

Gordon's comments on the *DC v. Heller* decision:

My good friend, Doris Moore Bailey, said I was wrong in my interpretation of the Heller case.

I'm not sure what she meant. (I.e., I'm not sure where she faulted me?)

Perhaps she thought I was trying to say that, had Heller lost, all guns would be banned nationwide. (Had I said this, Doris would have been right in claiming that I made a mistake.)

In any event, Heller, who won his case at the U.S. Supreme Court, by a slim 5-4 split decision, had this problem:

He is a Federal Policeman, who uses a gun at work, and he wanted one at home, for self-defense, like most of us. However, the District of Columbia would not issue him a concealed weapon's permit. (Florida, on the other hand, is a "must issue" state, and is much more friendly to those wishing to get gun permits. Oddly-enough, places like DC and Chicago, with strict gun laws, have higher crime & murder rates, but that is an aside.)

Had Officer Heller lost his case, this would not have banned guns nationwide, but it would have allowed states to effectively ban guns (by making "concealed weapons" licenses next to impossible to get). This reminds me of how some states make "photo ID" requirements so difficult that it makes it next to impossible for poor people and minorities to get a voter ID card and vote.

In both cases, a bad decision would not have affected citizens nationwide, but it would have allowed states to step on & crush ordinary citizens – whether they wanted to vote, have a gun in their bedroom, or whatever.

My point: The guy who was denied a gun permit for his home was a Federal Policeman, and if he was stepped on, so easily, how much more easily would an "ordinary Joe" be stepped on? I mean, if this guy is a Federal Police officer, and he can't be trusted to have a firearm in his own home, then, really, none of us is safe.

Moreover, Hillary Clinton thinks that the Heller decision was decided wrongly, and she wants to pack the court with justices to overturn that decision. PROOF:

"Hillary Clinton believes a 2008 Supreme Court ruling that is the linchpin of an individual's right to own a gun was "wrongly decided," her policy adviser told Bloomberg Politics on Friday."

Source: "Hillary Clinton Opposes Heller Gun Rights Ruling, Adviser Says," by Sahil Kapur, @sahilkapur May 20, 2016 — 5:28 PM EDT, *Bloomberg*, <http://www.Bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2016-05-20/hillary-clinton-believes-pivotal-gun-rights-ruling-was-wrong-adviser-says>

Conclusion: Since Hillary Clinton, should she win the U.S. Presidential race, might appoint justices to the High Court to overturn *Heller*, which "just barely" upheld Officer Heller's right to own a gun in his bedroom, this could allow states to "willy-nilly" strip ****any**** of us of our rights to own a gun in our own bedrooms – for any reason – or no reason – and, while Donald Trump is quite weird, I'd feel a whole lot safer regarding our gun rights with him calling the shots. (But that is just my opinion: Some people think he is a loose canon, and they're entitled to believe that, but if they vote him down, they will have to live with a bully government that would strip them of their gun rights – or, more accurately, let states do this.)

Gordon Wayne Watts (Lakeland, Fla., USA)