



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on December 17, 2015

Obama Pushes Gun Control, but Americans Oppose Assault Weapons Ban

President Obama continues to lobby for more federal and state gun-control laws, particularly for “assault weapons.” In fact, he specifically mentioned “assault weapons” during an October 27 speech, stating, “That’s why the IACP [International Association of Chiefs of Police] believes we shouldn’t sell military-style assault weapons to civilians. They don’t need them. They don’t need them to hunt a deer.”



But at least half of Americans are opposed to a ban on such weapons. A *New York Times*/CBS poll taken from December 4-8 indicated that 50 percent of those polled opposed a nationwide ban on assault weapons, while only 44 percent favored such a ban.

When asked which party would make the right decision when it came to gun laws, 41 percent said the Republican Party, 37 percent said the Democratic Party, nine percent said “neither,” two percent said “both,” and 21 percent either said they did not know or did not answer.

Twenty-two percent of those polled identified themselves as Republicans, 37 percent as Democrats, 33 percent as Independents, and seven percent did not identify any political affiliation. Sixteen percent of those said they owned some type of firearm, 14 percent said another household member owned a firearm, ten percent said both they and another household member owned a firearm, and 55 percent said no one in their household owned a firearm.

An *Economist*/YouGov poll taken in January 2014 indicated that 39 percent of American households had guns, with 56 percent claiming not to have one.

National polls consistently indicate that most Americans support the right and keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. A Pew Research poll released in December 2014 indicated that 52 percent of Americans favor the Second Amendment over more gun legislation, while those favoring restrictions on gun ownership slipped to just 46 percent, the lowest level seen since the tragic Columbine High School massacre in 1999.

Gun-control promoters such as President Obama and members of his administration have always exploited tragedies to promote their agenda. In a rare Oval Office speech on December 6, the president led off by addressing the tragic shootings in San Bernardino on December 2 that took 14 lives, and as he did in his weekly address the previous day, called for more gun control.

Five days later, in a December 11 press conference, White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said regarding the administration’s investigation of the San Bernardino shootings: “if we determine, as this review is ongoing, that congressional authority is required to make some of the [gun control] changes that we believe need to be made, then we won’t hesitate to go to Congress to request that authority to make those changes.”

During that press conference, a reporter, citing a recent statement made by Senator Marco Rubio (R-



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on December 17, 2015

Fla.) that no mass shootings would be stopped by the proposed gun-control measures, asked Press Secretary Earnest: “If not a single mass shooting — recent mass shooting — would have been stopped by the kind of gun control measures you champion, are those the right approach to this problem?”

Earnest replied: “Well, Bryon, I think we’ve been pretty direct and upfront about the fact that there is no piece of legislation that Congress can pass that would prevent every single act of gun violence.”

The reporter then asked a very pointed follow-up question:

Can the White House point to a recent mass shooting that would have been stopped by an expanded assault weapons ban or stricter background checks? I mean, the evidence seems to be that in all these recent mass shootings, these folks either pass background checks or were very determined to circumvent the sort of strict gun laws that are already on the books. Can you point to any that would have been prevented or stopped by the kind of proposals the White House is championing?

Earnest answered:

I think the same thing applies here, which is it is not our view that we should wait until somebody who’s on the no-fly list walks into a gun store, legally purchases a gun and kills a bunch of innocent Americans before we pass a law preventing it. That’s a common-sense view. The President believes that that’s in our national security, and that’s why we believe quite strongly that Congress should take action to address it and close the no-fly, no-buy loophole.

What Earnest basically said is that the Obama administration takes the position (“we should not wait”) that it is acceptable to *proactively* suspend the right to keep and bear arms guaranteed in our Bill of Rights because some disturbed individual just *might* abuse that right to commit a tragic mass shooting.

Earnest alleges, “That’s a common-sense view.” However, whether he and Obama think it is a “common-sense view,” it is decidedly not a *constitutional* view.

We do not tolerate proactively suspending any other part of the Bill of Rights because someone might commit a crime. We do not allow suspension of the First Amendment because someone might use free speech or freedom of the press to incite a riot. We prosecute the perpetrators after the crime has been committed. Neither do we tolerate the suspension of the Fourth Amendment because someone might be hiding contraband in his house. We wait until there is enough probable cause for a judge to issue a search warrant.

There is a description of the type of society that would permit proactive law enforcement to prevent innocent citizens from having the freedom that might allow them to *possibly* commit a crime — it is called a totalitarian police state.

Related articles:

[Obama Uses Speech on San Bernardino Shootings to Again Promote Gun Control](#)

[Jump in FBI Gun Background Checks Indicates Rising Gun Sales](#)

[Pew Research Shows Increasing Public Support for Gun Rights](#)

[Obama Pushes Federal Gun Control Laws During Chicago Speech](#)

[Senators Manchin and Toomey Consider Reviving Failed Gun Control Legislation](#)



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on December 17, 2015

[Judge Considers Rewrite of Missouri Gun Rights Amendment Summary](#)

[New Yorkers Protest "Assault Weapon" Registration Law](#)

[Idaho Latest State to Stand Against Federal Assault on Gun Rights](#)

[Kentucky State House Considering Gun Grab Nullification](#)

[Gun Production Continues to Rise](#)

[Obama Gun Control Scheming Sparked Record Firearm Sales](#)

[Obama to Ignore Senate, Sign 2nd Amendment-Violating UN Gun Treaty](#)

[Constitutional Sheriffs Convention Focus: States' Rights, 2nd Amendment](#)

[Texas House of Reps Passes Slate of 2nd Amendment Protections](#)

[Kansas Governor to AG Holder: We Will Continue to Defend 2nd Amendment](#)

[Hillary Clinton Unchained: Gun Ban "Worth Looking at"](#)

[The "Gun Control" Farce](#)

[The "Gun Control" Farce: Part II](#)



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