police had acted sooner. Thankfully, many police have now decided to change their tactics to emphasize a more immediate response to an active shooter than was used at Columbine High School.

At Virginia Tech, the

campus was crawling with police due to a double murder on campus that same morning. But, even with the campus crawling with police looking for a murderer on the loose, it still took the police 5 minutes to get to the scene of the active school shooting. During those long five minutes, the school shooter fired off 170 rounds, hitting his dead victims 100 times - many at point blank range, and killing 32 students. Those totals do not include the wounded. The shooter had to reload his guns multiple

times. Then, the shooter took his own life. If there had been even one CWP holder there, things could well have turned out differently.

It should be obvious to any thinking person that the best way

to protect our children from an active school shooter is to stop the shooter as quickly as possible. While there is no way to stop a deranged person from starting to shoot people at a school, we do have the means to stop the shooter before the body count gets bigger and bigger. The best means we have to protect our children is to allow SC CWP holders - the mothers, fathers, and teachers of our children - to carry at schools.

Some people will argue we should leave the job of protecting our children to the "professionals." But, when minutes can mean the difference between life and death as shown by what happened at Virginia Tech, waiting minutes for even the best trained police to arrive is never as good for our children's safety as already having an armed protector at the scene.

It would be laughable, if it were not so tragic, when the fear mongers claim that allowing CWP holders to possess self-defense sidearms at schools will harm more children than letting deranged killers have free reign at the schools. The fear mongers would have you think it is better to keep existing laws to prevent that which has never happened - i.e., CWP holders shooting our children, than to pass laws to allow our children to be protected by the mothers, fathers, and teachers of our children in a way that has already happened many times.

The fear mongers somehow believe that a deranged killer who is willing to violate God's law against killing people, will

It should be obvious to any thinking person that the best way to protect our children from an active shooter is to stop the shooter as quickly as possible.

...terrorist attacks upon their schools stopped.

Down Range



by Bill Rentiers

So much has been happening behind the scenes at GrassRoots HQ since our last Defender.

We have been very active at the statehouse during the 2007 legislative session. GrassRoots leaders attended a number of subcommittee meetings regarding gun bills recently. So far this year GrassRoots has spoken regarding H.3310 (the "car carry" amendment), H.3212 (the expanded CWP reciprocity bill), H. 3464 (the Firearms Freedom Act) and H.3964 (CWP carry at school). When the House Judiciary Committee met to vote on H.3310 and H. 3212 GrassRoots was there, along with the GrassRoots Gorillas, watching our lawmakers like hawks. Both bills were unanimously given a favorable recommendation by the House Judiciary Committee. Thanks to hard work such as this, and our many members who called their Representatives to demand support of these bills, both passed the full House by an overwhelming margin and were sent on to the Senate. H.3310 passed the Senate and was signed into law by Governor Sanford on May 14th.

Due to all the legislative activity this year, GrassRoots has been sending out Action Alerts a bit more frequently lately. If you want to receive Action Alerts you can sign up by visiting our website at www.scfirearms.org. Action Alerts are sent out very sparingly and then only by a member of GrassRoots leadership.

One of our email alerts was a call for volunteers to become GrassRoots Gorillas. A GrassRoots Gorilla is a particular brand of pro-gun activist. Gorillas show up at the statehouse for committee meetings to keep track of how our legislators vote on bills of concern to GrassRoots. This way, our legislators can't get away with claiming to support our position while voting to oppose us. GrassRoots Gorillas Ralph Baker, Talbert Black, Josiah Gardner, Bill Griffin and Greg Keneally recently answered the call to show up at a House Judiciary Committee meeting. Armed with distinctive orange clipboards to tally votes, we let our legislators know that we are watching. Talbert Black and Josiah

Gardner earned a GrassRoots Activist pin for their participation in this event. (Special thanks goes to Ralph Baker for donating sixteen clipboards and painting them all orange.) If you want to volunteer as a GrassRoots Gorilla, email or call me and I'll add you to the list.

Our upstate members will be happy to learn that a member has volunteered to coordinate the Greenville gunshows. Mike Harris of Greenville will be taking over as gunshow coordinator for the Greenville/Spartanburg area. If you live in the upstate and would like to help out with staffing our gunshow table, please call Mike to volunteer. His phone number & email address are listed gunshow box on the back page.

Several members have expressed interest in being able to pay for membership renewals and donations online. We have been in talks with a pro-gun company in Virginia to begin accepting credit cards on our website. Hopefully we will have that function for our website installed very soon.

GrassRoots has also been considering making some changes to our Merchant program. We have many members who own and run businesses. We'd like to do what we can to let our members know

who these gun friendly business owners are, and ask them to support these member-owned businesses. We have been approached by a few GrassRoots members with suggestions for expanding the Merchant program to include discounts on products and services to our members.

We think this is a wonderful idea, so we are working on the particulars of what sort of discount a merchant should offer to our members, and what GrassRoots should offer in return. I had a particularly interesting conversation with GrassRoots member Ray Visotski, owner of Funeral Home Cremation Center, Inc., in Aiken, SC, about his ideas to offer discounted services to members. We are also considering issuing a GrassRoots Membership card which would be presented to a merchant as proof of membership in good standing in order to receive a discount. If you own a business and you would be interested in offering a discount to GrassRoots members, please contact me to be added to the list.

GrassRoots leaders have also been busy honing their skills. In late November, Rob Butler and I attended a seminar in Charleston on Marketing for Non-Profits which was very instructive. In ear-

ly March, Rob Butler, Ed Chidsey, Justin Coleman, Ben Davis, and I attended a "GrassRoots Activism" seminar put on by the Leadership Institute in Greenville. While that seminar was more geared to running political campaigns, it was free of charge and there were some useful bits of information we were able to take away from it.

The January issue of The Defender newspaper was very well received by our readers. This was the first issue that GrassRoots brought "in-house" for design and layout, which saved us a great deal of expense. It was packed full of information about the legislation your GrassRoots leaders had been busy working on since our last issue, and there was a very compelling article about the plight of Jason Dickey. I received many positive letters from members and non-members about the Defender and about Jason's ordeal.

Those of you who have been paying close attention also noticed that we have made a number of changes to our website in the past few months. We have added a link on our main menu so that you can sign up for Action Alerts. We've also added several Legislation Watch pages so that our members can read about the various legislation we are following and exactly what actions we have taken regarding each bill.

In short, folks, GrassRoots leaders are working very hard to protect the gun rights of every South Carolinian, and I am having the time of my life in the process. If you have any questions, comments, suggestions, ideas or anything I can help you with, please feel free to contact me. My email and my telephone number are listed in the Staff box and I'm determined to be available day or night to serve the members.



GrassRoots Gorillas (from left to right) back row: Bill Griffin, Ralph Baker, Talbert Black, front row: Bill Rentiers, Josiah Gardner & Greg Keneally.

OSHA

continued from page 1

primers, smokeless propellant, cartridges for propellant-actuated power devices, and cartridges for industrial guns.

Note that ammunition and reloading supplies are all now classified as "Explosives."

(viii) **No person enters a facility containing explosives or a blast site unless authorized to do so by the employer:**

This includes retail stores such as WalMart, Cabelas, Bass Pro Shops, and your favorite corner gun stores.

(ii) **During the approach and progress of an electrical storm, the employer shall ensure that: (B) Employees located in or near facilities containing explosives or in blast sites are withdrawn immediately to a safe remote location.**

This means all retail stores that sell "explosives" (ammo) will be required to evacuate the entire store if a storm approaches (or just quit carrying ammo

anymore).

(iii) **The employer shall ensure that: (A) No open flames, matches, or spark-producing devices are located within 50 feet (15.2 m) of explosives or facilities containing explosives:**

Stores may be required to search customers for matches and lighters, and ban customers from bringing them into the entire store (or just quit carrying ammo anymore).

(B) **Smoking is only permitted in authorized smoking areas located a safe distance from explosives:**

How far is "a safe distance"? Can a gun store be located in a strip mall near a tobacco store? Is smoking outside the store's main entrance "a safe distance"?

(C) **No person carries firearms, ammunition, or similar articles in facilities containing explosives or blast sites except as required for work duties;**

Retail stores will be required ban customers from lawful concealed carry on

their premises.

(e) **Transportation of explosives. (1) General provisions. The employer shall ensure that: (i) No employee smokes, carries matches or any other flame-producing device, or carries any firearms or cartridges (except firearms and cartridges required to be carried by guards) while in, or within 25 feet (7.63m) of, a vehicle containing explosives:**

No truck drivers may be armed or carry any ammo, nor can they carry matches or a lighter, nor can anyone who loads or unloads these trucks when ammo is onboard.

(2) **Vehicles. (i) The employer shall ensure that any vehicle used to carry explosives: (A) Is able to safely carry the designated load; (B) Has close-fitting floors; and (C) Has wood or other non-sparking materials covering any exposed spark producing metal on the inside of the vehicle body.**

Lowcountry Goodwill Industries lacks good will

Recently, GrassRoots member John Godwin noticed several Goodwill stores in the North Charleston, Summerville and Goose Creek area had been posted against concealed weapons. He brought the issue to my attention. I personally visited the Moncks Corner location and observed signage that appears to meet all of the requirements of Section 23-31-235 of the SC Code of Laws regarding the posting establishments against concealed carry on the premises. As I dug deeper, I found that indeed all fourteen Goodwill Industries store locations in the Lowcountry area have been posted.

I called Mr. Tom Wright, Director of Retail Operations at his North Charleston office to discuss the matter. I approached the situation in a friendly, non-confrontational manner, to see how reasonable they might be willing to be about possibly removing the signs, or at least replacing them with signs that don't conform to 23-31-235.

Mr. Wright told me that the policy was created by their Loss Prevention Department in order to discourage crime and provide a safer workplace for their employees. We discussed the fact that posting these signs would only prevent law-abiding customers from being armed in his stores and that the average SC CWP holder would probably decide to shop elsewhere rather than choose to disarm and shop at Goodwill locations. Mr. Wright replied that he too was a gun owner and a hunter, and that "people don't *have* to carry at all times." I explained that many of our members are staunch 2nd Amendment activists and many would simply choose to do all of their shopping and donating with a competitor rather than disarm and enter the posted Goodwill stores. The signs would not in any way prevent the criminal element from entering these stores anyway, since (being criminals) they would disregard the signs. He agreed, saying that most of their theft is employee-related.

I suggested that Mr. Wright might consider a compromise that would accomplish his goals while not banning law-abiding CWP holders from his stores. I asked him if he would consider using alternative signs that were smaller and said something simpler such as "No Illegal Weapons." He was receptive to the idea, so I said that I would send him some samples for his Loss Prevention Department to consider. I then mailed a letter to Mr. Wright thanking him for taking the time to discuss the issue with me and

for considering the alternative signage. I called him a few days later to follow-up and make sure that he had received those signs. He said that he had indeed received them and he passed them on to Ms. Renee Raven in their Loss Prevention department. He told me that I could call her directly and discuss it with her but that she was busy prosecuting a case and that I probably wouldn't be able to reach her.

I called Ms. Raven and left her a message, which was not returned. I called again a few days later and spoke with Ms. Raven who said that she had discussed the issue with Mr. Wright and they have no plans to remove or change their signs. She explained that they had researched the proper signage with the North Charleston and city of Charleston Police Departments and the signage they posted was recommended by those agencies.

I explained that many gun

owners (and especially GrassRoots members) would probably prefer to shop elsewhere once they see these signs posted. Ms. Raven said that she didn't think most gun owners would feel this way, and that most would simply disarm and continue to shop in Goodwill stores. Ms. Raven stated she "agreed with our issue" and "she and her husband were gun owners, and that her husband is a hunter" but she went on to say "we don't see why you need to carry guns in our stores." [Editor's note: It is interesting how many anti-gunners also use this "we are hunters" claim] I explained to Ms. Raven that posting is largely an issue of safety. Stores that post against lawful concealed carry tell the criminal element that they will be the only ones armed in these locations.

Ms. Raven said, "a person who is licensed to carry a firearm could come in and rob our stores too." I explained to her the actual

crime data shows violations of the law by CWP holders is extremely rare, and in fact is even less than is found among members of the law enforcement community.

She then claimed that the police had told her that they "often have to deal with domestic violence committed by those licensed to carry firearms." I told her that this is in fact false, since there have been an extremely tiny number of arrests made of CWP holders over the past ten years of the law's existence, and that CWP holders undergo thorough federal criminal background checks. It is thoroughly verifiable that such claims are not at all honest. It was becoming very clear to me that she had some false and rather nasty preconceived notions about this cause of ours, which she so vigorously claims to support. Nothing I was going to say to her was going to change her mind.

See **GOODWILL** on page 12

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.scfirearms.org>

January 31, 2007

The Honorable Scott Talley
South Carolina House of Representatives
P.O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: H. 3310

Dear Rep. Talley:

GrassRoots GunRights has significant concerns both about the need for H.3310 and about H. 3310 as currently written. GrassRoots relies upon a South Carolina Attorney General's opinion to question the need for H. 3310. Also, as currently written, H. 3310 would most likely negatively impact female concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders. Thus, H. 3310 either needs to be tabled to let die, or amended to ensure that female CWP holders are not discriminated against.

The SC Attorney General has already addressed the issue of CWP carry in vehicles in an informal opinion issued April 19, 1999, in response to a request from James A. Preacher, Jr., Chief of Police of the Norway Police Department. The AG opinion states in part:

"In this instance, therefore, 16-23-20(12), which exempts from the pistol law, any person granted a permit by SLED to carry the pistol (defined for purposes of this exemption as the CWP permit authorized pursuant to 23-31-210 et seq.), must be given equal weight as 16-23-20(9) and cannot be interpreted as limited by Subsection (9). Accordingly, applying the rule of construction that penal laws are strictly construed, as well as the other rules of construction referenced above, and based upon the same analysis as used in *Barwick* [*State v. Barwick*, (Unpublished Opinion No. 96-UP-208 filed July 18, 1996)], it is my opinion that a CWP permittee is not limited by 16-23-20(9). The result is that the permittee does not have to keep the concealable weapon as required by 16-23-20(9) while in an automobile, but may carry such weapon as permitted by the Law Abiding Citizens Self-Defense Act of 1996. In other words, if a person has a CWP permit under the Law Abiding Citizens Self-Defense Act of 1996, that permit is not limited by the fact that the permittee is in an automobile. The permittee may carry the concealable weapon in the same way as is authorized by the Law Abiding Citizens Self-Defense Act of 1996." 1999 WL 387043 (S.C.A.G.).

As can be seen from the above opinion, H. 3310 is not needed since CWP holders are

continued on next page

The “Zumbo Effect”

On Friday February 16th, 2007 avid hunter and longtime writer Jim Zumbo publicly used his online blog to commit a sort of “virtual hara-kiri” within the second amendment community. He referred to AR and AK style weapons as “terrorist rifles” and condemned their use in hunting. Within hours a grassroots groundswell of outrage arose from every corner of the gun community. Pro gun forums such as AR15.com and our own GrassRoots discussion group were buzzing with outraged commentary. Thousands of gun rights supporters sent angry email to his sponsors. Mr. Zumbo quickly apologized for his thoughtless comments, but by then it was already too late. Within 36 hours several firearms related sponsors (Remington, Outdoor Life, Gerber, Mossy Oak) dropped him like he was radioactive. Jim had committed the unpardonable sin. He had suggested a gun ban.

The ensuing firestorm of outrage from the pro-gun community was swift and merciless. More of Mr. Zumbo’s apologies followed along with a pledge that he will go on a hunting excursion with Ted Nugent using an AR. But the damage was done. Anti-gun forces were quoting Zumbo’s blog to legitimize their point about “those evil guns.” On his *Brady Blog*, Paul Helmke of the Brady Bunch made reference to Zumbo’s comments to legitimize his assertion that we consider regulating these “terrorist rifles” for public safety.

Maybe Jim Zumbo still deserves some credit that he cares about gun rights, even if he did stick his foot squarely and deeply into his mouth. Or maybe not. I don’t know. Jim and I are different animals though. He is an avid hunter. Personally, I don’t hunt. I never have. That doesn’t mean I’d never be willing to give it a try. I just haven’t given much thought to shooting something that isn’t trying to kill me first. Jim Zumbo loves his “sporting rifles” and he is very proud of them. I can understand that. I can appreciate all types of firearms, but being ex-Army, I enjoy military rifles and handguns most of all. One big difference between Jim Zumbo and me - I would never call for a ban on the weapons which HE enjoys - even if they aren’t my favorite ones. I don’t pretend to understand the enjoyment some folks get from hunting and fishing, but enjoy it they certainly do, and rightly so. Why not? But why would one part of the pro-gun family act so self righteous and smug against another? Are we not weaker when we are divided? Had Zumbo forgotten

that Sarah Brady was still going to come after his “sporting rifle” the minute he is through helping her collect my AK? Did he not realize that his comments would give aid and comfort to our enemies? It doesn’t make much sense for a supposedly pro-gun guy to behave this way, does it?

So what have we learned from Zumbo-gate? Some say it shows that we are not to be trifled with, and that we’ll eat our own if necessary. I think the whole episode has taught us a much brighter lesson. Let’s call it the “Zumbo Effect.” The fact that thousands of your fellow second amendment brothers and sisters mobilized, without urging or guidance, without any leader whatsoever, and took individual action, on a massive scale, using only the internet and email, and the whole episode

...the power we can exert for our cause is formidable indeed, so long as it is concentrated in great numbers.

was over before the sun set on the weekend. Do you realize what this means? Yes, we gun owners are an active, passionate, bunch. And we vote. But the real story is deeper. The deeper story is that the power we can exert for our cause is formidable indeed, so long as it is concentrated in great numbers. Imagine the effect we would have on any fight we take on, if we were

well-organized, focused, and working as a team!

If we are properly organized and well coordinated, we can duplicate the Zumbo Effect any time we

try. If you want to have this kind of power and get these same results each the time, here are a few things you can do to make that happen.

- First and foremost, make sure you are a member of GrassRoots. Annual dues are \$25 per year. Have you joined up? If you are a member, your membership expiration date will be printed on

this newspaper right next to your mailing address. Are your dues current?

- Once you’ve done that, tell a friend about GrassRoots. Tell several friends. Our strength is in our numbers. The bigger we get, the stronger we will be, and the harder it will be for legislators to ignore us when we speak with one voice. Our enemies get stronger everyday. We must continually grow in size & strength to meet the challenge.
- When you receive those orange postcards, send them in right away. Receiving a big fat stack of them really does have an effect on legislators. They get the message.
- Sign up to receive GrassRoots Action Alerts and act on them when you receive an alert. We don’t send them out very often, but when we do, if everyone acts on them right away, our voice will be heard loud and strong.
- Join the GrassRoots discussion forum online and follow the issues we are discussing on a daily basis (at least weekly). Know what is going on with the gun laws and other firearms issues here in South

See **ZUMBO** on page 18

already allowed to carry in vehicles.

Unfortunately, as currently written, H. 3310 will most likely negatively impact female CWP holders because the express language of H. 3310 requires that a CWP holder in a vehicle must carry the handgun “concealed on his person”. This is a more stringent requirement than now exists. Currently, according to a SC Attorney General opinion dated October 9, 1998, CWP holders may carry their concealed handgun in a purse or briefcase. See 1998 WL 940262 (S.C.A.G.). But, if H. 3310 was to pass as currently written, the courts would most likely rule that a CWP holder could not carry her handgun in her purse or briefcase while in a vehicle. Instead, a CWP holder would be forced to remove the handgun from the purse or briefcase and put the handgun either on her person (which would most likely not happen because she would have already had the handgun on her person if that was her desired way to carry) or into a glove box, console, or trunk. Since females are the CWP holders most likely to use a purse as a means to conceal their handguns, this bill would disproportionately negatively impact female CWP holders.

If H. 3310 must be passed - and GrassRoots does not believe there is any real need to do so, then H. 3310 must be amended to protect female CWP holders so as not to discriminate against women and their means of carrying their self-defense sidearms.

GrassRoots proposes the following language to replace the proposed Section 16-23-20(9)(b) found in H. 3310:

“(b) Notwithstanding any other law, concealed on or about his person, and he has a valid concealed weapon permit pursuant to the provisions of Article 4, Chapter 31, Title 23;”

The GrassRoots proposed language would accomplish the same goal as the current language of H. 3310, but without the discrimination towards our female CWP holders found in the current wording of H. 3310.

GrassRoots believes that H. 3310 is not needed and should be tabled to let die. In fact, H. 3310 is actually harmful to the rights of female CWP holders. If a version of H. 3310 must get passed, then GrassRoots has provided alternative language that will protect the rights of our female CWP holders. We urge you to use the GrassRoots proposed alternative language.

Sincerely,



Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President
GrassRoots GunRights SC

JUDICIARY

continued from page 3

refrain from doing so because of a man made law that says guns are not allowed at schools. This is unreasonable, illogical, and should be considered criminally negligent.

Point 4. The fear mongers argue that allowing CWP holders on school grounds will make things impossibly difficult for the police when the police arrive at the scene. They claim they fear coming upon an armed conflict with 15 armed people and not being able to distinguish the good guys from the bad guys. Such fears are completely unfounded.

First, by the time the police arrived in each of the documented cases of armed citizens saving our children, the active shooter had already been subdued and under the control of the armed citizen. The police only had to take care of the paperwork and write the reports. The real work of stopping the killer had already been done before the police arrived.

Second, proper police use of force dictates that the responding officer immediately identify himself as a police officer and then tell the people at the scene what he wants them to do. So, when the police officer arrives, all he need do is say: "I am the police. Drop your guns." The good guys will drop their guns. The bad guys will not. That should not be too difficult for a properly trained police officer to do to distinguish the good guys from the bad guys. If that is too much of a problem for police, then the solution is to increase police training. The solution is not to allow more of our children to die in an active school shooting situation simply because the police are too unskilled to follow proper procedures.

Third, the claims that there will be 10 to 15 armed people at the scene of a school shooting (as claimed by Rep. Todd Rutherford on CNN Headline News with Erica Hill) is absolutely ridiculous! Only one percent of the people in South Carolina have a CWP. Anyone under the age of 21 years old can not even obtain a CWP in South Carolina, which - for all practical purposes - means that only seniors, graduate students, professors, or mature people who started college later in life will have a CWP. So, even in a large lecture class of 100 students, it would be extremely unusual to have more than 1 or 2 CWP holders in the class. In fact, the chances of having 10 armed students there would be less than 3/1000ths of 1%, and the chances of having 15 armed students there would be about 1 in 667 million.

It is amazing how the fear mongers can get so worked up over a scenario that has never

happened and is a statistical non occurrence, while completely ignoring the real life scenario of a maniac shooting up an unarmed classroom even though it has happened more than once. Then, the fear mongers want us to believe they have the high moral ground and are credible when they wring their hands about their bizarre scenarios and propose more gun control even as they turn a blind eye to the things that actually have happened.

Point 5. In 2006, Virginia Tech lobbied the Virginia General Assembly and asked them to kill HB 1572 - a bill to allow CWP holders to carry on school grounds. Virginia Tech did then just as some of our South Carolina colleges

are now doing today. Virginia Tech was successful in getting the General Assembly to kill the bill in subcommittee. Afterwards, Virginia Tech spokesperson Larry Hincker said, "I'm sure the university

community is appreciative of the General Assembly's actions because this will help parents, students, faculty and visitors *feel safe on our campus.*" Our children deserve better than to be sacrificed on the altar of political correctness. Our children deserve

to be safe, not simply *feel safe.* H. 3964 will actually help make our schools safer for our children, not just make them feel safer.

Point 6. The federal "Gun Free School Zones Act" allows South Carolina CWP holders

to carry in schools. The federal Centers for Disease Control found there was insufficient evidence to show any gun control law has ever saved any lives at all. Yet, South Carolina law makes CWP carry in schools a felony even though there is no evidence to support the value of that law. On the other hand, there is statistically significant evidence to show the South Carolina law is flawed and that such a law could turn a South Carolina school into the next Virginia Tech.

Dr. John Lott studied the impact of liberal concealed carry laws upon crime, especially multiple victim public shootings as occur in school shootings. Here is what Dr. Lott wrote:

"What can stop these attacks? ... [W]hile arrest and conviction rates, prison sentences, and the death penalty reduce murders generally, they have no significant effect on public shootings. There is a simple reason

See JUDICIARY on page 14

...there is statistically significant evidence to show the South Carolina law is flawed and that such a law could turn a South Carolina school into the next Virginia Tech.

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.scfirearms.org>

February 14, 2007

The Honorable Scott Talley
South Carolina House of Representatives
P.O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: H. 3212

Dear Rep. Talley:

GrassRoots GunRights would like to express our full support for H. 3212 as currently written.

Concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders are the good guys. The best available research shows not only are CWP holders no threat to the safety of the general public, but also that increased numbers of CWP holders serve to lower the violent crime rate for ALL people in the state - not just CWP holders. Thus, CWP holders are the most cost effective - at least as far as the state is concerned - violent crime deterrent in existence today. This fact has held true in every state.

H. 3212 simply recognizes good people remain good people, even if they cross a state line. By recognizing good people from other states remain good people even after entering South Carolina, H. 3212 will eventually allow the good people of South Carolina to be able to legally protect themselves and their families while traveling in about 30 other states. This is a good thing for the good people of South Carolina, and has no downside either here or in other states.

H. 3212 is a good bill based upon the best available research and logic, not hysterical anti gun emotions or fear of foreigners from other states. If it were not so serious and tragic, one could find humor in the "logic" that South Carolina allows anyone from another state who can legally possess a handgun to keep a loaded, readily accessible handgun in their vehicle, but refuses - for "safety" reasons - to let a person from another state who has a concealed weapon permit - i.e., is one of the proven good guys - from carrying a handgun on their person.

GrassRoots urges you to please pass H. 3212 as currently written, and to aggressively support this bill until it is enacted into law.

Sincerely,



Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President
GrassRoots GunRights SC

SC Legislation Watch 2007-2008

The following bills are currently in the state legislature:

S. 114: A gun confiscation bill hiding behind the excuse of preventing criminal domestic violence. The sponsors of this gun confiscation bill do not try increasing the penalties for criminal domestic violence. This bill would only punish abusers who own guns, not abusers who don't own guns. If domestic abuse is truly the issue of concern, then why don't the sponsors punish all abusers? If the sponsors truly care about preventing domestic violence - instead of wanting to confiscate all guns, they would increase the penalties for criminal domestic violence - not confiscate guns. This poorly drafted bill refers to one section which has been omitted by 2003 Act 92 section 2. Another section refers only to infractions which are only a misdemeanor. This bill serves only to additionally punish those who have committed a minor misdemeanor, or who have been served with a routine restraining order in a divorce case.

Principles Involved: The right to keep and bear arms is a constitutionally guaranteed right. Constitutionally guaranteed rights are too important to be denied merely for committing a minor misdemeanor, or simply going through a divorce.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots strongly opposes this bill, just as we did last session and the session before that.

Current Status: In the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Primary Sponsor: Leventis.

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/114.htm

S. 168: A bill to prohibit discharge of firearms within 25 yards of the Palmetto Trail, whether on private or public lands. The major penalty is the forfeiture of the guns and equipment in the violator's possession at the time of the violation. There is no provision for ensuring that the Palmetto Trail is clearly marked so that people will know exactly where the boundaries of the Palmetto Trail are located.

Principles Involved: Private property owners should not be turned into criminals for safely discharging a firearm on their own private property just because it is near the Palmetto Trail. Also, people need to be given proper notice that what they are doing is wrong before they are punished for doing something that is otherwise legal.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots opposes this bill until provision is made to ensure the Palmetto Trail is clearly marked and until the rights of private property owners are protected.

Current Status: In the Committee

of Fish, Game & Forestry.

Primary Sponsor: Leventis.

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/223.htm

S. 458: A bill to prohibit the sale, renting or giving away of metal or brass knuckles, or participate directly or indirectly in such transactions. This bill does not address possession or manufacture of brass knuckles on one's own private property. The bill also adds brass knuckles to the list of weapons prohibited on school property (unless by law enforcement).

Principles Involved: There is no reason to limit what sort of self-defense tools one can use by ordinary citizens based on where you are located at the moment. If they are bad for citizens they should be bad for law enforcement also. There is no logic behind banning the sale, renting or giving away of an object that can be owned or made without penalty.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots

opposes this bill.

Current Status: In the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

Primary Sponsor: Thomas

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/458.htm

S. 643: A gun confiscation bill which would ban a person from possessing firearms or ammunition if they have been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment of over 1yr. It exempts certain "white collar" crimes such as anti-trust violations, unfair trade practices, restraints of trade, or other similar offenses relating to the regulation of business practices.

Principles Involved: This bill would ban gun possession to hundreds upon thousands of citizens who are non violent and for many crimes that are not felonies but merely misdemeanors or unclassified. We should not punish the poor or the middle class more harshly than we do the rich. White collar criminals should not be

excluded from any such legislation. The right to keep and bear arms is a constitutionally guaranteed right, and should not be denied merely for committing a minor misdemeanor.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots opposes this bill.

Current Status: In the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

Primary Sponsor: McConnell and Ford

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/643.htm

H. 3065: This bill would make unlawful the discharge of a firearm into a dwelling, vehicle, aircraft, watercraft or school for any reason whatsoever. It makes a point to strike the word "unlawfully" discharging so that it will merely say "discharging a firearm." This means that no reason including self defense will be lawful any longer.

Principles Involved: If you come upon a crime in progress in your own house, another person's house, car or boat, or a school, you will be

See LEGISLATION on page 9

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.scfirearms.org>

February 20, 2007

The Honorable Scott Talley
South Carolina House of Representatives
P.O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: SLED deception regarding H. 3212

Dear Rep. Talley:

Last Wednesday, February 14, 2007, during the General Laws subcommittee hearing on H. 3212 (a bill to amend the concealed weapon permit reciprocity law), Capt. Joe Dorton, the lobbyist from SLED, attempted to mislead the subcommittee with information that he knew, or should have known, was not truthful. Capt. Dorton told the subcommittee New Hampshire did not have a minimum age limit for the issuance of concealed weapon permits, and specifically pointed out that New Hampshire could issue a concealed weapon permit to a 16 year old juvenile. Capt. Dorton went on to say that SLED had concerns about allowing such young people to carry concealed handguns while visiting Myrtle Beach. Capt. Dorton's representations would have led the General Laws subcommittee to believe 16 year old juveniles from New Hampshire would be allowed to carry concealed handguns while in South Carolina if H. 3212 was passed. Quite simply, that is not true.

The well established legal hierarchy of laws is that a state does not have the power to permit that which federal law prohibits. Federal law, 18 U.S.C. § 922(x)(2), states "It shall be unlawful for any person who is a juvenile [i.e., under 18 years of age] to knowingly possess a handgun or ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun." There exist a very limited number of exceptions, none of which would allow an out-of-state juvenile to carry a handgun while visiting Myrtle Beach, SC, or anywhere else in SC for that matter. The representations made by Capt. Dorton to the General Laws subcommittee are vilely deceptive. It is shameful when the premier law enforcement agency in South Carolina resorts to such deceptive tactics to influence legislation. The applicable section of the United States Code follows for your review so that you can verify who is being truthful and who is being deceptive.

GrassRoots GunRights demands its representatives always adhere to the highest ethical standard when lobbying, i.e., complete honesty. Our desire is that you demand the same from others.

GrassRoots thanks you for your support of H. 3212 as drafted, and we ask you to please let other members of the House Judiciary Committee know of how SLED has attempted to deceive

continued on next page

LEGISLATION

continued from page 8

guilty of a felony if you discharge your firearm for self defense purposes. There is no reason to alter existing law to remove the word "unlawfully" from existing law unless your goal is to make good people into criminals.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots strongly opposes this bill.

Current Status: In the House Judiciary Committee.

Primary Sponsor: Kirsh.

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3065.htm

H. 3212: This bill would make South Carolina a "recognition" state instead of a "reciprocity" state. This means South Carolina would honor other states' CWP's even without a reciprocal agreement. SLED would no longer be able to deny reciprocity with other states. This is important because SLED takes some extremely illogical positions to deny reciprocity. For example, SLED does not allow reciprocity with Florida because Florida's CWP law does not specifically state former felons can not get a Florida CWP. GrassRoots pointed out to SLED that federal law makes it illegal for former felons to possess any firearm, and that states may not grant privileges that are contrary to federal law because federal law is the supreme law of the entire country. But, SLED feels they must protect South Carolina people from all of those former felons in Florida who will get Florida CWP's and then travel to South Carolina to shoot people here. Recognition laws in other states are the reason that SC CWP's are honored in most states, not our reciprocal agreements.

Principles Involved: There should be no need for CWP's anywhere. It is our right to defend ourselves, a right recognized in the Second Amendment. But, since CWP's are required to stay out of jail if you carry a handgun, then recognition is much better than reciprocity. Every state should have a recognition law.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots strongly supports this bill and urges all members to contact their elected representatives about this bill.

Current Status: On the Senate contested calendar.

Primary Sponsor: M. A. Pitts

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3212.htm

H. 3310: This bill would change the existing "car carry" law (16-23-20) to add a part which specifically permits CWP holders to carry a concealed firearm "on or about his person" while in a vehicle. Current law mentions only three locations: glove compartment, console, or

trunk.

Principles Involved: Since CWP carry is already completely lawful according to an April 1999 opinion issued by the SC Attorney General, this bill should not be necessary at all. The bill was sponsored because some law abiding motorists who possess a CWP have been harassed by certain law enforcement officers.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots supports this bill and urges all members to contact their elected representatives about this bill.

Current Status: Signed into law May 14th, 2007 by Governor Sanford.

Primary Sponsor: M. A. Pitts

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3310.htm

H. 3464: Entitled "South Carolina The Firearms Freedom Act," this bill restates the 2nd, 9th and 10th Amendments to the Bill of Rights and exempts from regulation under the Commerce Clause all firearms and firearms accessories which are manufactured in South Carolina

and which remain in South Carolina. It exempts certain items such as crew operated weapons, exploding rounds, bore diameters larger than one and one half inches, and a firearm that discharges more than one round with a single pull of the trigger.

Principles Involved: This bill is a laudable attempt at restoring our gun rights, but it should not exempt one class of firearm from regulation under the Commerce Clause and leave others subject to it. Either items manufactured in SC which remain in SC are exempt or they are not.

GrassRoots Position: Grassroots would support this bill if amended to delete the list of items which are exempted.

Current Status: In the House Judiciary Committee.

Primary Sponsor: M. A. Pitts

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3464.htm

H. 3528: A bill to restrict the circumstances by which SLED under release the list of CWP permit

holders. This bill would prevent the list of CWP holders maintained by SLED from being released only upon the request of a law enforcement agency and for an official investigation.

Principles Involved: This bill would prevent private information of CWP holders, such as name and address, from being released to the general public, to news media, or to criminals seeking to rob houses to acquire guns.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots strongly supports this bill.

Current Status: In the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

Primary Sponsor: M. A. Pitts

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3528.htm

H. 3604: This bill would make it unlawful for a parent or guardian to intentionally, knowingly or recklessly permit a child under eighteen to possess a firearm if he is aware of a substantial risk that the child may carry it onto school property.

Principles Involved: This bill

See LEGISLATION on page 12

you on this bill. Then, if SLED has tried to deceive your fellow Judiciary Committee members too, you will have set the record straight to protect the interests of the good people of South Carolina. GrassRoots is confident that if the truth is known about H. 3212, it will pass. Again, thank you for your support of this meritorious legislation.

Sincerely,



Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President
GrassRoots GunRights SC

18 U.S.C. § 922(x):

(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to sell, deliver, or otherwise transfer to a person who the transferor knows or has reasonable cause to believe is a juvenile —

- (A) a handgun; or
- (B) ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun.

(2) It shall be unlawful for any person who is a juvenile to knowingly possess —

- (A) a handgun; or
- (B) ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun.

(3) This subsection does not apply to —

(A) a temporary transfer of a handgun or ammunition to a juvenile or to the possession or use of a handgun or ammunition by a juvenile if the handgun and ammunition are possessed and used by the juvenile —

(i) in the course of employment, in the course of ranching or farming related to activities at the residence of the juvenile (or on property used for ranching or farming at which the juvenile, with the permission of the property owner or lessee, is performing activities related to the operation of the farm or ranch), target practice, hunting, or a course of instruction in the safe and lawful use of a handgun;

(ii) with the prior written consent of the juvenile's parent or guardian who is not prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from possessing a firearm, except —

(I) during transportation by the juvenile of an unloaded handgun in a locked container directly from the place of transfer to a place at which an activity described in clause (i) is to take place and transportation by the juvenile of that handgun, unloaded and in a locked container, directly from the place at which such an activity took place to the transferor; or

(II) with respect to ranching or farming activities as described in clause (i), a juvenile may possess and use a handgun or ammunition with the prior written approval of the juvenile's parent or legal guardian and at the direction of an adult who is not prohibited by Federal, State or local law from possessing a firearm;

(iii) the juvenile has the prior written consent in the juvenile's possession at all times when a handgun is in the possession of the juvenile; and

(iv) in accordance with State and local law;

(B) a juvenile who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the National Guard who possesses or is armed with a handgun in the line of duty;

(C) a transfer by inheritance of title (but not possession) of a handgun or ammunition to a juvenile; or

(D) the possession of a handgun or ammunition by a juvenile taken in defense of the juvenile or other persons against an intruder into the residence of the juvenile or a residence in which the juvenile is an invited guest.

(4) A handgun or ammunition, the possession of which is transferred to a juvenile in circumstances in which the transferor is not in violation of this subsection shall not be subject to permanent confiscation by the Government if its possession by the juvenile subsequently becomes unlawful because of the conduct of the juvenile, but shall be returned to the lawful owner when such handgun or ammunition is no longer required by the Government for the purposes of investigation or prosecution.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term "juvenile" means a person who is less than 18 years of age.

House Judiciary Subcommittee Meets on H3212

The House Judiciary General Laws Subcommittee met on February 14, 2007 to discuss H. 3212. GrassRoots GunRights was the ONLY pro gun rights organization to attend the hearing in support of the bill. GrassRoots leadership gave the following statement before the House Judiciary General Laws Subcommittee on H. 3212:

“Mr. Chairman and Honorable members of this subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to speak today on H. 3212 - a bill to amend the concealed weapon permit reciprocity law.

I hope that each of you have had the time to read the letter that I faxed to each of you earlier

today. Unfortunately, I have just learned there is opposition to this bill.

Some will argue this bill needs to be amended to require “training” in other states before allowing people from those states to carry a self-defense sidearm in South Carolina. While such thinking is well intentioned, it is unsupported by facts.

The truth of the matter is that required concealed weapon permit training has been proven to be unrelated to any public safety benefits. But, required concealed weapon permit training has been shown to result in violent crime rates remaining higher than such rates would be if there was no required concealed weapon permit

training. Thus, required concealed weapon permit training is directly responsible for more women being raped, more people being killed, and more people being beaten than would have occurred had there not been any required concealed weapon permit training.

But, this bill is not about concealed weapon permit training in South Carolina, it is about allowing good people living in states more enlightened than we are in South Carolina to carry in South Carolina. Then, the good people of South Carolina can have the means to protect our families when we travel out of state. If this bill is passed as written, South Carolina concealed weapon permit holders will be able to carry in about 30 other states.

GrassRoots GunRights urges this subcommittee to pass H. 3212 as originally drafted. If you have any questions that you would like answered, I would welcome the opportunity to do so. Thank you.”

SLED lobbyist Captain Joe Dorton also addressed the subcommittee. Capt. Dorton said that SLED had “concerns” (political speak for “opposes”) about H. 3212. Capt. Dorton then told the subcommittee that this bill could allow a 16yr old from New Hampshire to lawfully carry a concealed firearm while in our state visiting Myrtle Beach.

The subcommittee unanimously voted in favor of H.3212 as GrassRoots requested.

CARRY continued frompage 1

such in an August editorial, Hincker hurrumphed: “Guns don’t belong in classrooms. They never will. Virginia Tech has a very sound policy preventing same.”¹⁵

Policy-makers will debate Virginia Tech’s delayed emergency response and its failure to address Cho’s clearly disturbed behavior; they will debate campus security. But if thirty-two murders say anything, it’s that police have neither the ability nor—as the Supreme Court has twice ruled—the responsibility to protect you.¹⁶

Seventy-six-year-old Professor Liviu Librescu, a Jewish survivor of Romanian labor camps, used his body to shield escaping Virginia students.¹⁷ Doubtless, the politicians who killed HB 1572 console themselves that their malfeasance didn’t quite cause his murder. But maybe North Carolina’s legislators will display uncharacteristic courage by passing legislation allowing concealed handgun permit-holders to deter or stop campus rampages. Heroes like Prof. Librescu deserve something better than their bodies to stop bullets.

1. “Gun bill gets shot down by panel: HB 1572, which would have allowed handguns on college campuses, died in subcommittee,” Roanoke Times, January 31, 2006, available at: <http://www.roanoke.com/news/roanoke/wb/wb/xp-50658>

2. “A principal and his gun,” Wayne Laugesen, Second Amendment Project of the Independence Institute, reprinted from Boulder Weekly, available at: <http://www.davekopel.com/2A/OthWr/principal&gun.htm>

3. “What If We Had Taken Columbine Seriously?” The Weekly Standard, April 24- May 1, 2000, by David B. Kopel, quoted from Second Amendment Project of The Independence Institute, available at: “ <http://www.davekopel.org/2A/Mags/WhatIfWeHadTakenColumbineSeriously.htm>”

4. “Gun Stops Gunman,” The Wall Street Journal, January 18, 2002 .

5. “The Real Lesson of the School Shootings,” The Wall Street Journal, March 27, 1998.

6. Ibid. at note 5.

7. “Multiple Victim Public Shootings,” John R. Lott Jr., School of Law , Yale University & William M. Landes, University of Chicago Law School, November 1, 1996 , Latest Revision, October 19, 2000 , p 18. Forwarded to me by the researcher, and available upon request. Also available for download at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=272929>

8. “Timeline: Major Fatal Campus Shootings,” The New York Times, April 17, 2007 . Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/17/us/shootings-timeline.html>

9. Ibid. at note 5.

10. “The Resistance: Teaching common-sense school protection,” David B. Kopel, National Review Online, October 10, 2006 , available at: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=YTNmZDZhYzg4NTMwODFIMzFmOTJhNjkODMzYzYzMWI=>

11. Utah concealed carry restrictions can be found at: <http://bci.utah.gov/CFP/CFPFAQ/FAQForbid.html>

12. “TN Moves to Allow Guns in Public Buildings,” Nashville News Sentinel, 4-18-07 , quoted from: <http://www.firearmscoalition.org/>

13. “A permit to pack,” News & Record, May 8, 2005 , Eric J.S. Townsend.

14. “Student pleaded with Tech: Allow guns,” The Roanoke Times, 4-20-07 , Bradford Wiles, available at: <http://www.roanoke.com/editorials/commentary/wb/113894>

15. “Imagine if students were armed,” The Roanoke Times, 9-5-06 , Larry Hincker, available at: <http://www.roanoke.com/editorials/commentary/wb/81277>

16. Supreme Court decisions Warren v. D.C., available at: <http://www.gunowners.org/sk0503.htm> and Riss v. NY, available at: <http://www.4lawschool.com/outlines/bank/torts102.htm>

17. “Israeli professor killed in US attack,” The Jerusalem Post, April 17, 2007 , available at: <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?apage=1&cid=1176152816138&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2F>

FireArms Safety Education

Monthly CWP/Basic Pistol Classes in Columbia or Your Location

NRA Basic and Instructor Classes:

NRA Basic Pistol, Rifle, Shotgun, Home Firearms Safety
Personal Protection In The Home, Personal Protection Outside The Home
Metallic and Shot Shell Reloading, Muzzeloading

Featuring the New NRA Personal Protection Outside the Home Class
for Advanced Shooters, Instructors and Training Counselors
Be Better Able To Protect Yourself. Call us about Advanced Courses Today!

Instructor Team:

- Frank Headley, NRA Senior Training Counselor/Certified Instructor, SLED Certified CWP Instructor, NRA Chief Range Safety Officer, Cell: 803-920-2673, Email: fheadley@onemain.com
- P. E. Morris, NRA Training Counselor/Certified Instructor, Inspector U. S. Marshal's Service (Ret), SLED Certified CWP Instructor, NRA Chief Range Safety Officer, Cell: 803-465-4485, Email: pmorris2@sc.rr.com
- Linda Headley, NRA Certified Instructor, SLED Certified CWP Instructor, NRA Range Safety Officer Phone: 803-776-1226, Email: lheadley@onemain.com
- Deborah Morris, NRA Certified Instructor, SLED Certified CWP Instructor Phone: 803-776-2984, Email: pmorris2@sc.rr.com

Are you receiving your GrassRoots Action Alert emails?

Have you signed up to receive GrassRoots Action Alerts but not receiving any? Recently we discovered over a thousand email addresses on our Action Alert list that were bouncing back to us and may no longer be valid email addresses. If you have not received at least three in the past three months, there may be a problem receiving them and you may not even know it. Here are some things you should do to make certain:

- Verify that we have your correct email address. Has it changed? Did you inform us?
- Check with your internet provider to make sure emails from us are not being blocked.

House Judiciary Subcommittee Meets on H3964

GrassRoots leadership faxed the following letter in support of H.3964 to all members of the House Judiciary General Laws Subcommittee on 9 May, 2007. GrassRoots leaders also attended the hearing.

Dear Representative Talley:

As we start to look at the merits of H. 3964, we need to remember that what we should be most interested in doing is protecting the children. Being pro gun or anti gun should not be our concern. Rather, we need to remain focused on being pro children.

We understand the issue of allowing guns in schools is an emotion laden issue. But, the best laws are those laws calmly and deliberately considered, and firmly grounded in principle, logic, and fact. The worst laws are those passed in the heat of emotion and based upon fears, erroneous information, and deceptions. So, lets look at the facts.

First, the federal Centers for Disease Control found there is insufficient evidence to show that gun control laws have saved any lives at all in the United States. Thus, to claim that a "gun free" school zone law will save lives is simply an assumption unsupported by fact. When dealing with life and death issues regarding our children, our children deserve better laws than ones based upon unsubstantiated assumptions.

Second, concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders have proven themselves to be the good guys. Wherever more liberal CWP laws have been passed, violent crime rates have dropped. This benefits all the people in the state, not just the CWP holders who bear all of the costs. There is no evidence to support the wild claims - which are made every time a more liberal gun law is proposed - that we will have "Wild West shootouts" or "blood running in the streets" if a more liberal gun law is passed. Such unsubstantiated fears have never proven true and our laws should not cater to such fears. CWP holders are simply not a threat to our children.

Third, the best available research shows that virtually all mass public shootings occur where concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders are prohibited from carrying their sidearms. This is not surprising since most mass murderers never expect to survive their deadly rampage. These mass murderers want to make a political or social statement by killing as many people as they can before being stopped. An armed good guy - either a law enforcement

officer or other armed citizen - is the only thing standing between the mass murderer and his goal of a bunch of dead bodies. Therefore, a mass murderer seeks to avoid encountering armed good guys until after he has finished amassing the highest body count he can get.

Researchers John Lott and William Landes, then at Yale and the University of Chicago, respectively, studied multiple victim public shootings. Examining data from 1976 to 1995, they discovered the number of shootings in states which adopted concealed handgun laws declined by 84%, deaths plummeted by 90% and injuries by 82.5%. Crediting the reductions to deterrence (even suicidal maniacs avoid victims who shoot back), Lott and Landes called their findings "dramatic," concluding: "[T]he only policy factor to have a consistently significant influence on multiple victim public shootings is the passage of concealed handgun laws."

...our schools are not really "gun free."

Fourth, as proven by school shootings over the last few years, our schools are not really "gun free." One need only look at Virginia Tech; Columbine; Pearl, MS; and Virginia's Appalachian School of Law to see that laws banning guns do not stop mass murderers from bringing guns to schools. The bad guys still bring guns to school to harm our children because the bad guys do not obey the law. There is no rational basis to believe that a person intent upon violating God's law against murder will somehow stop merely because of a man made law against carrying a gun on school grounds.

When gun control advocates peddle their "gun free school zone" scheme as a solution, they avoid mentioning details of three other school shootings where armed intervention saved lives without additional shots fired. In Pearl, Mississippi, assistant principal Joel Myrick stopped triple murderer Luke Woodham by using a handgun retrieved from his car. In Edinboro, Pennsylvania, the 14-year-old who killed a teacher at an off-campus dance was captured by shotgun-wielding James Strand. And, at Virginia's Appalachian School of Law, student Tracy Bridges used his pistol to stop and detain murderer Peter Odighizuwa.

Contrast the three school shootings above with the recent Virginia Tech shootings and you will see why H. 3964 is needed. At Virginia Tech, the police were called immediately, and it only

took them five minutes to get to the site of the shooting. That is an excellent response time. But, the killer was still able to fire 170 rounds, killing 32 people after shooting them over 100 times. And that does not count the wounded. Then, the killer shot himself. The only thing that could have stopped this carnage sooner was if there had been a CWP holder with his sidearm in the school.

Mass murderers make rational decisions to avoid armed good guys who could stop them. Police officers are easily identified by their uniforms, and thus easily avoided. But, CWP holders are not easily identified, and thus are not easily avoided. And, even more importantly, there are approximately 300% more CWP holders in South Carolina than there are police officers. Therefore, the best way for a mass murderer to avoid a legally armed good guy capable of stopping the carnage is to choose a place where legally armed good guys are legally prohibited from carrying a sidearm. This is why legislatively created "gun free" zones are actually the most dangerous places to be when a mass murderer seeks to make a statement.

Law enforcement officers - about 25% of the legally armed good guys in SC - carry guns in schools to protect our children, and our children are not being shot by them. It is only non-law enforcement armed good guys - about 75% of the legally armed good guys in SC - who are banned from possessing guns at school to protect our children because these good guys obey the law even when the law is wrong. Just as we can see there is a difference between law enforcement officers and gang bangers, we need to recognize there is a difference between CWP holders and gang bangers. Not everyone with a gun is a bad guy.

Fifth, the federal "Gun Free School Zone Act" allows South Carolina CWP holders to carry in schools because SC CWP holders have proven themselves to be the good guys by passing both FBI and SLED background checks. Additionally, SLED requires a SC CWP holder to have a squeaky clean record, even speeding tickets are sufficient cause for denying a person a CWP.

Unfortunately, SC law denies SC CWP holders the right to carry on school grounds, even if simply dropping off or picking up their children at school. What this does is create safe havens for those who would prey upon our children. These mass murderers usually keep killing others until they either run out of ammunition or the police or

someone else shoots them. The threat of punishment afterwards is of absolutely no deterrent value when dealing with a person intent upon killing as many people as he can until he dies. The only effective deterrent is an armed good guy.

If we truly loved our children, we would not create safe havens for the killers of our children. Instead, we would recognize there is a difference between gang-bangers and CWP holders. We would recognize that CWP holders are the mothers and fathers of these school children. We would recognize that letting mothers and fathers save their children from a mass murderer is more important than hopefully punishing the murderer later. The most effective way to save our children is to allow the proven good guys - SC CWP holders - the right to carry on school grounds just as federal law already does. We must repeal the criminal safe haven law.

Section 1 of H. 3964 expressly provides that CWP holders can legally carry on school grounds, but Section 2 expressly denies that same right. This creates ambiguity where none need exist. The last sentence of Section 2 of H. 3964 reads "Nothing contained herein may be construed to alter or affect the provisions of Sections 10-11-320, 16-23-420, 16-23-430, 16-23-465, 44-23-1080, 44-52-165, 50-9-830, and 51-3-145." References to Sections 16-23-420 and 16-23-430 should be deleted so as to avoid any conflicts with Section 1 and thereby create ambiguity over whether such sections of law are applicable to CWP holders. Also, Section 50-9-830 was repealed effective July 1, 1996, and thus should also be deleted.

H. 3964 is well grounded in principle, logic, and fact, and deserves to be enacted into law after adding just a couple of amendments necessary to perfect the bill. GrassRoots GunRights asks that you pass this bill after amending it as proposed above.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President, GrassRoots
GunRights

Do you want to make a REAL
difference in the next election?
Help fund the

GunRights PAC

Send donations to:
220 Isobel Ct.
Lexington, SC 29072

LEGISLATION continued from page 9

would punish parents who are “aware of a substantial risk” but it does not say that any crime has to have been committed. A parent is potentially still in violation of this if their child never takes a firearm to school. It does not address what constitutes “being aware” of this risk. Will a teacher or administrator’s word be enough? It does not address what are the acceptable measures a parent must take to secure firearms from the child. Would they be required to be banned from the household altogether?

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots opposes this bill unless amended to better protect the rights of the parent to keep firearms in the home, and unless it requires that the child has actually taken a firearm to school before the parent is guilty of this section.

Current Status: In the House Judiciary Committee.

Primary Sponsor: Ballentine.

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/

GOODWILL

continued from page 5

Toward the end of our conversation, Ms. Raven told me that she was very busy, she didn’t see why the signs would bother us, and that they were not going to change them. At that point, she very quickly gave me the “brush off” and hung up the phone.

Personally, I have decided not to do business with Goodwill Industries. Evidently, my wallet is welcome at Goodwill, but my firearm is not. You see, Goodwill Industries does want your dollars. They just don’t trust you in their store – unless you are completely defenseless.

Make a contribution
to GunRights PAC
today!

Mail your donations
to:
GunRights PAC
220 Isobel Ct.
Lexington, SC 29072

Do you want to be able to
read daily updates & in-
formation about your gun
rights in South Carolina?

Join the GrassRoots online
discussion forum at: [http://
groups.yahoo.com/group/
scfirearms/](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/scfirearms/)

bills/3604.htm

H. 3876: A stealth gun control bill which attempts to expand the ban on gun ownership of all types from “violent offenders” to all felons, even those who are nonviolent offenders. It also changes the wording that “handguns” may not be sold to a person under 21 to state “firearms” may not be sold to a person under 21. This will make the purchase (and effectively the ownership or possession) of any shotgun or rifle by persons under 21 unlawful. Hunting by all persons under 21 years of age would disappear, unless accompanied by an adult.

Principles Involved: The right to keep and bear arms is a constitutionally guaranteed right. We should not permit even the slightest incremental erosion of our rights by those who wish to eventually take all guns away from every person.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots strongly opposes this bill.

Current Status: In the House Judiciary Committee.

Primary Sponsor: Stavrinakis

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3876.htm

H. 3964: A bill which intends to eliminate the ban on carry of a firearm on school and college premises by Concealed Weapon Permit holders. The bill needs to be amended because it states nothing contained in the bill will alter the provisions of certain other sections which say that carry on school property is unlawful. Another section is cited which has been repealed.

Principles Involved: The right to keep and bear arms should not be restricted in any location where the general public has the right to be. Law abiding citizens should be able to carry a firearm where ever

they wish.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots supports this bill.

Current Status: In the House Judiciary Committee.

Primary Sponsor: Duncan

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3964.htm

H. 3974: A bill that would allow a firearm to also be stored under the seat of a vehicle.

Principles Involved: Gun owners should be able to store a firearm where they choose.

GrassRoots Position: GrassRoots supports this bill

Current Status: In the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

Primary Sponsor: Rutherford

Full Text: http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/bills/3974.htm

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.scfirearms.org>

February 20, 2007

The Honorable James H. Harrison
South Carolina House of Representatives
P.O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: H. 3212 and H. 3310

Dear Rep. Harrison:

GrassRoots GunRights has an interest in two bills coming before the Judiciary Committee today - H. 3212 and H. 3310. GrassRoots urges you to pass both bills exactly as recommended by the General Laws subcommittee.

H. 3212 is a bill to amend the South Carolina concealed weapon permit (CWP) reciprocity law to help protect South Carolina CWP holders and their families when they travel in other states by allowing CWP holders from other states to carry in South Carolina. Once this bill is enacted into law, SC CWP holders will be able to carry in approximately 30+ other states. As of this morning, SLED’s web site lists only nine (9) states with which SC currently has reciprocity, and www.packing.org lists another eleven (11) states that will honor a SC CWP regardless of whether SC honors their CWP.

The fear mongers and the anti gun forces oppose this bill by claiming all sorts of things that simply are not true. For example, at the General Laws subcommittee hearing last week, SLED tried to deceive the subcommittee with false claims that H. 3212 would allow 16 year old juveniles from New Hampshire to carry concealed handguns at Myrtle Beach. GrassRoots thoroughly discredited that ridiculous claim in a letter to the subcommittee citing federal law - 18 U.S.C. § 922(x)(2) - that specifically refutes such outlandish claims. Last year, Rep. Mike Pitts reported that SLED told legislators Florida issued CWPs to felons to carry guns even though SLED knows that federal law prohibits felons from possessing firearms and a state can not grant permission to do that which is prohibited by federal law. Unfortunately, it is not possible to keep up with all of the outlandish claims being made to scare people. So, GrassRoots will stick to the facts.

The truth of the matter is that CWP holders have proven they are law abiding people no matter where they come from in these United States, and they are not a threat to public safety anywhere. There are good guys and there are bad guys, and the bad guys do not bother to get a CWP - they just carry guns without a permit. People do not change their character just because they cross a state line.

continued on next page

Criminal Justice Taskforce Meets

by Tom Glaab

On Monday April 16th I was asked to represent GrassRoots South Carolina at the special North Charleston meeting of the Senate Judiciary Committee Criminal Justice System Task Force. The Task Force had been convened at the request of the Governor, and was soliciting input from citizens across the state.

The Task Force had come up with a list of bills that they thought would help address the crime problems that are popping up around the state. Their recommendations included support for several

Senate bills – S.141, S.142, S.143, S.144, S.145, S.146, S.147, S.148, and various administrative actions. None

of these bills speaks directly to firearms issues, however they could create some troubling legal issues down the road. Specifically, S.147 calls for a mechanism to reclassify offenses. We have already seen how this has been used, through the US Senate’s “Lautenberg Amendment,” to deny citizens their second amendment rights long after they satisfied their obligations to the justice system.

The legislative proposals appeared to be fairly good – for people who were already in “the system.” Bills spoke to moving the Courts’ caseloads quickly, keeping non-violent offenders out of prison, allowing younger people to take the GED, and, oddly, a bill to push the use of DNA for identifying people.

Three of the five Task Force members attended the hearing: Chairman Gerald Malloy, Robert Ford, and Jake Knotts. Senate Judiciary Chair Glenn McConnell also attended. They heard from various citizens and groups, whose common theme appeared to be, “give us money.” These community groups spoke of their programs – walking the streets, leadership programs, alternative schools, and church programs. All seemed to say their program would be a bigger success if it were funded by the Senators.

When it was my turn to speak for GrassRoots GunRights South Carolina, I stood at the podium and decided which of my five prepared points I would cover. It was clear that several were not germane, or had been addressed by the panel already. I was wearing a Virginia Tech sweatshirt, and I explained to the panel that it had been a very long day for me, as I had graduated from the Virginia

Tech engineering program, and knew the scene in Blacksburg well. I told them that unfortunately the University and the legislature had worked hard to ensure the gunman had no opposition. Criminals don’t follow the rules, and that’s why GrassRoots South Carolina was keeping an eye on the Task Force.

I noted that the Task Force only intended to affect criminals, but inevitably the definition of criminal changes over time. “A fight that was forgotten long ago is reclassified as domestic violence. Domestic violence is reclassified as a disqualifying offense.”

GrassRoots intends to ensure these entirely predictable “unforeseen side effects” aren’t allowed to happen.

Senator Jake Knotts lit up when he heard that GrassRoots was speaking, and jumped on me about why GrassRoots did not support mandatory eight-hour training requirements – an obvious reference to his opposition to H.3212. I smiled and explained that GrassRoots does not support an arbitrary mandatory minimum training requirement, but would much rather see the CWP holder demonstrate competence through testing, much as drivers’ licenses are issued based on proficiency, not mandatory minimum training. Senator Knotts claimed that the

eight hour training requirement was written into the original law to gain the support required to pass. He also insisted that there is a big difference between driving a car and carrying a firearm, to which I respectfully disagreed. I refused to be drawn into a fight with the Senator, and Senator Ford declared that I was “farther to the right than [Senator Knotts].” I smiled and thanked him.

Later, GrassRoots member Jason Rucker spoke. He had a compelling story about how his family had fled their home downtown when the police failed to take the crime problem seriously. His statement that the police need to take “victimless crimes” seriously because they inevitably escalate drew a favorable response from the audience.

Jason also spoke to the crime reclassification problem, getting the panel to admit that there are misdemeanors that carry one year penalties – thus providing for felony punishments. He also spoke against S.643, which invokes the felony-grade punishments for misdemeanors. And that’s when things got interesting.

Clearly these hearings are orchestrated – while speakers sign up ahead of time, the panel selects the speaking order. The people who are known to support their positions are given prime spots. There are hidden agendas shaping the arguments. And Jason

didn’t know that he stepped right into S.643. He was quickly shot down by Senator Malloy, being told that S.643 was not a Task Force bill. Many other topics not on the Task Force’s agenda had been brought up, so why was S.643 off-limits? After the meeting we spoke with Senator Malloy, and it seems that he had effectively tabled that bill in subcommittee, and did not want anybody bringing it up. While he was a bit harsh on Jason, it was probably for the best. Unfortunately we were not fully prepared, and could have handled that better.

Senator Knotts used several other opportunities to take cheap shots at GrassRoots. He brought up his arbitrary training requirements a few times. When Charleston Chief of Police Greg Mullins spoke, Senator Knotts said that GrassRoots supported gun owners carrying into bars. Chief Mullins was quick to vigorously disagree with that stand, and the audience applauded. Unfortunately Senator Knotts was misrepresenting GrassRoots’ position – I no longer had the floor and could not respond, but have followed up with a letter to Chief Mullins noting that he allowed himself to be suckered into a bad position by not putting parameters on an open-ended question. Does Chief Mullins see an equivalence between a Saturday-night-only bar and the fine restaurants downtown? Does the mere presence of alcohol in a place like Chuck-E-Cheese cause

See **TASKFORCE** on page 19

GrassRoots does not support an arbitrary mandatory minimum training requirement.

H. 3212 is a bill that recognizes good people remain good people even after crossing a state line, and H. 3212 will allow the good people of South Carolina to be able to protect their families when traveling out of state. GrassRoots urges you to pass H. 3212 without amendment exactly as recommended by the General Laws subcommittee.

H. 3310 is a bill to amend Section 16-23-20(9) to specifically allow CWP holders to carry while in their vehicles. This bill is not needed because existing law already allows CWP holders to carry while in their vehicles. But unfortunately, there are many reports of law enforcement officers not knowing the law and thereby harassing honest law abiding citizens for doing what the law allows. GrassRoots believes the proper solution is to educate law enforcement about the CWP law, not pass another law to say what the first law already says.

H. 3310 - as initially drafted - will cause harm primarily to our female CWP holders by making it a crime for them to carry in their purse when in a vehicle. This would force our female CWP holders who choose to carry in their purses to have to transfer the sidearm between their purse and the glove box or console every time they enter and leave a vehicle. This unnecessary and excessive handling of firearms is not in the best interests of public safety. Therefore, if this bill must get passed - and GrassRoots sees no need to do so, then please amend H. 331 as GrassRoots and Rep. Mike Pitts requested the General Laws subcommittee to do - and the General Laws subcommittee has already done - to protect our female CWP holders.

If GrassRoots leaders can be of any further assistance or answer any questions, please feel free to contact Dr. Robert D. Butler at (803) 957-3959. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President
GrassRoots GunRights SC

JUDICIARY

continued from page 7

for this: Those who commit these crimes usually die in the attack. ... The normal penalties simply do not

GrassRoots Instructor Program

by Frank Headly

GrassRoots Instructor
Program Coordinator

Instructors are a very important part of GrassRoots. They are the first contact with members of the public wanting to learn how to safely use firearms. Whether an instructor teaches just CWP classes or a wide variety of pistol, shotgun, rifle or other civilian or law enforcement basic, advanced or instructor level classes dealing with firearms they need to be a GrassRoots Instructors member. The GrassRoots instructors program will promote all shooting sports.

GrassRoots is the only organization in the state that actively lobbies for gun rights and needs the support of the instructors to recruit new members. The future of our rights is directly proportional to the amount of effort that we put into educating our lawmakers and the public about the benefits of concealed carry and the shooting sports and that firearms have a positive impact on our state in the hands of law abiding citizens. As instructors we have an obligation to promote gun rights organizations. Too few of our students are members of any gun rights organization.

What are the benefits of you becoming a GrassRoots Instructor Member?

This is what we are working on now that are in place or soon to be in place:

1. Free web space to get your name out on the web page
2. Preferential ad rates in the defender
3. Incentives for you to recruit new members. Free stuff.
4. Automated listing of your individual class schedules from your computer
5. Brochures with all instructors listed to be handed out at gun shows and other venues

The membership is \$25 and the instructor now receives free web site space.

If your membership has lapsed please renew now.

Call me in the evening at 803-776-1226 or on my cell phone 803-920-2673 with suggestions or comments or email me at instprog@scfirearms.org Thank you for your help and support.

apply.

... *The best way to prevent these attacks might therefore be to limit the carnage they can cause if they do attack. We find only one policy that effectively accomplishes this: the passage of right-to-carry laws.*

When different states passed right-to-carry laws during the nineteen years we studied, the number of multiple-victim public shootings declined by a whopping 84 percent. Deaths from all these shootings plummeted by 90 percent, and injuries by 82 percent. ... *The very few attacks that still occur ... tend to occur in particular places where concealed handguns are forbidden, such as schools.*

... *Concealed-handgun laws also have an important advantage over uniformed police, for would-be attackers can aim their initial assault at a single officer, or alternatively wait until he leaves*

the area. With concealed carrying by ordinary citizens, it is not known who is armed until the criminal actually attacks.

Despite all the debate about criminals behaving irrationally, reducing their ability to accomplish their warped goals reduces their willingness to attack. ... Unfortunately, without concealed carry, ordinary citizens are sitting ducks, waiting to be victimized." John R. Lott, Jr., *More Guns, Less Crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control Laws 195-197* (2nd ed., 2000).

H. 3964 is not about kids carrying guns on campus because kids can not possess handguns. H. 3964 is about allowing parents of students to possess a handgun when caring for their children at school. It is about teachers being prepared to defend our children if a deranged killer seeks notoriety for shooting up a school as has happened many times already. It is about older female students taking

night classes and being able to walk to their cars in dark parking lots without becoming easy victims of rapists.

The parents who have taken the time and effort to get a CWP should not be turned into felons for dropping off or picking up their children at schools and colleges. It is unreasonable to force parents of college students to travel unarmed while driving hours each way to drop off or retrieve their children from some distant college, oft times in the dark of night. It is unreasonable to force a parent to travel unarmed while going to and from work in a crime ridden area just because the parent also has to drop off or pick up their child from school. It is unreasonable to turn classic soccer moms into felons for possessing a handgun on school property when they suddenly find that the team's away game is at a school instead of a public field.

If we truly loved our
See JUDICIARY on page 18

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.SCFirearms.org>

May 2, 2007

The Honorable John D. Hawkins
South Carolina Senate
P.O. Box 142
Columbia, SC 29202

RE: H. 3212

Dear Senator Hawkins:

As I was trying to edit the mountains of factual, principled, and logical data supporting passage of H. 3212, I realized it was most likely a waste of time. Why? Because most people are motivated to act by emotions such as fear and hate rather than principles, logic, or facts. But, the good people of South Carolina deserve better than to have their laws passed based upon the factually unsupported and irrational fears of others, especially when those laws deal with matters of life and death. So, here are the facts.

H. 3212 would allow concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders from other states to carry in South Carolina. Then, other states would allow South Carolina CWP holders to carry in their states. Georgia and Florida are two of the closer states that would allow SC CWP holders to carry in their states if only SC would allow their CWP holders to carry here.

Unfortunately, there are those who resort to half truths and deceptions to get people emotionally upset in efforts to stop passage of this bill. For example, in the House General Laws subcommittee hearing earlier this year on H. 3212, SLED stooped to a new low when Capt. Joe Dorton told the subcommittee that New Hampshire would issue a CWP to a 16 year old youth thereby allowing such youth to carry guns in Myrtle Beach, SC. That is simply NOT true. Attached you will find the letter GrassRoots sent to the members of the House General Laws subcommittee to set the record straight.

Last year, SLED told lawmakers Florida would issue a CWP to a mentally incompetent person or a felon. SLED knows a state can not grant a privilege to do something that federal law prohibits, and SLED also knows federal law prohibits such people from possessing a firearm. Thus, SLED was intentionally deceptive in their successful effort to kill a bill similar to H. 3212. The fears generated by this factually unsupported, emotional response overruled logic and facts.

The current fear being exploited with regards to H. 3212 is the fear that "untrained" people from Georgia will inundate SC and wreak havoc upon us. Georgia CWP holders have

continued on next page

GunRights PAC Update

GunRights PAC is dedicated to punishing those politicians who claim to support our gun rights and ask for our votes during the election season, but fail to support our rights during the legislative season. We need to make these politicians understand gun owners are not going to be so gullible anymore. We need to make these politicians understand we are watching what they DO during the legislative season, and that we will respond accordingly during the election season.

GunRights PAC judges politicians by what they do - or fail to do - during the legislative season. GunRights PAC is not swayed by what these politicians claim during the election season.

Politicians need to learn that actions - i.e., their votes during the legislative season - speak louder than words - i.e., their campaign promises and claims of being 2nd Amendment supporters. Just because Bill Clinton and John Kerry claimed they supported the 2nd Amendment and even went duck hunting during the election season to "prove" it, does not make it true. We know from their actions during the legislative season that these politicians do not support the 2nd Amendment.

GunRights PAC will also need to support our true blue friends in the General Assembly. But, a true blue friend is one that can be counted upon ALL of the time, not just some of the time.

GunRights PAC gives a huge "Thank you" to the many people who have contributed to GunRights PAC. In an effort to ensure your contributions are put to work doing what you want your money to do, a decision has been made to not send out individual "Thank you" letters to contributors. Please understand GunRights PAC is not ungrateful. Rather, we think you would rather we spend your contributions in the fight to protect your rights, not wasting it on postage, envelopes, and paper thanking you for your contributions.

The GunRights PAC strategy is quite simple - inflict pain upon those who betray us. Why inflict pain for bad actions instead of rewards for good actions? Because it has been proven that pain is remembered much longer than pleasure is remembered. So, to get the most bang for our buck, we need to do what will be remembered the longest.

GunRights PAC will take many small contributions - and large ones, too - from gun rights supporters all across South Carolina and combine them into one large war chest. Then, we will look to get involved in a primary

campaign where the incumbent is vulnerable. This incumbent has to be one who needs the votes of gun owners to get elected. This incumbent has to be one who claims to support our gun rights, but has failed to do so during the legisla-

tive season.

Once GunRights PAC finds such a race, we can use as much of our war chest as needed to help oust an incumbent who has failed to support our gun rights. We will not be limited by the campaign contribution limits in the law because we will make our expen-

ditures as independent expenditures separate from the candidates' expenditures. It is this strategy that makes GunRights PAC different.

GunRights PAC currently has almost \$30,000 in its war chest. That is not quite enough to oust an incumbent, but it is very

See PAC on page 16

proven themselves to be just as law abiding people as SC CWP holders have proven themselves to be. GA CWP holders have proven themselves to be no threat to the people of GA, so why would they suddenly become a threat to the people of SC? The fear mongers would have you believe GA CWP holders will have radical personality changes when they cross the state line into SC and become homicidal maniacs. That is a factually unsupported, emotional response to our fear of strangers. SC deserves better.

Since the issue of mandatory CWP "training" is a primary concern for the vocal opponents of H. 3212, lets look at the real value of CWP "training." Dr. John Lott studied this very issue. Dr. Lott found that whether a state required no "training", a little "training", or extensive "training", there was NO adverse impact upon public safety due to accidental shootings by CWP holders. But, Dr. Lott did find that mandatory CWP "training" *negatively* impacted public safety by allowing violent crime rates to remain higher than the rates would have been had there been no mandatory CWP "training" requirement. Thus, mandatory CWP "training" has been shown to actually *decrease* public safety, not increase it. But, this is another inconvenient truth, not an emotional hot button.

The federal Centers for Disease Control published a study that found there was no evidence supporting the claims that any gun control laws have saved any lives. Again, more facts.

The fact of the matter is that most shooting incidents fall within the "Rule of Threes," which states that a shooting incident will last less than three seconds, at a distance of less than three yards, and will involve three shots or less. Think about that for a minute. How much training does it take to hit a target that is almost within touching distance? An honest answer will tell you why some states do not impose a mandatory "training" requirement to obtain a CWP.

The true "value" of CWP "training" has already been recognized in some states. SC CWP "training" teaches that one should get a proper sight alignment, proper sight picture, use proper breath control, and slowly squeeze the trigger when shooting a firearm. Unfortunately, such teaching is only good for target shooting or hunting. It is not compatible with the real world of life and death self-defense, where people - even highly trained police - just point and shoot when their lives are in imminent danger from a threat less than three yards away.

Imposing a mandatory CWP "training" requirement before allowing one to exercise the constitutionally guaranteed right to keep and bear arms and the right to effective self-defense, is no different than imposing a mandatory literacy test prior to allowing one to exercise the constitutionally guaranteed right to vote. Both the mandatory "training" and the literacy test are designed to prevent people from exercising their rights. Both are wrong.

H. 3212 does not ask that SC eliminate its CWP "training" requirement. All H. 3212 does is allow SC CWP holders to carry in other states by allowing CWP holders from other states to carry here. There is no danger to SC from allowing good people from other states to

carry here as they already do at home. And, there is a tremendous benefit to SC CWP holders being able to carry in other states when traveling.

GrassRoots can not impress and entertain you with emotion ridden fears, half-truths, deceptions, and predictions of blood running in the streets, people from Georgia turning into zombies after coming to SC and killing our children, or that the sky will fall if you pass H. 3212. But, that is because none of those things will happen. GrassRoots believes the best laws are those based upon factually supported, logical, and principled reasons. That is why you should pass H. 3212.

GrassRoots asks you to please pass H. 3212 exactly as it came from the House.

Sincerely,



Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President, GrassRoots GunRights SC

Personal Protection Outside the Home

by Frank Headley
GrassRoots Instructor
Program Coordinator

For the past 10 years the NRA Training Department has been working on a new course to offer to advanced students who have taken Basic Courses such as Basic Pistol and Personal Protection Inside the Home. At this time, there are about 48 states offering some form of concealed carry to its citizens with about 40 offering a shall issue permit to persons who have completed a very basic safety and firearms course (or not) and are law abiding citizens with no criminal record.

This has worked fine even in states which require little or no training. Our own state requires a minimum of training which has not caused any problems. Students who complete a CWP class

generally know how to handle a gun safely, the laws regarding the use of deadly force and the places where a firearm can be legally carried. They have also passed a basic firearms skill test which was designed to make sure that the applicant can handle the firearm in a safe manner under actual range conditions. It is not designed to turn ordinary citizens into pistoleros. Although we have seen many students shoot the middle out of the target.

The Personal Protection Outside The Home course is a 14 hour course broken into a 9 hour "Basic" module and a 5 hour "Advanced" module. It is designed to be taught in one weekend or as two separate courses with about 7 plus hours of range time with various shooting exercises designed to help the student become more proficient

in the use of a firearm for self defense. After over 220 rounds, the student has actual experience in firing after drawing from the holster from concealment from various positions at typical self defense range of 2 yards to 10 yards. Students can use a strong side holster or holster purse. This course teaches the SAFE way to present and fire from concealment.

For an NRA Certified Instructor to be certified to teach Personal Protection Outside The Home, the instructor must be an NRA Certified Instructor in Basic Pistol and Personal Protection In The Home. The instructor is then required to take the 14 hour student version and the 16 hour Instructor course for a total of 30 hours. There are no exceptions to this for any NRA Instructor or Training Counselor.

This course was first

offered to the public and instructors in early 2007 and NRA Instructors around the country are offering a package to include all pre-requisites with the express purpose of getting students to a higher level. In South Carolina there are several Master and Senior Training Counselors offering this course to Instructors and Training Counselors. There are several NRA Instructors who are now trained in the state who will be offering this class to students. The Master and Senior Training Counselors were trained by the Master Training Counselors at the NRA Training Department in summer 2006 through January 2007.

This class is not Gunsite, Lethal Force Institute or Thunder Ranch but it is advanced enough to be a pretty good pre-requisite for any major training venue. It is a good choice for anyone who wants to improve their shooting and self-defense skills.

PAC

continued from page 15

close. Remember, the best way to get the respect of politicians is to let them know that you "talk softly, and carry a big stick."

Please send whatever you can afford to help make an example of one of these politicians who claim to support your rights during election season, but who betrays you and your rights during the legislative season. Better yet, if you send enough money, we could try to oust a couple of these politicians.

Again, a hearty "Thank you" to all of you have already contributed. And, another request for your support to everyone. The anti gunners are well funded. We need to show that we have the ammo to win this fight.

Contributions should be sent to:
GunRights PAC
220 Isobel Court
Lexington, SC 29072

Do we have your correct email address?

GrassRoots hopes to use more of the funds you donate specifically for 2nd Amendment victories. To do that, we need to save money where ever possible. The rising cost of postage and printing makes sending out paper membership renewal reminders very expensive. If we have your email address, we can send out membership renewals by email each month for free. This means we can use your valued donations in areas that will have a more direct impact. Let us know if you would prefer to receive the Defender by email too.

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.SCFirearms.org>

May 7, 2007

The Honorable Glenn F. McConnell
South Carolina Senate
P.O. Box 142
Columbia, SC 29202

RE: H. 3212

Dear Senator McConnell:

The best laws are those laws calmly and deliberately considered, and firmly grounded in principle, logic, and fact. The worst laws are those passed in the heat of emotion and based upon fears, erroneous information, and deceptions. H. 3212 is well grounded in principle, logic, and fact, and deserves to be enacted into law.

The single most important fact is that concealed weapon permit (CWP) holders in *EVERY* state have proven themselves to be law abiding citizens that are *NOT* a threat to the safety of other law abiding people. This fact holds true regardless of whether the CWP holder is required to obtain extensive "training", moderate "training", or no "training" at all. This fact was discovered and published by Dr. John Lott, and has withstood the scrutiny of the peer reviewed academic journal community. Thus, CWP "training" has been proven to have no positive impact upon public safety.

Another important fact is that people are creatures of habit. If one is a law abiding citizen on one side of a state border, then one will remain a law abiding citizen on the other side of a state border. Citizens of Georgia do NOT change from law abiding people in Georgia to reckless or homicidal maniacs simply because they cross the border into South Carolina. Thus, CWP holders from Georgia are no threat to the people of South Carolina.

The right to self-defense and the right to keep and bear arms are God given rights. Such rights should only be infringed when there is a compelling reason to do so, such as not allowing incarcerated individuals to possess firearms. Unsubstantiated fears are not compelling reasons to infringe upon fundamental God given rights.

H. 3212 is needed to protect the lives of South Carolina people when they travel. If H. 3212 is enacted into law, South Carolina CWP holders will be able to legally carry in more than 30 states. As it stands now, South Carolina only has reciprocity with 11 states, while at least 11 other states have already passed laws similar to H. 3212 that will recognize the CWP from another state.

continued on next page

An Apology from GrassRoots Leadership

The leadership of GrassRoots GunRights would like to apologize to everyone for being late with the publication of *The Defender*. It's our fault and we're sorry. But there were some very good reasons that *The Defender* is so late arriving in your mailbox.

If you read through this entire issue, you'll see that we've had a very busy legislative season so far this year. Every time we thought we were close to finishing *The Defender*, something else would come up down at the Statehouse and it would throw a wrench into our plans. If you compare the dates on all the letters we've sent with a calendar, you can see that there was quite a lot of activity up at the Statehouse throughout March, April and May of this year. GrassRoots leaders spent considerable time preparing for, attending and speaking before Senate and House committees and subcommittees, which were voting on several very important gun bills.

The news about the Virginia Tech shootings also caused a flurry of activity for GrassRoots leaders. If you've been to our website [www.SCFirearms.org], you will have noticed that no less than three television appearances resulted from topics relating to the Virginia Tech massacre and our backing of H.3964, which, in its original form, would have permitted lawful CWP holders to carry on school grounds.

The first GrassRoots appearance was aired by WIS-TV channel 10 in Columbia, SC, who filmed GrassRoots testimony before the House Judiciary General Laws Subcommittee regarding H.3964. Evidently that was picked up by national newswires, because the second appearance was as a guest on CNN opposite Representative Todd Rutherford (D-Richland) to debate the issue of allowing lawful carry on school and college campuses. The third appearance was as a guest on CNN Headline News, also opposite Rep Rutherford and on the same topic. If you have not already done so, please visit our website and watch the three video segments posted on there.

As you read through all the information on our website, you'll notice that we created an area we call our "Legislation Watch" pages. This area was created to keep you informed of all the things GrassRoots have been doing up at the Statehouse regarding various gun related legislation. On that section of our website you can find letters sent by Grassroots to our legislators. These letters contain important talking points, which you can use when discussing the issues with your friends and

neighbors. The Legislation Watch area also contains information and details of events that transpired at various public and private meetings at the Statehouse. Many of these details you won't find anywhere else. The mainstream media won't tell you about them. Our elected officials certainly won't tell you what they are up to. GrassRoots is always there, keeping an eye on them for you, and we will keep you informed.

One thing to keep in mind about *The Defender*, however is that your membership dues do not pay for a

subscription to the newspaper. We've had some people express some concern that they "paid for a subscription" and were not receiving their newspaper. This is evidently a common misconception. *The Defender* is FREE to everyone who wants it. We mail out thousands to gun owners across the state. Some are GrassRoots members, but many are not. Many are simply

CWP holders. We send stacks of newspapers to businesses that request them to be given out for free to their customers. We send bundles to CWP instructors that request them to give out at their classes. We even post it online on our website for the whole world to download and read absolutely free of charge. What your membership dues pay for is *gun rights activism*. Here at GrassRoots HQ that never stops, even those times when we missed a *Defender* publishing deadline.

While many of our members get up-to-date information weekly or even daily from our website, from our online discussion forum [<http://groups.yahoo.com/groups/scfirearms/>], or from our Action Alert emails, some members still get their information only by reading *The Defender*.

Yes, we've been very busy with everything going on up at the Statehouse, and with the Virginia Tech tragedy, but we've come to the realization that we

are just not going to be able to put *The Defender* out without something being somewhat outdated. Important gun-related news happens every day, and the moment we think we're done, something new will happen. So we've resolved to stick to a strict quarterly publishing schedule no matter what comes up in the future.

In order to accomplish this, we are calling for volunteers to help us with the nuts & bolts of writing and publishing *The Defender*. If you have any special talents or skills in researching, writing, layout, design, proofreading or publishing, please step up and volunteer your assistance and become a member of *The Defender* staff. We could certainly use your help and our publication would become that much better with your input. Contact Bill Rentiers, our Executive Officer if you would like to volunteer to help out on the next *Defender*.

If you'd rather receive *The Defender* by email, we can accommodate that very easily. In fact, you'd probably receive *The Defender* before everyone else gets his or hers in the mail. And it

See **APOLOGY** on page 20

*The Defender is
FREE to everyone
who wants it.*

Another argument in favor of enacting H. 3212 into law is that there are many CWP holders who choose which states they will vacation in based upon whether their own state's CWP will be honored there. South Carolina is losing tourism dollars to Georgia and Florida due to South Carolina's failure to honor other states' CWPs.

The opponents of H. 3212 cry that allowing CWP holders from Georgia into South Carolina will cause a bloodbath. These claims of "blood in the streets" are virtually the same claims that were made when the South Carolina CWP law was being considered in 1996. Such fear mongering claims were wrong then, and they are still wrong today. The fact is that such claims have *NEVER* proven to be true in any state. There is *NO* factual, principled, or logical basis for such claims.

Unfortunately, even SLED has gotten involved in trying to deceive the General Assembly about the merits of H. 3212. In the House General Laws subcommittee earlier this year, SLED falsely claimed that New Hampshire would issue a CWP to a 16 year old youth, and that then such youths would be allowed to carry guns in Myrtle Beach. Last year, SLED claimed that Florida issued CWPs to mentally incompetent people and felons, and thus South Carolina would be forced to allow such people to carry guns here.

SLED's claims are simply not true. SLED knows federal law prohibits people under the age of 18, mentally incompetent people, and felons from possessing handguns. SLED also knows state law can not allow that which federal law prohibits. SLED should be ashamed for making such claims, and the General Assembly should not allow itself to be manipulated by a state agency in this way.

Taking the above facts and principles into consideration, the only reasonable conclusion that can be reached is that H. 3212 should be enacted into law. There is no danger to the people of South Carolina. It allows good people from other states to exercise their right to self-defense while in South Carolina. It is good for tourism. But, most importantly of all, passage of H. 3212 will allow the good people of South Carolina to be able to protect themselves and their families whenever they travel to other states.

Sincerely,

RD Butler

Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President
GrassRoots GunRights

Make a contribution to the
GunRights PAC

220 Isobel Ct.
Lexington, SC 29072

**These merchants carry Grass-
Roots flyers. Please support
them with your patronage.**

Carolina Precision Rifles
1200 Old Jackson Hwy.,
Jackson, SC
(803) 827-2069

Carolina Star
371 Cedar Branch Rd.,
Windsor, SC
(803) 649-0878

The City Barber Shop
238 Park Av. SW.
Aiken, SC
(803) 642-6594

Hootie's Outdoors
3770 Jefferson Davis Hwy
Clearwater, SC
(803) 593-0019

The Jeweler's Loupe
1304 Richland Ave.
West Aiken, SC
(803) 648-3875

Sidney's Dept. Store
550 - 560 Broad Street
Augusta, GA
(706) 722-3112

Sportsman's Link
596 Bobby Jones Exp. #21A
Augusta, GA
(703) 210-7283

United Loan & Firearms
1040 Broad Street
Augusta, GA
(706) 722-1326

Walden's Outdoor World
2323 Peach Orchard Rd.
Augusta, GA
(703) 560-2266

If your store carries GrassRoots
flyers, your name should be here
too! Let us know if we should
have listed your business and
missed it. If you want to carry
our flyers, send an email to Ex-
ecOfficer@SCFirearms.org

Make a donation to the
**GrassRoots Legal
Defense Fund**
P.O. Box 2446
Lexington, SC 29071

ZUMBO continued from page 6

Carolina.

- GrassRoots members can join the GrassRoots Leadership online discussion forum. Get involved with the planning and strategy of the organization. Contribute your knowledge and drive to the cause.
- Become a GrassRoots Gorilla and attend committee meetings at the state capitol. Let your legislators know that you are watching them like a hawk!
- Make a donation to one or more of the GrassRoots funds, such as

the GrassRoots PAC, the Grass-Roots Legal Defense Fund, or just to the GrassRoots general fund. It doesn't have to be a large amount. Don't put yourself in any financial strain. Just send what you can afford, when you can afford to. Every little bit helps.

- Write letters to the editor of your local paper. Tell them your positions on gun rights and self defense issues. The general public should read opinions more often from honest, hard working people who

simply want to keep our gun rights intact, and the reasons why that is important to us.

Each of these are small steps that all of us can take individually to make GrassRoots an even stronger and more effective organization in the fight to preserve our gun rights. What steps have you been taking to protect your right to bear arms? Have other priorities crept in and made your life "too busy" to focus on protecting your gun rights? Its time to re-focus. Get back in the fight. We need you. Join us.

JUDICIARY

continued from page 14

children, we would not create safe havens for the killers of our children. Instead, we would recognize there is a difference between gang bangers and CWP holders. We would recognize that CWP holders are the mothers and fathers of these school children. We would recognize that letting mothers, fathers, and teachers save our children from a mass murderer

is more important than hopefully punishing the murderer later.

The fear mongers have predicted "Wild West" shootouts and blood in the streets every time a liberal gun law has been proposed. Not once have these fear mongers been right. It is now time to do what should have been done years ago - simply reject such lies, fantasies, and deceptions and do the right thing to enhance our children's safety.

The most effective way to save our children is to allow the proven good guys - SC CWP holders - the right to carry on school grounds just as federal law already does. We must repeal the criminal safe haven law.

H. 3964 is well grounded in principle, logic, and fact, and deserves to be enacted into law. GrassRoots GunRights asks that you pass this bill.

GrassRoots GunRights

P.O. Box 2446 Lexington, SC 29071 <http://www.SCFirearms.org>

May 28, 2007

The Honorable Robert W. Harrell, Jr.
South Carolina House of Representatives
P.O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Dear Rep. Harrell:

H. 3964 MUST NOT PASS AS AMENDED BY THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE! The newly proposed Section 23-31-245 will negate every concealed weapon permit (CWP) reciprocity agreement that South Carolina has entered into with every other state! This amendment is totally unacceptable to the 50,000 CWP holders in South Carolina! The Judiciary Committee's proposed Section 23-31-245 must be deleted from H. 3964!

The newly proposed Section 23-31-245 would become part of the South Carolina CWP law. As such, SLED must take this section of law into consideration when determining whether another state has "permit issuance standards equal to or greater than the standards contained in" the South Carolina CWP law. Since other states do not require what Section 23-31-245 would require of South Carolina CWP holders, ALL reciprocity agreements with South Carolina would be voided. This is totally unacceptable to the 50,000 CWP holders in South Carolina.

If the newly proposed Section 23-31-245 is amended to change it so as to not be part of the CWP law, then it would no longer be germane to the rest of H. 3964. Thus, the newly proposed Section 23-31-245 can not be amended within H. 3964 either without voiding all SC CWP reciprocity agreements or becoming non germane to the rest of the bill. Therefore, Section 23-31-245 should simply be deleted.

The newly proposed Section 23-31-245 destroys the privacy of medical records. Destroying the privacy of medical records is a controversial issue that will bring together a diverse coalition to oppose such a draconian measure. Resolution of this controversial issue will take quite some time to accomplish.

South Carolina CWP holders should not be forced to remain in the cross fire that is sure to occur once the issue of the destruction of the privacy of medical records is discovered. South Carolina CWP holders and public safety should not be held hostage to this issue while the fight drags on. The destruction of medical records privacy needs to be addressed outside of the CWP law.

GrassRoots GunRights - on behalf of the 50,000 SC CWP holders - requests first that the newly proposed Section 23-31-245 be deleted from H. 3964, and then, that the rest of H. 3964 be passed exactly as it came from the Judiciary Committee. The public safety benefits H. 3964 brings to the people of South Carolina demand the proposed Section 23-31-245 be deleted and the rest of H. 3964 get passed as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Butler, J.D.
Vice President
GrassRoots GunRights SC

GrassRoots Firearms Instructors

Please use the many Firearms Instructors, FFL Dealers and General Merchants who are members of GrassRoots GunRights of SC when you have purchases to make during the coming year. It is very important that we in the Pro-Gun community stick together and conduct business with Pro-Gun establishments whenever and wherever possible.

Below is a list of instructors who are GrassRoots members who can be contacted if you need firearms training such as CWP, Basic Pistol, Rifle, Shotgun, Home Firearms Safety, etc.

Mark Bilicki the454casull@hotmail.com	864-907-2852	Aiken, SC
Robert Brewer robcarb Brewer@bellsouth.net	803-649-9972	
Sam Clark samclark@concealedguns.com	864-834-7596	Traveler's Rest, SC
David Dean ddean@sc.rr.com	803-438-8656	
Christopher Green firstshotcwp@yahoo.com	864-444-0872	Lyman, SC
William Griffin wgriffin@bellsouth.net	803-755-9304	West Columbia, SC
Mike & Sherry Harris mhborn2fly@outdrs.net	803-313-0744	Greenville, SC
Frank & Linda Headley fheadley@onemain.com	803-776-1226	Columbia, SC
Mike Kaufman cwp@BIBCA.com	864-525-0320	Gaffney, SC
John Kolesar jks22@fhtm.us		Timmons ville, SC
Mike Lanford spartanmike@charter.net	864-414-5533	Simpsonville, SC
Kenneth Lear mike@charter.net	864-414-5533	Simpsonville, SC spartan-
Gary Morningstar gary@synergygroup-sc.com	864-230-3688	
Powell & Deborah Morris pmorris2@sc.rr.com	803-776-2984	Columbia, SC
Johnnie Nash johnnieelcid89@aol.com	843-747-0281	North Charleston, SC
Bob Oberst palstshooting@hargray.com	843-379-4867	Okatie, SC
Paul Peters papeters@msn.com	803-356-1728	Lexington, SC
David Rankin rankincwp@charter.net	864-225-6424	Anderson, SC
Buck Sawyer wwjd@sccoast.net	843-358-5555	Aynor, SC
Steven Sheppard sdftc66@yahoo.com	843-241-6398	Longs, SC
Sam Shock shock_s@bellsouth.net	864-444-2931	Pickens, SC
Larry Smith cwpclass@earthlink.net	864-630-1883	Liberty, SC
Mark Starnes markstarnes@gmail.com	803-628-0304	Clover, SC
Jackson Stone	843-413-9402	Florence, SC
Mike Walguarnery dw230012@ncr.com	803-781-1360	Columbia, SC
Hank Wooten HenryTWooten@aol.com	843-797-1765	Goose Creek, SC

TASKFORCE

continued from page 13

gun owners to go berserk?

Senator Knotts was also insistent that his support for the the Task Force bills was to bring South Carolina law into compliance with Federal Law. I only hope he feels that way about the federal Gun Free School Zones Act.

The hearing was closed by local defense attorney Reese Joye – you've probably seen him on late night television commercials – speaking in favor of the various reforms. He spoke of openly carrying as he left his offices late

at night – and Senator Knotts was quick to point out that the CWP program was set up to keep the guns hidden and the criminals guessing. Mr Joye also noted that when he started practicing law there were only twelve felony offenses. Now there are over 500.

I'm not sure what effect we had on the Task Force's plans. But I'm proud to have spoken for GrassRoots, and to let them know that we are watching them, even when they leave Columbia.

RECIPROCITY AND RECOGNITION STATES

According to the SLED website [http://www.sled.sc.gov/Reciprocity1.aspx?MenuID=CWP] The following states are the only ones with which South Carolina has signed CWP reciprocity agreements.

Alaska, Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

According to the website Packing.org, the following states recognize a South Carolina CWP permit even though our state does not recognize their concealed carry permits.

Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia.

As always, you must should verify all information with the proper authorities before travelling and be certain you obey the laws of the state you are visiting.

GRASSROOTS GUNRIGHTS

Help us do more!

Complete and mail with check to:
GrassRoots, PO Box 2446, Lexington, SC 29071

- One-year Membership (New) \$25**
Includes newspapers and mailings, email alerts and updates
Additional contributions are welcomed (see below) and are used to further the goals of GrassRoots right here in South Carolina.
- One-year GrassRoots Firearms Instructor Membership (New) \$25**
Instructor Member benefits include free copies of GrassRoots newspapers to hand out to your students, Advertising on our web page, publication of your special class offerings, and articles in the GrassRoots newspaper (on a space-available basis), referral of inquiries to GrassRoots for CWP classes. Grass-Roots wants instructors to succeed and we'll help!
- Renewal \$25 for Membership - \$25 for Firearms Instructor**
Please check here if you are renewing Regular or Instructor membership so we can avoid duplicates.
- Please send me ___ GrassRoots bumper stickers \$1.00 when included with dues.**
- Thanks for making my CWP more useful.** Here is an extra contribution to help in the work. Please continue to do all you can to protect and promote my rights as a South Carolina gun owner and CWP holder.
Amount enclosed _____

Name: _____
 Address: _____
 City/State/Zip _____
 Phone: _____
 Fax: _____
 Email: _____

Make checks payable to GRASSROOTS
News 0707

Visit us on the web:
www.SCFirearms.org



APOLOGY

continued from page 17

would allow us conserve the funds donated by our members which is normally spent on printing and postage, so that it can be spent on important firearms legislation initiatives.

Make a contribution to GunRights PAC today!

Mail your donations to:
 GunRights PAC
 220 Isobel Ct.
 Lexington, SC 29072

Southern Patriot Shops
 Where South Carolina goes for Southern Pride
 sclos owned

www.spsstore.com
 (803) 467-8986
 3018 Charleston hwy
 Cayce, SC

Abbeville store
 100 yards north
 of the square.
 Abbeville, SC

OSHA

continued from page 4

All vehicle cargo spaces will have to undergo modifications to make them "spark proof."

(3) Operation of vehicles. (i) The employer shall ensure that: (C) Except under emergency conditions, no vehicle containing explosives is parked before reaching its destination on any public street adjacent to or in close proximity to any place of employment:

Deliveries of ammo will no longer be able to be made by carriers such as UPS, FedEx, DHL, etc. These carriers often make several stops during their delivery route.

(h) Small arms ammunition, small arms primers, and smokeless propellants. (1) Applicability. This paragraph does not apply to temporary in-process storage during the manufacture of small arms ammunition, small arms primers, or

smokeless propellants. (2) Small arms ammunition. The employer shall ensure that small arms ammunition is separated from flammable liquids, flammable solids, and oxidizing materials, by a fire barrier wall with at least a 1-hour rating or by a distance of at least 25 feet (7.6 m).

Small businesses will be required to store all paint & cleaning supplies behind a fire barrier or 25 feet away. Does this also mean during shipment by motor carrier?

As you can see by the excerpt above, OSHA's proposed new regulations amount to nothing short of pure unadulterated gun control through denying the general public access to ammunition. Many businesses that make, ship or sell ammunition and reloading supplies would find it easier just to get out of the business altogether.

GrassRoots GunRights of SC is committed to staying on top of all such attempts to curtail our gun rights in South Carolina.

HELP JASON DICKEY!

Jason Dickey needs money to pay for legal representation, and he desperately needs your help. Please send whatever you can afford to help get Jason out of prison and protect your right to self defense to:

GrassRoots Legal Defense Fund
 PO Box 2446
 Lexington, SC 29071

GrassRoots GunRights started a Legal Defense Fund to protect our gun rights. This war against self defense and the CWP program is exactly why the Legal Defense Fund exists. We must protect Jason and the entire CWP program against this war on CWP holders and self defense. Please do all that you can to help. Please contribute something today.

Please send whatever you can afford to help get Jason out of prison and protect your right to self defense!

2007 Gun Shows Schedule

Gun Shows and GrassRoots

With the support of our members, GrassRoots will again have a table at each of the Gun Shows listed below for 2007. From time to time, we also have some special GrassRoots tables at some other venues. As usual it's our volunteers who make it possible for these good things to happen.

Keep checking our Website <http://www.scfirearms.org> and future issues of *The Defender*, for announcements and updates.

South Carolina Gun Shows Scheduled for 2007

Greenville Palmetto Expo Center
 2007- Sept. 22 - 23, Dec. 15 -16

Greenville Carolina First Center
 2007 - Oct. 20 - 21

Spartanburg Expo Center
 2007 - Aug. 25 - 26, Dec. 1 - 2

Columbia Jamil Shrine Temple
 2007- July 28 - 29, Oct. 13 - 14, Nov. 17 - 18

Columbia SC State Fairgrounds
 2007- Dec. 8 - 9

Florence Florence Civic Center
 2007- July 21 - 22, Oct. 20 - 21

Charleston Exchange Park Fairgrounds, Ladson
 2007- Sept. 8 - 9, Nov. 24 - 25

*More and more of our members are giving their time and talents by volunteering to work a shift at our GrassRoots tables at gun shows. Many of these folks find they enjoy the experience and sign up again and again, but there's always room for new members to help. If you would like to volunteer for a shift just contact your area GrassRoots gun show Organizer (list below), contact the coordinators listed below and volunteer to help. You will probably be paired with an experienced show worker for one of the half - day shifts, and you can see how you like it. **When you're at one of these shows please tell the promoters "Thank You for giving GrassRoots a Table", so we can promote SC GunRights, and stop by our table to tell the volunteers thanks too.***

Gun Show Table Organizers:

- Greenville: Mike Harris (864) 299-6622 mhborn2fly@outdrs.net
- Charleston: Tom Glaab (843) 769-0659 gunshow@clutter.com
 Howard Jones, III (843) 538-5668
- Myrtle Beach: Tom Glaab (843) 769-0659 gunshow@clutter.com
 Howard Jones, III (843) 538-5668
- Florence: Dr. John Clarke (843) 332-4213 redvert@aol.com
- Columbia: Mike Walguarnery (803) 315-8112
CWPTrainer@sc.rr.com

GrassRoots GunRights Gun Show Stateside Director:
 Mike Walguarnery (803) 315-8112 gunshows@scfirearms.org

Please do NOT call GrassRoots Gun Show Coordinators to ask about renting vendor table space at these gun shows. GrassRoots is not the show promoter for these gun shows. You should contact the show promoter directly if you want tables for the show.

Make a donation to the

GrassRoots Legal Defense Fund

P.O. Box 2446
 Lexington, SC 29071