



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on February 11, 2014

EU Parliament Calls for UN Control of Conventional Arms

On February 5, the European Parliament voted to authorize European Union (EU) countries to [ratify the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty \(ATT\)](#).

In a less-than-enthusiastic press release, the European Parliament declared that the Arms Trade Treaty “wouldn’t necessarily result in the reduction of arms production, but it should stop arms getting into the hands of terrorists and should stop arms flooding into areas that are unstable.”



That’s sounds troubling. Given the proclivity of regimes to label dissenters as “terrorists” and to nominate the United States as a battlefield in the global “War on Terror,” however, the rights protected by the Second Amendment are most certainly under attack in the form of this globalist gun grab masquerading as a peace treaty.

David Martin, a British member of the Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats who helped draft the recommendation for EU member ratification of the ATT, admitted that the aim of the treaty is control of firearms. “There are weaknesses in the treaty, but it’s nevertheless a major step forward. This is the first time that conventional weapons have been put under any sort of control at all,” Martin said in [an interview with the EU press](#).

A major step forward indeed.

Arms Trade Treaty and the Second Amendment

The ATT is so offensive to the preservation of the right to keep and bear arms, it is an understatement to call it unconstitutional. As *The New American* has reported, several provisions of this treaty significantly diminish the scope of this basic right.

First, the Arms Trade Treaty grants a monopoly over all weaponry in the hands of the very entity (government) responsible for over 300 million murders in the 20th century.

Furthermore, the treaty leaves private citizens powerless to oppose future slaughters.

An irrefutable fact of armed violence unaddressed by the UN in its gun grab is that all the murders committed by all the serial killers in history don’t amount to a fraction of the brutal killings committed by “authorized state parties” using the very weapons over which they will exercise absolute control under the terms of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Article 2 of the treaty defines the scope of the treaty’s prohibitions. The right to own, buy, sell, trade, or transfer all means of armed resistance, including handguns, is denied to civilians by this section of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Article 3 places the “ammunition/munitions fired, launched or delivered by the conventional arms covered under Article 2” within the scope of the treaty’s prohibitions, as well.

Article 4 rounds out the regulations, also placing all “parts and components” of weapons within the



scheme.

Perhaps the most immediate threat to the rights of gun owners in the Arms Trade Treaty is found in Article 5. Under the title of “General Implementation,” Article 5 mandates that all countries participating in the treaty “shall establish and maintain a national control system, including a national control list.”

This list should “apply the provisions of this Treaty to the broadest range of conventional arms.”

Article 12 adds to the record-keeping requirement, mandating that the list include “the quantity, value, model/type, authorized international transfers of conventional arms,” as well as the identity of the “end users” of these items.

In very clear terms, ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty by the United States would require that the U.S. government force gun owners to add their names to the national registry. Citizens would be required to report the amount and type of all firearms and ammunition they possess.

Section 4 of Article 12 of the treaty requires that the list be kept for at least 10 years.

Although the White House has not announced when the president will sign the document, Secretary Kerry said that in the United States “we look forward to signing it [the Arms Trade Treaty] as soon as the process of conforming the official translations is completed satisfactorily.”

Finally, the agreement demands that national governments take “appropriate measures” to enforce the terms of the treaty, including civilian disarmament. If these countries can’t get this done on their own, however, Article 16 provides for UN assistance, specifically including help with the enforcement of “stockpile management, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes.”

In fact, a “voluntary trust fund” will be established to assist those countries that need help from UN peacekeepers or other regional forces to disarm their citizens.

Senators Stand Strong

Although ratification by the various EU governments is likely to happen any day, in the United States there are lawmakers determined to oppose the designs of the United Nations (and the Obama administration) to disarm civilians.

In [an op-ed published earlier this month](#), Senator Jerry Moran (R-Kan.) noted that in signing the treaty on behalf of the president and “the United States,” Secretary of State John Kerry invoked the specter of “terrorist,” in justifying his plan to participate in an agreement that so expressly violates the Second Amendment. Moran writes:

After signing the treaty, Secretary Kerry stated that “this treaty will not diminish anyone’s freedom” and that it “reaffirms the sovereign right of each country to decide for itself ... how to deal with the conventional arms that are exclusively used within its borders.” While the treaty does include a preamble referencing lawful firearm ownership, it is not binding and the treaty itself does not recognize the ownership and use of firearms or individual self-defense as fundamental rights.

Secretary Kerry says this treaty is about “keeping weapons out of the hands of terrorists and rogue actors.” However, North Korea, Syria and Iran — who most would agree are “rogue actors” — voted against the ATT. If 50 nations ratify the treaty it will take effect, but those rogue actors will not be a party to it and will not follow its provisions, leaving them free to continue dealing in arms. Meanwhile, the United States could find itself handcuffed when it comes to aiding our most



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on February 11, 2014

vulnerable allies — including Israel, Taiwan and South Korea — due to international pressure exerted under the guise of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Finally, remarking on the ambiguity of the key terms of the treaty, Moran unambiguously declares the refusal of Congress to ratify or even fund this globalist scheme to confiscate arms and ammunition from Americans and place these tools of resistance to tyranny under the monopoly control of the United Nations. Moran explains in his op-ed:

Good treaties are not ambiguous, and our constitutional rights are too important to be entrusted to a dangerous treaty drafted by nations hostile to the ownership of firearms by private citizens. That is why Congress stands in firm opposition to the treaty's ratification. Just in case with this Administration that is not enough, the passage of language prohibiting any funding of the enactment of the treaty has made it unequivocally clear that Congress is committed to upholding the fundamental individual rights of Americans and rejects the U.N. ATT. We will not be bound by the treaty and we will not fund its implementation.

Admittedly, acceptance of the treaty by the EU doesn't affect the rights of Americans. The attitude of our own senators, however, does matter. William Jasper, senior editor of *The New American*, described the future of the fight:

Last March, 53 senators went on record in opposition to the treaty. If they mean what they say and stand firm, the administration will not have the two-thirds majority it needs to ratify the treaty. But that is a big "if," and some senators can be sure to flip-flop unless they receive constant, overwhelming public pressure to hold fast.

Now is the time for all Americans who refuse to allow Obama and his internationalists allies to confiscate their guns and ammo to contact their senators and tell them they will be held accountable for their adherence to their oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, in particular as it is demonstrated by their vote on the UN Arms Trade Treaty.

Joe A. Wolverton, II, J.D. is a correspondent for The New American and travels nationwide speaking on nullification, the Second Amendment, the surveillance state, and other constitutional issues. He is the co-founder of Liberty Rising, an educational endeavor aimed at promoting and preserving the Constitution. Follow him on Twitter @TNAJoeWolverton and he can be reached at jwolverton@thenewamerican.com.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

[Subscribe](#)