

November 15, 1987

Honorable Don Mulford
California State Legislature
State Capital
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford,

Since the recent enactment of the Mulford Firearms Control Act by the California Legislature there have been two occasions in which it was necessary to use the Act to avert serious civil disorder in the City of Berkeley.

In both cases the responsible person was carrying a loaded firearm under conditions that would have been lawful prior to the adoption of the Mulford Act by the Legislature. In one instance the arrested person who was carrying the firearm openly in his automobile had a long criminal record and a history of violence. In addition to the firearms violation under Section 12031 of the California Penal Code the subject was also found to have narcotics in his possession.

While these are only two examples, it has occurred to me that you might be interested to know of the use that has been made to date of your Legislative efforts to prevent irresponsible and potentially dangerous persons from transporting and using firearms in public streets and other places covered by the statutes.

The new Legislation has been and will continue to be of significant help to law enforcement and public safety.

Best regards,

W. P. BRALL
Chief of Police

cl/201

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

RE AB 1591

Proposed Amendments:


Any firearm that has a cartridge in the chamber, the magazine or clip thereof.

(I am seeking a more accurate description of "loaded" because present law indicates one in the chamber.)

Amend:

line 15 to read "Persons who are using target ranges for the purpose of practice shooting with a firearm, shooting clubs, but only on the premises thereof, for the purpose of hunting."

(Exclusion to protect one's self on one's own property)



BLACK PANTHER PARTY

5624 GROVE ST.
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

FOR SELF DEFENSE

WHAT WE WANT WHAT WE BELIEVE

WHAT WE WANT NOW! :

1. WE WANT FREEDOM. WE WANT POWER TO DETERMINE THE DESTINY OF OUR BLACK COMMUNITY.
2. WE WANT FULL EMPLOYMENT FOR OUR PEOPLE.
3. WE WANT AN END TO THE ROBBERY BY THE WHITE MAN OF OUR BLACK COMMUNITY.
4. WE WANT DECENT HOUSING FIT FOR SHELTER OF HUMAN BEINGS.
5. WE WANT EDUCATION FOR OUR PEOPLE THAT EXPOSES THE TRUE NATURE OF THIS DECADENT AMERICAN SOCIETY. WE WANT EDUCATION THAT TEACHES US OUR TRUE HISTORY AND OUR ROLE IN THE PRESENT DAY SOCIETY.
6. WE WANT ALL BLACK MEN TO BE EXEMPT FROM MILITARY SERVICE.
7. WE WANT AN IMMEDIATE END TO POLICE BRUTALITY AND MURDER OF BLACK PEOPLE.
8. WE WANT FREEDOM FOR ALL BLACK MEN AND WOMEN HELD IN FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, AND CITY PRISONS AND JAILS.
9. WE WANT ALL BLACK PEOPLE WHEN BROUGHT TO TRIAL, TO BE TRIED IN COURT BY A JURY OF THEIR PEER GROUP OR PEOPLE FROM THEIR BLACK COMMUNITIES, AS DEFINED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.
10. WE WANT LAND, BREAD, HOUSING, EDUCATION, CLOTHING, JUSTICE AND PEACE.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

WHAT WE BELIEVE:

1. WE BELIEVE THAT BLACK PEOPLE WILL NOT BE FREE UNTIL WE ARE ABLE TO DETERMINE OUR DESTINY
2. WE BELIEVE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS RESPONSIBLE AND OBLIGATED TO GIVE EVERY MAN EMPLOYMENT OR A GUARANTEED INCOME.

WE BELIEVE THAT IF THE WHITE AMERICAN BUSINESS MEN WILL NOT GIVE FULL EMPLOYMENT, THEN THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION SHOULD BE TAKEN FROM THE BUSINESS MEN AND PLACED IN THE COMMUNITY SO THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMUNITY CAN ORGANIZE AND EMPLOY ALL OF ITS PEOPLE AND GIVE A HIGH STANDARDS OF LIVING.
3. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS RACIST GOVERNMENT HAS ROBBERD US AND NOW WE ARE DEMANDING THE OVERDUE DEBT OF FORTY ACRES AND TWO MULES. FORTY ACRES AND TWO MULES WAS PROMISED 100 YEARS AGO AS RETRIBUTION FOR SLAVE LABOR AND MASS MURDER OF BLACK PEOPLE. WE WILL ACCEPT THE PAYMENT IN CURRENCY WHICH WILL BE DISTRIBUTED TO OUR MANY COMMUNITIES. THE GERMANS ARE NOW AIDING THE JEWS IN ISRAEL FOR THE GENOCIDE OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE. THE GERMANS MURDERED 6,000,000 MILLION JEWS. THE AMERICAN RACIST HAS TAKEN PART IN THE SLAUGHTER OF OVER 50,000,000 MILLION BLACK PEOPLE; THEREFORE, WE FEEL THAT THIS IS A MODEST DEMAND THAT WE MAKE.
4. WE BELIEVE THAT IF THE WHITE LANDLORDS WILL NOT GIVE DECENT HOUSEING TO OUR BLACK COMMUNITY THEN THE HOUSEING AND THE LAND SHOULD BE MADE INTO COOPERATIVES SO THAT OUR COMMUNITY, WITH GOVERNMENT AIDE, CAN BUILD AND MAKE DECENT HOUSEING FOR ITS PEOPLE.
5. WE BELIEVE IN AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM THAT WILL GIVE TO OUR PEOPLE A KNOWLEDGE OF SELF. IF A MAN DOES NOT HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF HIMSELF AND HIS POSITION IF FIREARMS POLICY COALITION, SOURCE HE HAS LITTLE CHANCE TO

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

RELATE TO ANYTHING ELSE.

6. WE BELIEVE THAT BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO FIGHT IN THE MILITARY SERVICE TO DEFEND A RACIST GOVERNMENT THAT DOES NOT PROTECT US. WE WILL NOT FIGHT AND KILL OTHER PEOPLE OF COLOR IN THE WORLD WHO, LIKE BLACK PEOPLE, ARE BEING VICTIMIZED BY THE WHITE RACIST GOVERNMENT OF AMERICA. WE WILL PROTECT OURSELVES FROM THE FORCE AND VIOLENCE OF THE RACIST POLICE AND THE RACIST MILITARY, BY WHATEVER MEANS NECESSARY.
7. WE BELIEVE WE CAN END POLICE BRUTALITY IN OUR BLACK COMMUNITY BY ORGANIZING BLACK SELF DEFENSE GROUPS THAT ARE DEDICATED TO DEFENDING OUR BLACK COMMUNITY FROM RACIST POLICE OPPRESSION AND BRUTALITY. THE SECOND AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GIVES US A RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS. WE THEREFORE BELIEVE THAT ALL BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD ARM THEMSELVES FOR SELF DEFENSE.
8. WE BELIEVE THAT ALL BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD BE RELEASED FROM THE MANY JAILS AND PRISONS BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT RECEIVED A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL.
9. WE BELIEVE THAT THE COURTS SHOULD FOLLOW THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SO THAT BLACK PEOPLE WILL RECEIVE FAIR TRIALS. THE 14th AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION GIVES A MAN A RIGHT TO BE TRIED BY HIS PEER GROUP. A PEER IS A PERSON FROM A SIMILAR ECONOMICAL, SOCIAL, RELIGIOUS, GEOGRAPHICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, HISTORICAL AND RACIAL BACKGROUND. TO DO THIS THE COURT WILL BE FORCED TO SELECT A JURY FROM THE BLACK COMMUNITY FROM WHICH THE BLACK DEFENDENT CAME. WE HAVE BEEN, AND ARE BEING TRIED BY ALL WHITE JURIES THAT HAVE NO UNDERSTANDING OF THE "AVERAGE REASONING MAN" OF THE BLACK COMMUNITY.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

10. WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS, IT BECOMES NECESSARY FOR ONE PEOPLE TO DISSOLVE THE POLITICAL BONDS WHICH HAVE CONNECTED THEM WITH ANOTHER, AND TO ASSUME AMONG THE POWERS OF THE EARTH, THE SEPARATE AND EQUAL STATION TO WHICH THE LAWS OF NATURE AND NATURE'S GOD ENTITLE THEM, A DECENT RESPECT TO THE OPINIONS OF MANKIND REQUIRES THAT THEY SHOULD DECLARE THE CAUSES WHICH IMPEL THEM TO THE SEPARATION.

WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF-EVIDENT, THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL, THAT THEY ARE ENDOWED BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN UNALIENABLE RIGHTS, THAT AMONG THESE ARE LIFE, LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS. THAT TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS, GOVERNMENTS ARE INSTITUTED AMONG MEN, DERIVING THEIR JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED, --THAT WHENEVER ANY FORM OF GOVERNMENT BECOMES DESTRUCTIVE OF THESE ENDS, IT IS THE RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO ALTER, OR TO ABOLISH IT, AND TO INSTITUTE NEW GOVERNMENT, LAYING ITS FOUNDATION ON SUCH PRINCIPLES AND ORGANIZING ITS POWERS IN SUCH FORM, AS TO THEM SHALL SEEM MOST LIKELY TO EFFECT THEIR SAFETY AND HAPPINESS.

PRUDENCE, INDEED, WILL DICTATE THAT GOVERNMENTS LONG ESTABLISHED SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED FOR LIGHT AND TRANSIENT CAUSES; AND ACCORDINGLY ALL EXPERIENCE HATH SHEWN, THAT MANKIND ARE MORE DISPOSED TO SUFFER, WHILE EVILS ARE SUFFERABLE, THAN TO RIGHT THEMSELVES BY ABOLISHING THE FORMS TO WHICH THEY ARE ACCUSTOMED, BUT WHEN A LONG TRAIN OF ABUSES AND USURPATIONS, PURSUING INVARIABLY THE SAME OBJECT, EVINCES A DESIGN TO REDUCE THEM UNDER ABSOLUTE DESPOTISM, IT IS THEIR RIGHT, IT IS THEIR DUTY, TO THROW OFF SUCH GOVERNMENT, AND TO PROVIDE NEW GUARDS FOR THEIR FUTURE REARMS.POLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

BLACK
PANTHER
PARTY
FOR
SELE
DEFENSE

BURN BABY BURN

BY MARVIN X

TIRED
SICK AND TIRED
AND TIRED OF BEING SICK AND TIRED

LOST
LOST IN THE WILDERNESS
OF WHITE ASS AMERICA

ARE THE MASSES ASSES?

COOL!
"COOL" SAID THE MASTER TO THE SLAVE,
"DON'T ROB AND STEAL I'LL BE YOUR
DRIVING WHEEL!"
COOL!
AND HE WHEELED US INTO 350 YEARS OF
BLACK MADNESS

TO HOGGUTTS, CONKED HAIR, AND COVODISES
TO BLEACHING CREAMS AND UNCLE THOMASES

TO THE STREETS

TO WATTS

TO KILLLLLLLLLL!!!!

BOOMMMMMM.....

TWO HONKIES GONE

MOTHERFUCK THE POLICE
AND PARKER'S SISTER TOO

BLACK PEOPLE
TIRED, SICK AND TIRED
AND TIRED OF BEING

COME ON CHULL'NS
DON'T MINE THE TAGS
GET ALL DEM BOSS RAGS

GET ALL DAT MOTHERFUCK'N PLUCK
GET THEM GUNS TOO
WE DON'T GIVE A FUCK

BURN, BABY, BURN

COOK OUT OF SIGHT!

FINEBURGS

WHITEFRONT

WINEBURGS

BLACKFRONT

SAFEWAY
NOWAY

BURN!

BURN BABY BURN

IN TIME
HE'LL
LEARN

THS 6000
3495

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

T H E B L A C K P A N T H E R M O V E M E N T

In recent weeks, activities of the gun-toting Black Panthers have caused serious concern to Law Enforcement Agencies. Although the Black Panther movement has been known of for some time, it is only recently that there has been demonstration of a show of force. Reference is made to three (3) incidents:

1. Black Panther members entered a meeting, held on April 17, 1967, which had been called by the Welfare Rights Organization for the purpose of bringing together the District Attorney and members of the Dowell family to discuss the death of Denzil DOWELL, killed by a Deputy Sheriff of Contra Costa County on April 1, 1967. That meeting was held in the building of the Council of Community Services.
2. On April 20, 1967, in the City of Martinez, a number of Black Panthers, all bearing arms, attempted to enter the office of the Sheriff so that they might discuss the Dowell shooting.
3. On April 22, 1967, at the corner of Filbert and Chesley in North Richmond, armed members of the Black Panthers appeared for the purpose of recruiting new members into their group.

There have been other incidents in the East Bay where armed Black Panthers have come into contact with police officers. Details of the incidents will be set forth later in this report. We mention them at this time merely to point out the recent activities of the Black Panthers.

To better understand the Black Panther movement, particularly as it exists in the East Bay, one must go back to its origin.

The Black Panther Party started in Alabama in 1966 (?). It was organized as a political party by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Its purpose was to enter Negro candidates in counties where Negroes had a potential voting majority. The "Black Panther" was chosen as a symbol as they felt they needed a visual name that would depict the Southern Negro. It is supposed to represent courage, determination and freedom.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Since the founding of SNCC, other organizations have supported it. The magazine, "The Young Socialist", in its issues for May, June and July of 1966, offered them support. This magazine is published by the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA). In one of their issues it was indicated that the YSA in Berkeley was supporting the Black Panther party by selling buttons.

Although the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee implies non-violence, it is generally known that they do, in fact, advocate violence. Stokley Carmichael, the National Director of SNCC, preaches hate of the white man, as well as the use of force by the Negro to obtain what is "justly" his. Mr. Carmichael is a young Negro, well educated and a fiery orator. He appeared at the Contra Costa College a few months ago, at the invitation of the Associated Students. Some 700 or 800 attended and about 90% were Negro. Mr. Carmichael's audiences are always large and he is in constant demand as a speaker. He is given extremely good coverage by the press, newspapers and television.

SNCC, an organization based in Alabama, was organized for the purpose of voter registration and to encourage Negroes to run for various public offices. As stated before, non-violence has given way to violence which is advocated by their leader, Carmichael. There is no SNCC organization in the Bay Area. There is, however, a group known as "The Friends of SNCC" who have offices in Berkeley. It is understood that the purpose of this organization is to act in support of SNCC in Alabama. There is an extensive list of supporters to whom they mail monthly notices of SNCC activities. Much of the information they impart is contained in reports from Loundes County, Alabama, as well as in their newspaper, "The Movement". In addition, they collect money, food and clothing for the needy Negroes of the South.

The local leaders of the Black Panther Party are known for their dislike of the whites. They have demonstrated their hate and openly advocated

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

violence, even to the point of attempting overthrow of our government.

Bobby Seale, reported to be the leader of the Oakland Black Panther party, came to our attention in August, 1965. At that time, he was identified with the Western Student Movement. This organization is located in North Richmond. Its purpose is to tutor elementary school children of that community. At that time, it was funded through OEO with \$59,000 Federal funds and approximately \$6,000 from the Rosenberg Foundation.

The Western Student Movement resulted in issuance of fliers, inviting the public to a debate to be held at Shields Park in North Richmond. The subject for debate was, "Violence Versus Non-Violence". The principal speakers were Ken Freeman, Hermon Blake and Ron Bridgeport. All spoke and all advocated the use of violence by the Negro to focus attention upon their demands and "get what is rightfully theirs". Bobby Seale was also present, but took only a small part in the program. Both Seale and Freeman are not identified with the Black Panther party.

Also in 1965, a publication entitled "Soulbook" was issued. It was produced in Berkeley by the Afro-American Research Institution". Members of the Editorial Board were Donald Freeman, Isaac Moore, Ernest Allen, Jr., Carroll Holmes, Ken Freeman and Bob Hamilton. Bobby Seale is listed as Distribution Manager and is credited with all printing.

It is interesting to note that an organization known as "The Revolutionary Action Movement" (RAM) includes as members many of the same people as the Afro-American Research Institution. Further, they subscribe to beliefs such as were expressed by the speakers in Shields Park and contained in the publication, "Soulbook", i.e., hatred of whites and the condoning of violence. Literature distributed by RAM in the Berkeley-Oakland area contains identification of the following persons as officers: Ernest Allen Jr., Kenneth Freeman,

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Donald Freeman, Carol Freeman, Isaac Moore and Bob Hamilton. Bobby Seale is known as a close associate.

RAM is described as a revolutionary organization which advocates a worldwide black revolution to create a "new world", free from exploitation and oppression of man by man. RAM envisions a seizure of power and, to accomplish this goal, they have devised a three-stage plan. Stage #1 is referred to as "Ideological Warfare" which consists of education and recruitment. Youthful criminals from youth groups are of particular interest to recruiters. Stage #2 is referred to as "Expropriation". Funds derived will be obtained by both legal and illegal methods. Stage #3 is "Direct Action". Implication is that the system of government in the United States will be replaced by violence, if necessary.

RAM's National leader is Robert Franklin Williams. In August, 1961, Williams and his family fled to Cuba, just hours before he was indicted on charges of kidnapping a white couple and holding them for several hours during a racial disturbance. A Federal warrant is outstanding for William's arrest.

As we now face the militant Black Panther Party, there is evidence of a continued similarity through all of the aforementioned organizations. With some variations, Stage #1 of RAM coincides very much with violence, as demonstrated by the Black Panthers. Furthermore, many of the same people have been active in all organizations.

There is deep concern on the part of Law Enforcement officials over the recent activities of the Black Panthers, as well as over the group's publications. Quoted here are some of their demands and beliefs:

"We want freedom. We want power to determine the destiny of our black community."

"We want an end to the robbery by the white man of our black community."

"We want all black men to be exempt from military service."

"We want an immediate end to Police Brutality and Murder of black people."

"We want freedom for all black men and women held in Federal, State, County and City Prisons and Jails."

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED⁵BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

"We want all black people, when brought to trial, to be tried in court by a jury of their peer group, or people from their black communities, as defined by the Constitution of the United States."

"We believe that black people should not be forced to fight in the military service, to defend a racist government that does not protect us. We will not fight and kill other people of color in the world who, like black people, are being victimized by the white racist government of America. We will protect ourselves from the force and violence of the Racist police and the Racist military, by whatever means necessary."

"We believe we can end police brutality in our black community by organizing black self defense groups that are dedicated to defending our black community from racist police oppression and brutality. The second amendment of the Constitution of the United States gives us a right to bear arms. We therefore believe that all black people should arm themselves for self defense.

"We believe that all black people should be released from the many jails and prisons because they have not received a fair and impartial trial."

The local (Oakland) Black Panther party is known in full as, "The Black Panther Party for Self Defense". In their terminology, this means defending one's self with a weapon, be it a pistol, rifle or shotgun. It is clear that members are well informed concerning the laws governing the ownership and carrying of weapons. However, they are seen almost daily with weapons on their persons, particularly in recent days when they have moved about in numbers of from six to twenty-five. This, then, represents a threat to the peace of any community in which they choose to appear.

The first big showing of the Black Panthers was in San Francisco at the airport on February 21st and 22nd, 1967. This was in connection with the Malcolm X Grassroots Memorial, at which time Mrs. Betty Shabazz, widow of Malcolm X, was the featured guest. About twenty Black Panther party members appeared at the San Francisco airport, carrying an assortment of guns. The entire incident was vividly covered by the press.

Oakland has had several contacts with armed Black Panthers, as has Berkeley. Each contact with the police is a potentially explosive situation. They are very antagonistic toward the police and attempt to provoke incidents concerning their carrying or wearing weapons.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mr. John Nejedly, District Attorney of Contra Costa County, was in attendance at a meeting in Richmond, at the office of the Council of Community Services, on Monday, April 17, 1967. The purpose of the meeting was, as previously indicated in this report, to discuss a recent Coroner's inquest with the parents of the subject of the inquest who had been killed by a Deputy Sheriff. Before the meeting had gotten under way, a number of Black Panthers, said to have been seven, invaded the meeting. All were armed with shotguns, rifles or sidearms. On Thursday of the same week, a large number of Black Panthers appeared before the County Building in the City of Martinez, again fully armed. They attempted to enter the building with their weapons, to meet with the Sheriff. They were told they could not bring the weapons into the building. They reluctantly left their weapons in their vehicles.

It is reported that on Saturday, April 22, 1967, the Black Panthers held a street rally at the corner of Chesley and 4th Street in North Richmond. Well over one hundred persons gathered around. It would appear that this type meeting is for the purpose of gaining support and to recruit new members.

For police agencies to be aware of the activities of the Black Panther party is not enough. With Black Panther leaders, Bobby Seale and Huey Newton, stating that their prime objective is to arm the Negro community to full capacity for the purpose of backing all plays by the Negro community, and to act as a deterrent to all organizations, including police departments, it is evident that new enforceable legislation is urgently needed so that there may be better control over the use of weapons by any group. This is particularly true when the weapons are used as a threat to the peace of any community. Under presently existing laws, the police are powerless to act.

NOTE: The name Bob Hamilton has appeared in this report. The correct spelling of the first name is BOBB.

OAKLAND TRIBUNE
May 3, 1967

Armed Foray In Assembly Stirs Wrath

By ED SALZMAN
Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Shocked by an invasion by armed members of the Eastbay's "Black Panther Party For Self Defense," the Assembly today appears prepared to enact tough legislation prohibiting anyone from carrying a loaded gun in public.

A dozen Panthers carrying loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns yesterday knocked down a sergeant-at-arms and barged into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session.

About 25 more armed men, most of them from the Eastbay, circulated in the Capitol at the same time to protest a bill by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, outlawing carrying of loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place.

Upon departure from the capitol, 24 of the Panthers aged 17 to 25 were arrested.

About four hours after the invasion, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee met to consider Mulford's bill.

The assemblyman asked that the committee take the measure under submission—but only to give him time to prepare amendments tightening up the bill and making it a felony for anyone to enter the legislative chambers carrying a loaded weapon.

He also reported he must resolve a constitutional question about the right to bear arms.

Some members of the committee said that they were willing to go even further than Mulford and enact comprehensive gun-registration laws.

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Richmond, suggested an urgency clause which would place the bill into effect

'Panther' Invasion Shocks Assembly

Continued from Page 1

immediately after it is signed by the governor.

The invasion of the Assembly began when Sergeant-At-Arms James Rodney was knocked down attempting to prevent the armed band from entering the chamber.

The Panthers were surrounded by cameramen as they entered the chamber. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, D-Hayward speaker pro tempore, was presiding and spotted only the photographers.

"Sergeant-At-Arms," he shouted, "will you remove the cameramen? They have no permission to be in this chamber."

Sergeant-at-arms Tony Beard managed to expel both the photographers and the Panthers. "They broke right through the men guarding the entrance to the chamber," he reported. "We hustled them out as fast as we could."

State police temporarily disarmed the men. The weapons were returned unloaded.

Meanwhile, Mulford told the Assembly that there had been an "historical invasion and I am shocked beyond belief." He said his bill is directed against "this same type of shocking episode."

Panther Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was protesting "the racist Oakland police" and demonstrating for the right to bear arms.

The armed visitors handed out mimeographed sheets signed by Huey P. Newton, identified as the party's "minister of defense."

The leaflet stated that the "racist California Legislature" is considering a bill "aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was also protesting what he called the "racist" shooting April 1 of Dennis Dowell, 22, a Richmond laborer killed by a Contra Costa sheriff's deputy investigating an attempted burglary in North Richmond.

A coroner's jury ruled the death justifiable homicide.

Two of those arrested yesterday were Dowell's brothers, James, 17, and George, 20.

The armed band left the Capitol just before Gov. Ronald Reagan was scheduled to join a group of Pleasant Hill youngsters for a picnic on the west lawn of the Capitol.

The governor was mobbed by newsmen and spectators. As a result, the luncheon was moved indoors to Reagan's office.

"Americans don't go around carrying guns with the idea of using them to influence other Americans," Reagan declared. "This is a ridiculous way to solve problems . . . anyone who would approve of this type of demonstration must be out of his mind."

By the time the committee met to consider Mulford's bill,

most of the Panthers were under custody of the Sacramento police and there was no need for a heavy police guard in the committee room.

Mulford said the bill was proposed by law enforcement officials as a result of incidents in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

Some of the problems, he emphasized, have been caused by Caucasians "and this has nothing whatsoever to do with the charge that it is pointed at one ethnical group."

Police, Mulford declared, are becoming alarmed at the number of bands of armed citizens "intimidating and coercing people in the streets of our communities."

Supporting the bill were Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly, Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly and Undersheriff Harry Ramsey of Contra Costa County, Deputy Chief Joseph J. Veretto of the Oakland Police Department and Jules Lyons, principal of Walter T. Helms Junior High School in San Pablo.

They described a series of incidents in Clyde, Orinda, North Richmond, and Oakland in which armed bands have become serious problems for police.

Gun Curbs Plan Moves to Assembly

Conspiracy Charge Faces Gun-Toters

SACRAMENTO — Five juveniles and 19 adults, members of the "Black Panther Party for Self Defense," were charged with conspiracy yesterday after forcing their way into the State Capitol with loaded weapons.

Only two, well-known activists Mark Comfort, 33, of 6914 Lockwood St., and Bobby Seal, 30, of 809 57th St., both Oakland, were released on \$2,200 bail. The others were held overnight in the city jail or Juvenile Hall.

Bail of \$2,200 each was also set for seven others after attorneys contacted municipal judges, but Comfort and Seal were the only ones who posted bond during the evening.

The rest of the group was expected to appear in Municipal Court today, probably before Judge Arthur Eissinger, for setting of bail.

Besides the blanket conspiracy charge, a felony, the group was also booked initially on various other charges which were later dropped. They included carrying concealed weapons, brandishing a weapon in a threatening manner and possession of loaded weapons in vehicles.

Most of the dropped charges were misdemeanors but one, possession of a sawed-off shotgun, was a felony.

While the conspiracy charge was filed against all 24 members of the group, additional charges were levied against Eldridge Cleaver, 31, 3301 Broadway St., San Francisco, and Reginald Forte, 18, 1120 54th St., Oakland.

Cleaver was charged with

violation of parole and booked en route to his parole officer in San Francisco. Forte was charged with assault with a deadly weapon against a police officer.

Police said the rest of the group, charged solely with conspiracy, included:

- Johnny Bethea, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;
- Ardell Butler, 17, 1038 61st St., Oakland;
- Kenneth Carter, 19, 1184 82nd Ave., Oakland;
- Bruce Cockerhan, 18, 1014 54th St., Oakland;
- Albert Commo, 21, 1342 85th St., Oakland;
- Emery Douglas, 23, 900 Haight St., San Francisco;
- George Dowell, 23, 1360 Filbert St., Richmond;
- James Dowell, 17, 104 Market Ave., Richmond;
- Sherwin Forte, 19, 1135 54th St., Oakland;
- Truman Harris, 18, 1909 1/2 Herman St., Berkeley;
- Oleander Harrison Jr., 17, 5810 Grove St., Apt. D, Oakland;
- Ernest Hatter, 18, 1472 81st St., Oakland;
- Mikel Hall, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;
- Bobby Hutton, 17, 898 56th St., Oakland;
- Lafayette Robinson, 17, 1223 77th Ave., Oakland;
- John Sloan, 30, 1823 63rd St., Berkeley;
- Willie Thompson, 20, 109 Hunter Ave., Oakland;
- Lee Torris, 22, 104 Market St., Richmond;
- Warren Tucker, 19, 554 63rd St., Oakland;
- Benney Yates, 19, 54th St., Oakland.

SACRAMENTO (UPI)—The Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee has approved legislation clamping new restrictions on the sale and possession of anti-tank guns, cannons, bazookas mortars machine guns, zip guns and other exotic armaments.

Action came late last night after the committee heard an appeal by Deputy State Atty. Gen. Charles A. O'Brien to arm law enforcement with legal tools to curb the accumulation of private arsenals by individuals and paramilitary groups.

The committee approved legislation by chairman W. Craig Biddle, R. Riverside, which would:

- Require registration with the state of the mail order sale of concealable weapons.

- Outlaw the possession of machine guns and machine gun parts.

- Require a state permit to possess bombs, grenades, rockets, missile cannons and similar devices.

- Broaden the scope of the state's dangerous weapons control law to include any parts of such weapons.

Assemblyman Robert W. Crown D-Alameda, said he favored such legislation, but "I wish it had gone farther. I would be much happier if it did require some sort of registration of weapons that are now in the state."

"We're walking away from the real problem," he said.

O'Brien told the committee he was "happy to admit" the attorney general's office was conducting "a crusade against private military groups in California," adding that he could see "no legitimate constitutional reason for tolerating the dangers that exist due to the lack of these laws.

"Some well-meaning citizens seem bitterly determined to confuse patriotism with armed paranoia," he said.

Displayed before committee members was a wide-ranging assortment of weaponry confiscated by law enforcement agencies in recent months.

O'Brien centered a major part of his testimony on the recent seizure in San Francisco of a massive 77-ton cache of weapons from a home owned by William E. Thoresen.

O'Brien said Thoresen in the past 11 years has been arrested at least 11 times on charges including assault; grand larceny, sex perversion, setting explosives, possession of blackjacks and brass knuckles and resisting arrest.

"I present this record because I believe that we should consider the present law which allows such a man to legally own a military arsenal," he said.

Capitol Gun-Toters Draw Solons' Fury

Incident May Prompt New Control Law

Other stories related to the Black Panther incident in the Assembly are on pages A4, A7, A12 and C1.

By Martin Smith

An unprecedented invasion of the State Capitol by gun-wielding members of the militant Black Panther party for Self-Defense demonstrating against a bill to prohibit carrying loaded weapons in public may have had the reverse effect and increased support of the measure.

Individual legislators speculated that the appearance of the armed band carrying loaded shotguns, rifles and sidearms has improved chances that the proposal, Assembly Bill 1591, eventually will be approved.

New Amendments

Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, author of the bill, yesterday had the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure delay action on the measure so he could prepare amendments to broaden and strengthen the proposal.

Among other things, he wants also to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly or Senate with a loaded weapon.

Approximately half of the 24 men — all from the bay area — ultimately arrested yesterday did force their way into the lower house as it was in session during the noon hour. They did so as a bitter debate was in progress on a labor relations bill affecting firemen.

Swarming into the Assembly chamber with them was a knot of television and newspaper photographers. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee, presiding at the time, saw the men with cameras but, at first, did not notice the heavily-armed Negroes. Bee ordered the sergeant-at-arms to remove the photographers from the Assembly floor.

Moved Off Floor

Chief Sergeant-at-Arms Tony Beard, his assistants and State Police officers moved the entire group off the floor.

Bee termed the incident "one of the most flagrant violations of the rules" he has ever seen in his 13 years as an assemblyman. He confirmed he noticed only the cameramen at first.

"When I saw all those TV cameras coming, it was almost unbelievable," he declared.

Bee said the demonstration was of no value to the group in their efforts to prevent Mulford's bill from being approved and actually may have helped its chances.

'Does No Good'

"Our job is to make the laws, and this type of thing does no good," he added.

Assemblyman Bill Greene, a liberal Democratic legislator from Los Angeles and himself a Negro active in civil rights movements, declared:

"This action was not militant. It was senseless. No person, black or white, can condone this action."

Assemblyman E. Richard Barnes, R-San Diego County, whose seat in the rear of the Assembly chamber was near the action, predicted:

"I think this incident will result in a strict law prohibiting the bringing of firearms into any state building. I think it

Solons Assail Armed Band For Entering Capitol

From page A1

should be a felony. I will vote for it."

Lt. Ernest Holloway, a veteran on the State Police staff in the Capitol, said:

"Twenty-five years and I've never seen anything like this."

He noted previous incidents which were termed "invasions" of the Capitol included one by a group of striking lumber workers who appeared during the depression.

"They were peaceful," said the lieutenant. "We put them up at the fair ground."

A civil rights sit-in in the Capitol in 1963 was recalled by Holloway but he said "that was nothing" compared to yesterday's tense incident.

Well-Organized

The Black Panther group was well-organized, said Holloway.

"They knew how far they could go," he said. "They were quoting the Constitution verbatim about their right to bear arms."

The men removed from the Assembly, accompanied by ever-growing numbers of newsmen and also by the rest of the armed band who had been outside on the west steps of the Capitol, were taken to the first floor police office in the Capitol.

There the guns of several men were taken from them, over their strong protests, and examined by officers. The weapons were loaded although no shells were in their firing chambers. Because the weapons were being carried openly without any attempt at concealment the half-dozen officers returned the weapons to the men.

Verbal Abuse

In the Capitol, the men who had their guns taken from them temporarily did not physically resist the officers but heaped verbal abuse on them, calling them "racist dogs."

Most of the band's members

ignored questions by newsmen. But one man, Bobby Seale, a spokesman for the organization, read a statement issued in the name of Huey P. Newton, "minister of defense" for the Black Panther party for Self-Defense.

Statement's Contents

The statement called "upon the American people in general and the black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

The statement accused the American government of waging a racist war in Vietnam and reactivating concentration camps which had been used to confine Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

The camps "are being prepared for black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary," according to the statement.

Other Contentions

After also attacking the United States for lynchings, the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, "genocide practiced on the American Indians" and enslavement of Negroes, the statement concluded:

"The Black Panther party for Self-Defense believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction."

The armed men, accompanied by several young women, returned to their cars after gathering briefly on the west steps of the Capitol again. Visiting school children gawked at them and their weapons while leaders of the youngsters attempted to get some groups inside the Capitol away from the hubbub.

Arrests Are Made

The arrests of the men occurred minutes later as they, in five automobiles, drove into a service station at 15th and L Streets across from Capitol Park. City police officers swarmed over the station, took away their guns and placed them in a paddy wagon.

A little used section of the State Government Code, prohibiting the disruption of the state legislature while it is in session, was used to charge a number of men.

Police officers said one man pulled out his gun but was disarmed quickly. He was accused of assault with a deadly weapon.

One man arrested was identified as Eldredge Cleaver, a reporter for Ramparts magazine, a militant "New Left" publication. His attorney, Lawrence K. Karlton of Sacramento, said Cleaver was not carrying a gun, only a camera, and was present as a reporter.

Attorney's Comment

"They arrested everyone who was black," said Karlton. "He was the wrong color."

One of the women, Barbara Auther, of Berkeley, a pre-law student at the University of California, denied the Black Panther organization was a racist group. She was not arrested.

She said members, however, carry weapons wherever they go because of "police brutality."

Mrs. Auther denied any of the members of the group had broken the law.

"We conducted ourselves as ladies and gentlemen," she told reporters in a sidewalk interview.

Mrs. Auther indicated the group was incensed over the slaying of a Negro burglary suspect in the Richmond area by a Contra Costa County deputy sheriff. She termed the slaying "murder."

Asked if she thought the demonstration would persuade any legislators to vote against AB 1591, she said:

"I think it wouldn't make any difference."

Purpose Of Bill

The bill to which the Black Panthers object would, except

in certain instances, prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in the use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Officer Goes Down

The only thing close to violence which actually occurred, instead of being threatened, was when the group stormed into the Assembly. At an outer swinging gate, an elderly deputy sergeant-at-arms, James Rooney, brother of Sacramento Police Chief Joseph Rooney, was knocked back when the Black Panthers moved through.

He fell into a chair. He got up unhurt but angry.

State police officers tightened security arrangements at yesterday afternoon's hearing on the Mulford bill, but it was a calm meeting.

'Panther' Invasion Riles Legislature

(Photo on A-2)

SACRAMENTO, May 3 (AP)—A stunned California Legislature surveyed its security precautions today while Negroes who burst into the Capitol bearing a variety of loaded guns at noontime yesterday were summoned to court.

Twenty-six youths aged 17 to 25 were arrested by city police with drawn revolvers and hauled to the police station in a paddy wagon shortly after they left the Capitol agog Tuesday.

They were accused of possessing two illegal sawed-off shotguns, brandishing weapons in a threatening manner, disrupting the Legislature in session and carrying a fully loaded weapon in a car.

CAPITOL ACTION

At the Capitol today, support mounted among amazed and disgruntled lawmakers for tightening security and imposing more severe penalties on those who disrupt an Assembly or Senate session.

It was a noon-hour session of the Assembly that a dozen of the armed youth—members of the "Black Panther Party"—succeeded in penetrating briefly before they were ushered out and several of the loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns taken away by two state policemen in a mild struggle.

No guns were fired at any time, and the armed men took care while in the Capitol not to threaten overtly anyone with the guns.

They remained silent except for a spokesman, Bobby Seale, 25, of Oakland. He said they appeared to defend their constitutional right to bear arms, criticized "racist Oakland police" and opposed a bill outlawing the carrying of loaded weapons in public.

No one could remember

STATE 'PANTHER' PROBLEM

(Continued from Page 1)

anything like it happening before. Reaction ranged from simple amazement to anger.

A Democratic Negro assemblyman from the Watts district of Los Angeles, Bill Greene—considered a militant advocate of Negro rights—commented: "This action was not militant, it was senseless. No person black or white can condone this action."

Jim Rooney, one of three sergeants-at-arms manning the swinging gates that block off the Assembly chamber door 50 feet away, said that suddenly "a wave of them just rushed

in and shoved us out of the way."

He was knocked into a chair by someone in the traveling mob of about 50 Black Panther members, reporters and television cameramen.

The man presiding when the armed men burst into the rear of the chamber, speaker pro tem Carlos Bee, D-Hayward, remarked later: "The Legislature is certainly upset by the whole episode. People must be identified and have passes to come onto the floor. Any citizen can get a pass and there is no reason for anyone to push through in this manner."

Assemblyman Don Mulford R-Piedmont, author of the group control bill the group protested said he was "shocked beyond belief. It's a direct attempt to coerce me. This whole thing an affront to the people."

The bill was taken under suspension. Mulford said he would seek to include a provision make it a felony to disrupt legislative house in session.

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This reminder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish them in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpanded cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally, anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a hand gun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

Police Arrest 24 Capitol Invaders, Get 11 Weapons

The police arrested 24 persons and seized 11 shotguns, rifles and pistols in rounding up the bay area Black Panthers who charged into the State Assembly chamber carrying weapons yesterday afternoon. Reginald W. Forte, 18, of Oakland, was

charged with conspiracy to commit a crime and assault with a dangerous weapon upon a police officer. Detectives Joseph Del Ponte and Donald Shierts reported Forte raised a loaded .38 caliber revolver nearly out of a holster in a move toward them until they grabbed the weapon and disarmed him.

Eldridge Cleaver, 31, of San Francisco was booked in the city jail for possible parole violation. The officers said he is on parole in San Francisco for two counts of assault with intent to commit murder, two counts of assault to rape and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon.

Others Charged

All the others were charged with conspiracy. They are:

Sherwin Forte, 19, of Oakland; John Bethea, 18, of Oakland; Bruce Cocherhan, 18, of Oakland; George E. Dowell, 28, of Richmond; Willie Thompson, 20, of Oakland; Warren Tucker, 19, of Oakland; John Sloan, 30, of Berkeley; Ernest Hatter, 18, of Oakland; Truman Harris, 18, of Berkeley; Mikel Hall, 18, of Oakland; Benny Yates, 19, of Oakland; Albert Commo, 21, of Oakland; Kenneth Carter, 19, of East Oakland; Emery Douglas, 23, of San Francisco; Torris Lee, 22, of Richmond; Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland; Mark Comfort, 33, of Oakland; Oleander Harrison, 17, of Oakland; Bobby Hutton, 17, of Oakland; Lafayette Robinson, 17, of East Oakland; Ordell Butler, 17, of Oakland, and James Dowell, 17, of Richmond.

Seale and Comfort were released last night on \$2,200 bail. The five 17-year-olds were taken to the Juvenile Center.

The arrest reports stated all were part of the group which knocked two sergeants-at-arms to one side and forced their State Assembly chambers.

Sets \$2,200 Bail

Municipal Judge Arthur Eissinger this morning set bail at \$2,200 on each of the adults except Cleaver, whom he set for recognizance. However, Cleaver has a parole "hold" against him which means he will remain in custody until parole officials permit him to be released.

Attorneys Lawrence Karl of Sacramento and Beverly Melrod of San Francisco pleaded unsuccessfully for reduction of bail for Comfort, who was released last night on \$2,200 bail.

Attorney S. Carter McMor of Sacramento also asked the court unsuccessfully for a reduction in the bail for the other defendants.

Miss Axelrod, in pleading Cleaver said he was arrested "by mistake" because he was with the Black Panthers on assignment as a reporter for Ramparts magazine.

Assembly Unit Okays Gun Control Bills; Another Is Deferred After Intrusion

By Wilson K. Lythgoe

Concerned over the ease with which a person can arm his own army, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee late last night acted to tighten rules and penalties of laws on larger military-type guns and ammunition. Members of the committee, headed by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside County, were among those alarmed earlier in the day when armed Negroes shouldered their way into the Assembly carrying rifles and shotguns. The intruders said they were members of the Black Panther Party.

This incident and discovery and seizure of 77 tons of military arms in the home of William Thoresen in San Francisco overshadowed the hearing last night and another in the afternoon on firearms legislation.

Tense Atmosphere

The hearing amidst a charged atmosphere in the afternoon centered upon AB 1591 by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, which the armed Negroes said they were protesting.

This proposal would prohibit, except in certain instances, the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Mulford, himself, asked that the bill be put over, and said the Black Panther incident had caused him to consider amendments to broaden and toughen the bill.

Among other things, Mulford said he wanted to include an amendment to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly with a loaded weapon.

Special Attention

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Contra Costa County, noted that often when bills are put over that that is the last heard of them, but he said Mulford's bill would be worked on in conferences and in committee again to "stop the spread of this problem." He said Black Panther incidents had previously occurred in the bay area.

A Negro Assemblyman and member of the committee, John J. Miller, D-Oakland, decried what he termed to be a "circus atmosphere" and asked that the committee consider the bill in an objective manner "without reference to what happened this afternoon."

Mulford called it ridiculous to think that the legislation was aimed at any ethnic group, but despite an obvious attempt on his part and by other witnesses, the "Assembly incident" cropped up time and time again.

On Larger Weapons

The Assembly committee last night approved the main parts of its package of bills to tighten laws on larger caliber guns and ammunition. Twenty-five of these weapons, ranging from a 50 mm mortar to sidearms, were displayed for committeemen.

The legislation, boosted by the office of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and authored by Biddle, is based on findings and recommendations of a two-year study made by the committee.

But Charles O'Brien, deputy attorney general, said pistols, rifles and shotguns used as hunting weapons would not be changed by the measures.

He mentioned Minutemen in California as one group that the new legislation is aimed at, and Thoresen as an individual whom it could affect.

Return Arsenal

Under present law, he said, much of the arsenal taken from Thoresen may have to be returned. O'Brien said the present law is so weak that Thoresen was nearly arrested for possessing a fire hazard.

Assemblyman Kloyd L. Wakefield, R-Los Angeles County, blamed gathering of arsenals on laxity of the federal government. He said this became evident after World War II when many military-type weapons were allowed in from abroad.

"It's just too bad, as a demonstration in the Assembly showed us," Wakefield said.

The approved bills are:

AB 1326 which, for the first time, proposes to outlaw private possession of heavy military weapons, including anti-tank guns, bombs, booby traps and explosives.

Imported Weapons

AB 1324 to require Californians who buy concealable guns out of state to notify their local police or sheriff's officers and provide them with the same information required if they had bought the handguns in California.

AB 1325 which would define hand rocket launchers as concealable firearms. Gas-operated pistols were amended out of the bill.

AB 1323 would ban possession of machine gun parts. The bill was amended so it would not apply to semi-automatic weapon parts.

Final Comments

Col. E. F. Sloan of Redwood City, representative of the National Rifle Association, said he supported the basic principles of the bills, and offered suggestions to make them more workable.

The only serious objection came from William Andrews, Berkeley attorney, who asked that gas-operated pistols not be defined as concealable firearms because they "are not a lethal weapon."

And Richard Spear, Oakland attorney and cannon collector, said he could live with the bill, AB 1326, after it was made plain he could keep his cannons under permit from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

Black Panthers Believe Arming Is Needed To Fight 'White Oppression'

By Don Ferrell

Who are the Black Panthers and what do they stand for?

A check into their sketchy and somewhat vague background shows that the Black Panther Party is a spin-off of the Lowndes County, Ala., Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as its emblem.

The growing movement has since spread into other states and cities, including New York City, Detroit, Tennessee and San Francisco.

Before storming the Assembly Chamber in Sacramento yesterday the group—which can accurately be described as anti-white and revolutionary — had gained some small notoriety.

Previous Appearances

Last February, for instance, about 20 of them escorted the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown San Francisco. Later that day they caused a little nervousness among San Francisco officials when they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine.

But their latest public incident until yesterday was last month when a dozen or so armed Black Panthers showed up in Martinez

complaining about what they termed the murder of a Negro suspected of burglary in North Richmond.

Their goals, among other things, include an almost obsessed belief that the Negro community is oppressed by whites and that policemen are in reality an army which oppresses Negro neighborhoods.

Other Convictions

They openly advocate arming the Negro community against policemen and other whites and oppose members of their race being sent to fight in the Vietnam war.

The Black Panthers also believe that all big businesses should be nationalized unless private enterprise makes jobs available for Negroes.

Most of those involved in yesterday's incident came from Oakland and it is estimated that about 40 Panthers live in the bay area.

Leader Participates

One of those in the group was Bobby George Seals, a leader in the Oakland Panther movement, who reportedly received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958 and served

a six-month term in military confinement for disrespect to an Air Force officer.

Until yesterday, none of the Black Panthers had been arrested because of carrying weapons because under California law it is not illegal to openly carry arms.

However, it is against the law to carry loaded guns in vehicles.

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

Black Panther Episode Was A Senseless Thing

The Black Panthers who barged into the Capitol this week showing off loaded guns in a coarse act of public intimidation should learn more about the Constitution and Bill of Rights they used as their shields and battle cries.

Pleading repeatedly for "constitutional rights! constitutional rights!" these misguided exponents of armed force committed an intolerable injustice to their cause and defiled the very documents they quoted.

There are times when civil rights are turned into civil wrongs, and this was one of them. The Constitution does not specifically say a citizen cannot carry a gun, but it also does not specifically allow a citizen to use a gun to frighten the populace, to disturb the community tranquility, disrupt the orderly processes of government, or even to provoke publicity.

Nor does the constitutional provision for free speech guarantee a citizen the right to shout "fire!" in a crowded theater and thereby panic the audience.

The thing about loaded guns is that they have the propensity for going off at the wrong times. The final mechanical function of a gun is to kill or injure and no unloaded gun ever fired a bullet.

There was but one consoling factor in this episode. The State Police, the Assembly sergeants at arms and the city police acted with reserve and did not meet the provocation with the force they lawfully could have employed. The gunfire which could have erupted — accidentally or otherwise — could have injured or killed bystanders, including some school children who were visiting the Capitol to learn more about their government.

Society cannot and will not tolerate these kinds of bully-boy tactics whether they be performed by Black Panthers, Nazis, Minutemen, KKKs or any other bands of self-appointed law enforcers.

Assemblyman Bill Greene of Los Angeles County, a Negro active in civil rights movements, had the proper observation when he called the action senseless and one which no person, black or white, can condone.



Stronger Gun Laws Needed

The need for effective, comprehensive weapons control laws was never better illustrated than when a band of Negroes armed with loaded shotguns, pistols and rifles forced its way into the Assembly chamber at Sacramento.

The performance shocked not only those legislators and others in the Capitol who were supposed to be intimidated thereby but all law-abiding Californians who did not think such things possible in this enlightened day and age.

Ostensibly the so-called "Black Panther Party for Self Defense" was on the scene to protest a proposed law which would make it unlawful to carry a loaded weapon within a city.

The Black Panthers insisted the bill was "racist." But neither that view nor their actions found takers among Negro legislators. Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles), felt the bill was aimed at other groups and that it should "be applied equally to all, black or white." Assemblyman Bill Greene, whose district includes the Watts area, branded the action "senseless" and added that "no person, black or white, can condone this."

As a result of the unseemly demonstration it is probable that the measure will be made even more restrictive or an even broader act passed.

That the Black Panthers should lay stress on the constitutional right to bear arms under the circumstances which obtained at Sacramento, makes their position completely farcical.

Certainly the authors of the Bill of

Rights never had in mind such groups as the Black Panthers, the American Nazis, the Minute Men or the KKK when they wrote, in the Second Amendment:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

On the other hand, perhaps they foresaw the need for a well-regulated militia to protect against the emergence of just such groups in the future.

Under existing California statutes it is a violation of the Fish and Game Code to carry a loaded weapon in an automobile. There is, however, absolutely no law which prohibits carrying loaded weapons in plain sight on the public streets or anywhere else including, obviously, the chambers of any state, county or city legislative body. There is, of course, a law against disrupting a legislative session. But that hardly meets the situation.

Several days before the Sacramento demonstration Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch declared that there is no place in this day and age for "Wild West" exhibitions of firearms.

"The time has come," Lynch said, "when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places."

The Times agrees. The present situation is ridiculous—and fraught with danger.

Even the National Rifle Assn., that most militant defender of the right to possess arms, should agree that incidents such as occurred in Sacramento and which may occur elsewhere, cannot be tolerated in modern society.

Capitol Flurry In Gun Protest

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with sergeants-at-arms and were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivet as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim-faced, the group walked upstairs to the second floor, past open-mouthed employees and visitors. Two or three special

See Page 16, Col. 1

Panther Protest At State Assembly

From Page 1

guards followed them.

When the band reached the closed gates that stand about 50 feet in front of the Assembly chamber, a dozen of the Panthers burst through, knocking Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms Jim Rooney off his feet.

HALLWAYS

Some waited outside, some strode the hallways and a few pushed their way into the Assembly chamber.

Only a few of the legislators were actually aware of the intrusion. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee (Dem-Hayward), who was facing the door saw only a gaggle of news and television cameramen in what seemed to be a stampede.

Angrily he shouted for the sergeant-at-arms, Tony Beard, to remove the intruding photographers. But Assemblyman Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont) rose to inform the Assembly: "A serious incident has just occurred. People with weapons forced their way into this chamber and were ejected."

INVASION

Mulford described the invasion as a "direct attempt" to intimidate him.

His bill — prohibiting instruction in the use of firearms for the purpose of rioting and prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms on public streets and in public places by all except peace officers, guards and members of the armed forces — was scheduled for a hearing last night before the Assembly's Committee on Criminal Procedure.

Mulford said the incident had inspired him to toughen the bill.

LUNCH

Outside the Assembly chamber, the Panthers were met by State police who took them downstairs and began

confiscating their weapons. The guns were unloaded and returned when it was decided the Panthers had broken no laws.

The group started down the Capitol steps to meet their armed colleagues just as Governor Ronald Reagan was emerging to have a picnic lunch on the lawn with 30 youngsters from the Valley View Intermediate School in Pleasant Hill.

The Governor, the visiting children and their teachers were herded back into the Capitol by security officers and State police and the picnic was held in Reagan's office.

Later, Reagan said the Black Panthers had a right to bear arms, but added: "There's no reason why on a street today any citizen should be carrying a loaded weapon."

He called this a "ridiculous

way to solve problems among people of good will."

As the Governor was speaking, police, armed with riot guns and pistols moved in on about 25 of the Black Panthers who had assembled at a service station near the Capitol. They were disarmed, loaded into patrol wagons and taken to headquarters where some were booked for violating the Fish and Game Code which prohibits loaded guns in a vehicle.

When final inventory was taken, police said they had booked a total of 26 men between the ages of 17 and 25 on a variety of charges, including brandishing a gun in a threatening manner and possession of two sawed-off shotguns. Fifteen weapons were confiscated.

The Black Panthers offered no resistance. Bobby George Seale, 30, of Oakland, chairman of the organization, read a statement to newsmen which was signed by Huey P. Newton, 25, the party's "Minister of Defense."

It called on Americans — Negroes in particular — to "take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies . . . are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Seale said "the black people have prayed and demonstrated . . . and everything else. All their efforts have been answered by oppression. City Hall turns a deaf ear to pleas for help against this terror."

BILL

Meanwhile Mulford said it was "ridiculous to think my bill is aimed at any ethnic group . . . It is aimed at white people as much as anyone."

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown Jr. (Dem-S.F.), a Negro, agreed the proposed legislation has no racial implications but questioned Mulford's motives in offering it.

Brown said Mulford had previously opposed such bills "until Negroes showed up in Oakland — his district — with arms and then he seeks restrictive legislation." Brown added he is acquainted with some of the Black Panther group and called them "decent kids."

Another Negro, Assemblyman Leon Ralph (Dem-L.A.) said he felt the bill is "aimed at Nazis, the KKK the Minute men and others, and should be applied equally to all, black or white."

Bee, commenting later at the police station, said the legislature is "certainly upset" by the whole episode.

"This," he said, "will help the bill pass."

Friday, May 5, 1967 CCCAA
 SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Ugly Words at S. F. State --A Pro-Panther Rally

By Maitland Zane

Two hundred curious students at San Francisco State College witnessed an ominous spectacle yesterday — an array of Negro speakers preaching the “inevitability” of racial strife.

Le Roi Jones, the poet and playwright, was the best known at the rally, held to raise bail money for the armed “Black Panthers” who invaded the State Legislature Tuesday.

For him and the other speakers, policemen — particularly Oakland policemen — are “killers,” President Johnson is a “mass murderer” and white people in general “fiends and bandits.”

Jones affects loud clothes, a beard and a Jomo Kenyatta pillbox hat with gold embroidery.

JOHNSON

After reading a scatological and sometimes hilarious poem about President Johnson and his family, Jones urged “black people” to arm themselves for what he clearly hopes will be an armed “confrontation” with the hated whites.

“You’d better get yourself



LE ROI JONES
 Whites are ‘fiends’

a gun if you want to survive the white man’s wrath,” said Jones.

“Those white policemen aren’t here to protect you — they’re there to kill you.”

Earlier, Ed Bullins, a local Negro playwright and director of the Black Panther Party’s “Black House” here, called the people of his race “a captive nation.”

“We’re going to take control of our own community,” said Bullins.

MULFORD

“We’re going to run our own schools, and police our own community. We’re going to refuse to recognize white laws. We’re not going to have any whites coming in our community, even those of good faith.”

The only real applause of the rally went to Barbara Arthur, a young Negro woman who said the “power structure was shook” when the Black Panthers invaded the State Capitol.

According to her, the Panthers were merely “concerned citizens” demonstrating their opposition to the firearms bill proposed by Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont).

Only a few Negro students were among the noon-hour crowd at the open-air rally held in the Commons area.

JUL 31 1967

DONALD L. GRUNSKY
Chairman

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

ROBERT S. STEVENS
Vice Chairman

ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN
CLARK L. BRADLEY
GORDON COLOGNE
GEORGE E. DANIELSON
GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN

California Legislature

RICHARD J. DOLWIG
JOHN L. HARMER
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO
GEORGE R. MOSCONE
LEWIS F. SHERMAN
ALFRED H. SONG

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

ROOM 2191, STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
TELEPHONE: 448-8987

R. BLAIR REYNOLDS, COUNSEL

July 28, 1967

TO: The Honorable Don Mulford
FROM: Blair Reynolds
SUBJ: AB 1591

Dear Mr. Mulford:

In response to the call from the Governor's office concerning the wire service story of yesterday leading people to think that AB 1591 makes it illegal to carry ammunition in near proximity to an otherwise unloaded weapon I thought this memo might be helpful.

Section 4 of this bill states that a firearm shall be deemed loaded whenever both the firearm and ammunition therefor are in the immediate possession of the same person, i.e., in near proximity. However, this section is expressly limited to the simultaneous possession of the firearm and its ammunition in the following places: the State Capitol, any Legislative office, any office of the Governor or other constitutional officer, any hearing room in which any Committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing, the State Capitol grounds, the Governor's Mansion or other residence of the Governor, the residence of any other constitutional officer or Legislator, the grounds of any public school, the University of California or the state colleges.


Other than these specifically mentioned places, the possession of ammunition in near proximity to an unloaded firearm is no violation under the provisions of AB 1591. Therefore, it would be perfectly legal under this bill to carry ammunition and firearms together while on a public street while enroute to a place of hunting, etc.

Although I have not personally seen the wire service story, it is my impression from discussions with your office and people in Senator Grunsky's district that this story raised the implication that in all cases the gun and ammunition could not be kept together while in a public place or on a public street.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

The Honorable Don Mulford
Page 2

I hope this memorandum is sufficient to dispel this erroneous impression and will be helpful to you.


R. Blair Reynolds
Committee Counsel

RBR:bh

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

July 27, 1967

MEMORANDUM TO THE ASSEMBLY:

RE: AB 1591

Three days ago I was notified of potential violence in some communities in California.

Law enforcement officials requested that I do everything possible to expedite the passage of AB 1591. Yesterday afternoon the Senate approved AB 1591, as amended in the Senate June 27, 1967.

In my opinion the Senate amendments strengthen the bill and add to the excellent work of our own Assembly Judiciary Committee in making AB 1591 responsible legislation.

The amendments do the following:

1. Page 2, line 5 of the bill, add "members of the California State Police."

The California State Police wanted specific mention in view of the fact that the California Highway Patrol was specifically designated.

2. Page 3 of the bill, line 14, clarifying language adds humane officers.

It was pointed out that in rural areas humane officers must carry weapons in connection with their duties.

3. Page 3, line 47, clarifying language in connection with no restriction of hunting in Sacramento.

Although general language is used, I am not aware of any city, other than Sacramento, that requires this language.

4. Page 4, line 11, add the California State Police and Sergeant at Arms.

5. Page 4, line 47, add California State Police.

6. Page 5, line 9, broadens the language, "a person acting with his permission." Lines 12 through 16, further clarify the same subject and adds members of the Legislature.

The Senate Judiciary Committee felt that legislators may be subject to harassment and should be included in this bill.

7. On page 5, lines 25 and 29, add the residence of any member of the Legislature.

8. On page 5, line 36, clarifying language regarding inspection of loaded weapons.

Your concurrence is respectfully solicited.

DON MULFORD

2150 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
836-3080

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
95814
448-7584

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION
RULES EX OFFICIO

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

July 27, 1967

Mulford
TO THE ASSEMBLY:

RE: AB 1591

Three days ago I was notified of potential violence
in ^{STATE} ~~several~~ communities in California.

~~Police~~ ^{Law enforcement} officials requested that I do everything possible to expedite the passage of AB 1591. Yesterday afternoon the Senate approved AB 1591, as amended in the Senate June 27, 1967.

In my opinion the Senate amendments strengthen the bill and add to the excellent work of our own Assembly Judiciary Committee in making AB 1591 responsible legislation.

The amendments do the following:

1. ~~On~~ ^P page 2, line 5, of the bill, add "members of the California State Police."

The California State Police wanted specific mention in view of the fact that the California Highway Patrol was specifically designated.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

2. ~~on~~ ^P page 3 of the bill, line 14, clarifying language which ~~picked up~~ ^{adds} humane officers.

It was pointed out that in rural areas humane officers must carry weapons in connection with their duties.

3. ~~on~~ ^P page 3, line 47, clarifying language in connection with no restriction of hunting in Sacramento.

Although general language is used, I am not aware of any city, other than Sacramento, that requires this language.

4. ~~on~~ ^P page 4, line 11, add~~s~~ the California State Police and ~~Sergeant~~ ^S arms.

5. ~~on~~ ^P page 4, line 47, add~~s~~ California State Police.

6. ~~on~~ ^P page 5, line 9, broadens the language, "a person acting with his permission.". Lines 12 through 16, further clarification ~~of~~ ^{ed} the same subject, adds members of the Legislature.

The Senate Judiciary Committee felt that legislators may be subject to harassment and should be included in this bill.

7. On page 5, line 25 and 29, add~~s~~ the residence of any member of the Legislature.

8. On page 5, line 36, clarifying language regarding inspection of loaded weapons.

Your concurrence is respectfully solicited.

Gentlemen, I arise for the purpose of introducing what I believe to be one of the most important bills of this session. The measure before you is AB 1591, authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford.

Briefly, this bill prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded firearm in a public place, on a public street, or in an unincorporated territory where it is already illegal to discharge a firearm. Provisions of the bill extend to our schools, the Capitol, the homes and offices of the State's Constitutional officers, and to the homes and offices *of members* of the Senate and the Assembly.

This bill, gentlemen, is an excellent, well-thought-out piece of legislation. Much work on both sides of the Legislature has gone into it. As you will notice the bill has been amended six times. Each amendment has been meticulously considered by both the Criminal Procedure Committee in the Assembly and the Senate Judiciary Committee.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

I have told you, without going into minute detail, what the bill does. Now, just for a moment, allow me to tell you what this measure doesn't do. One thing it does not do, and perhaps the most important, it doesn't discriminate against the honest citizen. And in this same vein, it does not work a hardship on the legitimate hunter. In fact, this bill has the active support of the National Rifle Association.

Assemblyman Mulford submitted this legislation at the urgent request of law enforcement officials in the Bay Area and Southern California because ^{they} need a tool to deal with some persons who arm themselves with the sole purpose of intimidating society.

Armed bands, carrying loaded shotguns, automatic and semi-automatic rifles and pistols, have invaded our courts, the offices of municipal government, and, indeed, they have even violated the Chambers of the Assembly here in the State Capital. They have carried their loaded weapons into school

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

houses while children were attending school. They have formed vigilante gangs with the purpose of taking the law into their own hands. And they have paraded up and down our city streets brandishing their loaded weapons.

An Oakland police officer told Assemblyman Mulford, and I quote: "I hope you have good luck with your bill. As policemen out on our beats, we can cope with almost any weapon except a gun. When someone has a loaded gun -- he is as well armed as the police who have the responsibility of maintaining law and order."

Thrust
The ~~xxxx~~ of this bill, gentlemen, is to prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded weapon where they have no business being armed. The bill is constitutional according to the Legislative Counsel's office, and it fills a vital need of today's society. Therefore, I ask that you approve AB 1591 today.

INTRODUCTION FOR AB 1591
By Senator GRUNSKY

Gentlemen, I arise for the purpose of introducing what I believe to be one of the most important bills of this session. The measure before you is AB 1591, authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford.

Briefly, this bill prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded firearm in a public place, on a public street, or in an unincorporated territory where it is already illegal to discharge a firearm. Provisions of the bill extend to our schools, the Capitol, the homes and offices of the State's Constitutional officers, and to the homes and offices *of members* of the Senate and the Assembly.

This bill, gentlemen, is an excellent, well-thought-out piece of legislation. Much work on both sides of the Legislature has gone into it. As you will notice, the bill has been amended six times. Each amendment has been meticulously considered by both the Criminal Procedure Committee in the Assembly and the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I have told you, without going into minute detail, what the bill does. Now, just for a moment, allow me to tell you what this measure does not do. One thing it doesn't do, and perhaps the most important, it does not discriminate against the honest citizen. And in this same vein, it does not work a hardship on the legitimate hunter. In fact, this bill has the active support of the National Rifle Association.

Assemblyman Mulford submitted this legislation at the urgent request of law enforcement officials in the Bay Area and Southern California because they need a tool to deal with some persons who arm themselves with the sole purpose of intimidating society.

Armed bands, carrying loaded shotguns, automatic and semi-automatic rifles and pistols, have invaded our courts, the offices of municipal government, and, indeed, they have even violated the Chambers of the Assembly here in the State Capitol. They have carried their loaded weapons into school-houses while children were attending school. They have formed vigilante gangs with the purpose of taking the law into their own hands. And they have paraded up and down our city streets brandishing their loaded weapons.

An Oakland police officer told Assmbyman Mulford, and I quote: "I hope you have good luck with your bill. As policemen out on our beats, we can cope with almost any weapon except a gun. When someone has a loaded gun -- he is as well armed as the police who have the responsibility of maintaining law and order."

The thrust of this bill, gentlemen, is to prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded weapon where they have no business being armed. The bill is constitutional according to the Legislative Counsel's office, and it fills a vital need of today's society. Therefore, I ask that you approve AB 1591 today.

DONALD L. GRUNSKY
Chairman

ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN
CLARK L. BRADLEY
GORDON COLOGNE
GEORGE E. DANIELSON
GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

California Legislature

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

ROOM 8181, STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
TELEPHONE: 445-8987

R. BLAIR REYNOLDS, COUNSEL

ROBERT S. STEVENS
Vice Chairman

RICHARD J. DOLWIG
JOHN L. HARMER
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO
GEORGE R. MOSCONE
LEWIS F. SHERMAN
ALFRED H. SONG

JUN 16 1977


Dear Assemblyman Mulford:

Your bill A.B. 1591 has been referred to the Senate Committee on Judiciary.

In order that a detailed analysis of your bill may be prepared to aid the Committee members at the hearing, it would be very much appreciated if you would complete and return to the Committee Counsel the attached information sheet as soon as possible. It will facilitate presentation of your bill if this is received at least ten days before the hearing.

Generally, what we are seeking are brief informal statements from which we can determine the need for the bill and what it would accomplish.

Sincerely yours,


Donald L. Grunsky

DLG:sg

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Bill Analysis

WORK SHEET

Re: Your bill A.B. 1591.

Please complete this form and return to the Senate Committee on Judiciary as soon as possible, but not later than ten days before the scheduled hearing on your bill.

1. Origin of the Bill:

(a) Where did you get the idea for the bill? What group, organization, governmental agency, or other person, if any, requested introduction?

(b) Has a similar bill been before a previous session of the Legislature? If so, state the year and bill number.

(c) Has there been a Legislative Interim Committee Report on the bill? If so, please identify the report.

2. Problem or Deficiency in the Present Law Which the Bill Seeks to Remedy:

3. Please Attach Copies of any Background Material or Further Explanation of the Bill or State Where This Material is Available for Reference by the Committee Counsel:

4. Your Preference of Date of Hearing:

MAY 23 1967

Req. #20482

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591
AS AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 10, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In the heading of the printed bill, as amended
in Assembly May 10, 1967, strike out "Assemblyman Mulford"
and insert:

Assemblymen Mulford, Knox, Karabian, and Murphy

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 2, line 1, strike out "an
inhabited" and insert:

any public place or on any public street in a prohibited

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 2, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive,
and insert:

(3) Members of the military forces of this state
or of the United States engaged in the performance of their
duties.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 2, line 24, after "firearm" insert:

, or who are members of shooting clubs while hunting on the premises of such clubs

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 3, strike out line 3 and insert:

(6) The carrying of concealable weapons by persons who are authorized to carry such weapons

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 3, line 9, after "Code" insert:

, while acting within the course and scope of their employment

AMENDMENT NO. 7

On page 3, strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

(d) As used in this section "prohibited area" means any place where under existing conditions it is unlawful to discharge a weapon.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

On page 3, line 23, after "shell" insert:

, consisting of a case which holds a charge of powder and a shot or bullet, in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but not limited to,

AMENDMENT NO. 9

On page 3, line 25, after "firearm" insert:

; except a muzzle-loading firearm shall be deemed to be loaded when it is capped or primed and has a powder charge and ball or shot in the barrel or cylinder

AMENDMENT NO. 10

On page 3, line 27, after "business" insert:

, including a nonprofit organization,

AMENDMENT NO. 11

On page 3, line 28, strike out "of such person" and insert:

authorized by such person for lawful purposes connected with such business

AMENDMENT NO. 12

On page 3, line 29, after "business" insert:

, or any person in lawful possession of private property from having a loaded firearm on such property

AMENDMENT NO. 13

On page 3, between lines 29 and 30, insert:

(g) Nothing in this section shall prevent any person from carrying a loaded firearm in an area within an incorporated city while engaged in hunting, during such time and in such area as the hunting is authorized by a permit issued by the city council.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

On page 3, line 31, strike out "peace officer" and insert:

sheriff, constable, marshal, policeman, member of the California Highway Patrol, and an employee of the State Department of Justice listed in Section 817 who is designated as a peace officer, whether active or honorably retired, any other duly appointed peace officer, full-time paid peace officer of

another state or the federal government who is carrying out official duties while in California, or any person summoned by any such officer to assist in making arrests or preserving the peace while he is actually engaged in assisting such officer,

AMENDMENT NO. 15

On page 3, line 34, strike out "possess" and insert:

carry

AMENDMENT NO. 16

On page 3, line 36, strike out "is guilty of a felony" and insert:

shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than one year, or by fine of not more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or by both such fine and imprisonment, or by imprisonment in the state prison for not more than five years,

AMENDMENT NO. 17

On page 3, strike out lines 39 to 42, inclusive, and insert:

arm within the State Capitol, any legislative office, any office of the Governor or other constitutional officer, any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing, or upon the grounds of the State Capitol, which is bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento.

AMENDMENT NO. 18

On page 3, line 45, strike out "or the State" and strike out lines 46 and 47, and insert:

or within any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, except that such firearms may be possessed within or upon such grounds by members of reserve officers' training corps when engaged in training activities under the direct supervision of school authorities, or by persons as a part of a course of instruction in a school while under direction or supervision of local police authorities, or by persons as a part of a course of instruction in a school with the permission of the head of the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction of the area in which such school is located.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

On page 3, line 49, strike out "peace officer"
and insert:

sheriff, constable, marshal, policeman, member of the
California Highway Patrol, and an employee of the State
Department of Justice listed in Section 817 who is designated
as a peace officer, whether active or honorably retired, any
other duly appointed peace officer, full-time paid peace
officer of another state or the federal government who is
carrying out official duties while in California, or any person
summoned by any such officer to assist in making arrests or
preserving the peace while he is actually engaged in assisting
such officer,

AMENDMENT NO. 20

On page 4, line 1, strike out "possess" and insert:

carry

AMENDMENT NO. 21

On page 4, line 4, strike out "is guilty of a felony"
and insert:

with respect to the Governor's Mansion or any other residence of the Governor, or any other constitutional officer or a member of his immediate family with respect to such officer's residence, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than one year, or by fine of not more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or by both such fine and imprisonment, or by imprisonment in the state prison for not more than five years,

AMENDMENT NO. 22

On page 4, line 7, after "Governor" insert:

, or the residence of any other constitutional officer

AMENDMENT NO. 23

On page 4, line 10, after "Governor" insert:

, or the residence of any other constitutional officer

AMENDMENT NO. 24

On page 4, strike out line 19, and insert:

or shell, consisting of a case which holds a charge of powder and a shot or bullet, in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but not limited to, in the firing chamber

AMENDMENT NO. 25

On page 4, line 21, after "firearm" insert:

; except a muzzle-loading firearm shall be deemed to be loaded when it is capped or primed and has a powder charge and ball or shot in the barrel or cylinder

AMENDMENT NO. 26

On page 4, line 23, after "Sec. 5." insert:

If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.

Sec. 6.

State of California

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
SACRAMENTO 95814

MAY 24 1967



RONALD REAGAN
GOVERNOR

May 19, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
Room 3143, State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Don:

The Governor has asked me to reply to your letter concerning AB 1591. The attached letter from John Nejedly emphasizes the danger of the carrying of firearms by groups such as the Black Panthers and the need for control in this area.

The Governor is keenly concerned with the legislation you have introduced, he is following the progress of this bill with interest and will sign it when it reaches his desk.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jack Lindsey".

Jack Lindsey
Legislative Secretary

State of California

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
SACRAMENTO 95814



RONALD REAGAN
GOVERNOR

MAY 8. 1967

May 3, 1967

Mr. John A. Nejedly, District Attorney
Contra Costa County Courthouse
Martinez, California

Dear John:

Governor Reagan has asked me to answer your letter of April 20, 1967, concerning the need for legislation to provide for additional controls on the use of firearms.

We are very cognizant of the severe recent incidents throughout California, in which armed groups have openly displayed their weapons, thus constituting an imminent threat to the peace and safety of many citizens.

Effective legislation in this area is difficult to achieve, due both to drafting problems and to a great deal of resistance from certain special interest groups. We are presently working with legislators and law enforcement organizations to develop some new proposals. In this endeavor, we appreciate the information in your case, which is an excellent example in support of such legislation.

If there are any further incidents of this kind in your county, I would appreciate your advising me so that we can add them to the evidence in support of additional firearms controls.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

Edwin Meese III
Extradition and
Clemency Secretary

C
O
P
Y

April 21, 1967

The Honorable Ronald Reagan
Governor of California
State Capitol

My dear Governor:

Regarding the copy of letter from John A. Nejedly, District Attorney, Contra Costa County, I have introduced AB 1591, which will be polished with the addition of amendments. The Black Panther movement is creating a serious problem. The bill was introduced at the request of the Oakland Police Department.

At the proper time, I shall discuss it with you because we may need your personal help. I cannot help feeling that the people of this State are concerned about individuals armed with loaded weapons walking the streets of our communities in numbers.

Regarding the letter from Hardin Jones, I have requested that we all meet on next Thursday and bring Jones to Sacramento. His letter underwrites the reason for this meeting.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

Enclosures

cc Mr. Philip M. Battaglia
Mr. Lyn Nofziger

April 20, 1967

MEMORANDUM TO PHILIP M. BATTAGLIA AND LYN NOFZIGER:

Dear Phil and Lyn:

In view of today's incident regarding task force personnel prowling around the University of California, I urge you to give serious consideration for a briefing of any personnel you are sending into the University.

Without knowledge of who are the good guys and the bad guys, I would challenge the accuracy of any information your task force people may obtain. It all depends on the source of information. As I have explained to you, Lyn, the cancer grows.

I respectfully request that you arrange a briefing session with the Governor, each of you and myself, plus others you may want to invite, to meet with Hardin Jones next Thursday. Jones does not have classes on that day and is most anxious to talk with the Governor and bring him up to date on the current situation in view of Kerr's renewed activity.

I urge you not to sit on this because the organization is proceeding rapidly to strengthen itself in anticipation of a new president. Any president will be seriously handicapped unless he has the capacity and courage to terminate the bad guys at the top as soon as he arrives. This is going to be difficult.

I submit that we must be constantly aware of what is happening if we are to protect the Governor on the Campus.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

JOHN A. NEJEDLY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
JOHN B. CLAUSEN
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY
GEORGE W. McGLURE
CHIEF CIVIL DEPUTY
DONALD R. WALKER
CHIEF CRIMINAL DEPUTY

INVESTIGATORS
DAVID COOK JR., CHIEF
JACK W. FRANCIS
JOSEPH J. HALASZ
CHARLES A. MYHRE
WILLIAM R. PRICE

OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

COURT HOUSE, 4TH FLOOR
P. O. BOX 670
MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA, 94553
PHONE: 415/229-3000

CIVIL DIVISION
J. H. DISNEY
K. D. EWART
S. FISHMAN
W. W. MCCOMBS
J. M. MCBHARRY
V. H. PYNN
G. F. SWIFT
P. C. RANK
A. W. WALENTA, JR.
V. J. WESTMAN

CRIMINAL DIVISION
W. H. BARTLETT
D. L. BOAZ

DEPUTIES

K. J. BRANCH
H. C. FRYER
G. L. GINDER
H. T. GONSALVES
B. D. GLENN
W. R. HARTMAN
J. D. HATZENBUHLER
L. F. HOLDRICH
B. H. MESNICK
J. S. ODA
D. M. QUINLAN
T. C. SMITH
L. L. SNYDER
E. M. SWANN

April 20, 1967

APR 21 1967

Honorable Ronald Reagan
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

May I respectfully call to your attention recent incidents in this area that may suggest consideration of legislation to provide more effective controls in the area of possession of firearms.

Incident to the peace demonstrations at Port Chicago, certain residents of Clyde, an unincorporated community near the Naval Ammunitions Base, armed themselves with rifles and patrolled the streets, particularly at night. I was concerned with the obvious possibilities, met with these people and an agreement to terminate the carrying of arms was reached.

In December, groups in Orinda, concerned about incidents involving women and delays in securing Sheriff response, similarly armed themselves and instituted a patrol service. Again in meeting with these people we were able to secure the termination of this practice.

Last Friday, a request was made to me, through the Council of Community Services in Richmond, to meet with the family of a young man killed by a deputy sheriff in the course of a burglary. I met with the family in good faith only to be confronted with an armed group, the Black Panthers. This group was armed with pistols and shotguns and threatened to obtain "justice" if their demands were not met.

Today, this same group is appearing before the County Administration Building similarly armed, apparently as an incident to a meeting arranged with Sheriff Young on the same matter.

COPY

As the acts of carrying a firearm of these types are not per se a violation of the law, I respectfully bring these conditions to your attention. I am concerned as to the possibilities, particularly when one realizes that in the last instances, we are dealing with a group not sensitive to reasonable decisions.

Very truly yours,

John A. Nejedly
District Attorney

JAN:ems

cc: Assemblyman Don Mulford

BERNARD CZESLA
CHIEF DEPUTY

TERRY L. BAUM
J. GOULD
OWEN K. KUNS
RAY H. WHITAKER
KENT L. DECHAMBEAU
STANLEY M. LOURIMORE
EDWARD K. PURCELL
PRINCIPAL DEPUTIES

EDWARD F. NOWAK
DEPUTY IN CHARGE
LOS ANGELES OFFICE

3021 STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO 95814

110 STATE BUILDING
LOS ANGELES 90012

Legislative Counsel of California

GEORGE H. MURPHY

GERALD ROSS ADAMS
CARL M. ARNOLD
EVERETT AVILA
JERRY L. BASSETT
EDWARD BERSHATSKY
LAURENCE C. BLUNT
ROBERT A. BRAVERMAN
JOHN CORZINE
CLINTON J. DEWITT
JEROME DIAMOND
CARL A. ERIKSON, III
HARVEY J. FOSTER
THOMAS H. FRANKEL
ROBERT D. GRONKE
C. ROBERT JAMESON
JAMES E. KASSIS
L. DOUGLAS KINNEY
ERNEST H. KUNZI
SHERWIN C. MACKENZIE, JR.
ANN M. MACKAY
STEPHEN L. MILLICH
LARRY B. NORD
ROSE OLIVER
TRACY O. POWELL, II
MARGUERITE R. ROTH
CAREY W. ROYSTER
MARY SHAW
RUSSELL L. SPARLING
BRIAN L. WALKUP
DAVID M. WEETMAN
THOMAS D. WHELAN
DEPUTIES

Sacramento, California
May 2, 1967

Honorable Don Mulford
Assembly Chamber

A.B. 1591--Mob Violence and Firearms - #14969

Dear Mr. Mulford:

Enclosed is our opinion relating to A.B. 1591, in which we conclude that Section 12031 would be held constitutional but that Section 405.5 presents a constitutional problem.

Two alternative ways of strengthening Section 405.5 against constitutional attack occur to us. As noted in the discussion of proposed Section 12031, the Legislature has broad power to regulate the use of firearms. Section 405.5 could be recast to provide that every person who demonstrates or exhibits a firearm for the purpose of instructing another in its use for commission of the crime of riot is guilty of the crime of riot. A second possibility is to add to the section as it now reads an additional element, namely, that there be a clear and present danger that the prohibited conduct will result in commission of the crime of riot.

Very truly yours,

George H. Murphy
Legislative Counsel



By
Everett Avila
Deputy Legislative Counsel

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

EA:BM

APR 22 1967

Req. #18011

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, strike out "(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), every" and insert:

Every

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, line 8, after "who" insert:

, unless legally authorized to do so,

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, strike out "(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), every" and insert:

Every

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, line 8, after "who" insert:

, unless legally authorized to do so,

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

APR 22 1967

Req. #18011

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, strike out "(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), every" and insert:

Every

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, line 8, after "who" insert:

, unless legally authorized to do so,

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, strike out "(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), every" and insert:

Every

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, line 8, after "who" insert:

, unless legally authorized to do so,

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, strike out "(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), every" and insert:

Every

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, line 8, after "who" insert:

, unless legally authorized to do so,

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 11 to 15, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Bill Digest

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON
CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Bill: AB 1591

Hearing Date: 5/18/67

AUTHOR: Mulford

SUBJECT: Loaded weapons

BILL DESCRIPTION:

Section 1 declares every person carrying a loaded firearm on his person or in a vehicle while in any public place or street in a city or inhabited area of an unincorporated area is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Excepted are:

- 1.) Local, state, and federal law enforcement officers and persons assisting them.
- 2.) Guards and messengers of common carriers and financial institutions while engaged in transporting things of value.
- 3.) Military personnel while on duty
- 4.) Persons using target ranges or hunting on the premises of a shooting club.
- 5.) Special patrolmen appointed by the police commission of the local area.
- 6.) Persons licensed to carry a concealed weapon.
- 7.) Licensed private investigators and private patrol operators.

Peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried about in a public place or street to determine if it is loaded. Refusal constitutes probable cause for arrest for violation of this section.

An "inhabited area" is defined as being anyplace within 150 yards of any occupied dwelling or outbuilding used in connection therewith. However, privately owned property is excepted insofar as the owner, occupier, and anyone authorized by them to carry a loaded weapon, is concerned.

A firearm is defined as being loaded when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in, or attached to, the firearm.

Persons engaged in lawful business, their officers, employees and agents are excepted while within the place of business and any person in possession of private property is excepted while on such property.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

-2-

Persons hunting within an incorporated city are excepted if they have a permit, but only during the time and in the area designated by the permit.

Section 2 and 3 make it a felony for anyone to bring a loaded weapon into, or upon the ground of any:

- 1.) public school, including the University of California and State colleges. Excepted are R.O.T.C. personnel training under the supervision of school authorities, and persons taking a course under the direction of local police authorities.
- 2.) The State Capitol, offices of the Governor, constitutional officer, or legislator, or any room in which a legislative hearing is being held.
- 3.) The Governor's Mansion, his residence or the residence of any other constitutional officer.

Excepted are peace officers, military personnel, and persons licensed to carry concealed weapons. The Governor, constitutional officers, and their families are excepted from the provisions regarding their residences.

Section 4 amends the Fish and Game Code provision making it unlawful to possess a loaded weapon in a vehicle by changing the definition of "loaded" to include the presence of an unexpended cartridge or shell in, or attached to, the firearm.

The last two provisions of this bill are a servance and an urgency clause.

COMMENT:

Should special patrol officers and private detectives be allowed to carry loaded weapons outside of the "course and scope of their employment"?) *OK*

Should persons licensed to carry concealed weapons be allowed to wander around the Capitol with shotguns? Or should the exception regarding them be limited to concealed weapons? } *OK*

The definition of "inhabited area" adopts a Fish and Game Code provision prohibiting the discharge of weapons. Other code sections exist which either forbid the discharging of weapons within certain areas, or grant to the counties the right to "prohibit and prevent the... discharge of firearms ... (in)... public places and may pass all necessary

(over)

ordinances regulating or forbidding such acts." Another section makes it illegal to fire a weapon within 500 ft. of any magazine or explosive manufacturing plant. 602k and 602n of the Penal Code, together, make it illegal to discharge a weapon without permission on any cultivated, fenced, or posted property.

Yok

What would be the effect of defining an inhabited area as being any area where it is unlawful to fire a weapon?

Business owners, employees and agents are exempt from the provisions of this bill while they are at their place of business. Lee Oswald was an employee at his place of business. Why not exempt employees and agents only when they are authorized by their employer for purposes connected with the business?

ok

*allison
Court etc*

Would a blank cartridge fall within the definition of "cartridge or shell"?

Are nightclub shows, theatrical groups, and movie groups included within the provisions of this bill?

If a committee hearing is held away from the Capitol, then why not include the whole building, rather than just the room in which it is held?

ok

Would a non-commercial place such as a church or museum be included within the "place of business" exception? If not, would employees be considered persons in "possession" of private property.

Should Governors and constitutional officers have the authority to allow their duck hunting cronies to handle loaded weapons in their "residences"? What happens when the Governor takes up residence, for a few weeks, at some mountain lodge?

Should there be an additional exception (as in Shoemaker's 1021) allowing persons to handle loaded weapons on school property with the permission of the school authorities. What happens when the YMCA, the Boy Scouts, or gun clubs want to give lessons in gun safety?

ok

If a store owner is robbed, can he chase the thief out onto the street, with a loaded gun, or would he be in violation of this law once he passed the threshold of his store? What of the home owner who chases the midnight burglar down the public street? Or the man who rushes out to shoot the rabid dog, or the escaped wild animal?

ok

Does this bill include CO2 guns, gyro-jet, rocket, and 600 Nitro-Express guns?



This bill provides for a straight felony sentence.

Should there be an alternative county jail-misdemeanor?

MAY 18 1967

Req. #20240

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AS AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 10, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, line 1, of the printed bill, as amended in Assembly May 10, 1967, after "or" insert:

in any public place or on any public street

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 2, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

(3) Members of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of their duties.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 2, line 24, after "firearm" insert:

, or who are members of shooting clubs while hunting on the premises of such clubs

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 3, line 3, strike out "who are authorized"
and insert:

holding a valid license

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 3, strike out lines 20 and 21, and insert:

place within 150 yards of any occupied dwelling house,
residence, or other building or any barn or other outbuilding
used in connection therewith, except that it does not include
any privately owned property as to persons expressly authorized
to have such loaded firearm thereon by the owner or person
lawfully in possession of the property.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 3, line 23, after "shell" insert:

in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but
not limited to,

AMENDMENT NO. 7

On page 3, line 29, after "business" insert:

,or any person in lawful possession of private property from having
a loaded firearm on such property

AMENDMENT NO. 8

On page 3, between lines 29 and 30, insert:

(g) Nothing in this section shall prevent any person from carrying a loaded firearm in an area within an incorporated city while engaged in hunting, during such time and in such area as the hunting is authorized by a permit issued by the city council.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

On page 3, line 31, strike out " peace officer" and insert:

sheriff, constable, marshal, policeman, member of the California Highway Patrol, and an employee of the State Department of Justice listed in Section 817 who is designated as a peace officer, whether active or honorably retired, any other duly appointed peace officer, full-time/^{paid} peace officer of another state or the federal government who is carrying out official duties while in California, or any person summoned by any such officer to assist in making arrests or preserving the peace while he is actually engaged in assisting such officer,

AMENDMENT NO. 10

On page 3, line 34, strike out "possess" and insert:

carry

AMENDMENT NO. 11

On page 3, strike out lines 39 to 42, inclusive, and insert:

arm within the State Capitol, any legislative office, any office of the Governor or other constitutional officer, any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing, or upon the grounds of the State Capitol, which is bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

On page 3, line 45, strike out "or the State" and strike out lines 46 and 47, and insert:

or within any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, except that such firearms may be possessed within or upon such grounds by members of reserve officers' training corps when engaged in training activities under the direct supervision of school authorities, or by persons as a part of a course of instruction in a school while under direction or supervision of local police authorities, or by persons as a part of a course of instruction in a school with the permission of the head of the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction of the area in which such school is located.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

On page 3, line 49, strike out "peace officer" and insert:

sheriff, constable, marshal, policeman, member of the California Highway Patrol, and an employee of the State Department of Justice listed in Section 817 who is designated as a peace officer, whether active or honorably retired, any other duly appointed peace officer, full-time paid peace officer of another state or the federal government who is carrying out official duties while in California, or any person summoned by any such officer to assist in making arrests or preserving the peace while he is actually engaged in assisting such officer,

AMENDMENT NO. 14

On page 4, line 1, strike out "possess" and insert:

carry

AMENDMENT NO. 15

On page 4, line 4, after "family," insert:

with respect to the Governor's Mansion or any other residence of the Governor, or any other constitutional officer or a member of his immediate family with respect to such officer's residence

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

AMENDMENT NO. 16

On page 4, line 7, after "Governor" insert:

,or the residence of any other constitutional officer

AMENDMENT NO. 17

On page 4, line 10, after "Governor" insert:

,or the residence of any other constitutional officer

AMENDMENT NO. 18

On page 4, strike out line 19, and insert:

or shell in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but not limited to, in the firing chamber

AMENDMENT NO. 19

On page 4, line 25, after "Sec. 5." insert:

If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.

Sec. 6.

(#12)

persons as a part of a
course of instruction in a
school while under the
direction or supervision
of local police authorities
or persons as a part of
a course of instruction in
a school with the permission
of the head of the law
enforcement agency having
jurisdiction of the area
in which ~~the school~~ such
school is located

GEORGE H. MURPHY
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

MAY 17 1967

Req. No. 19913

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591
AS AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 10, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, line 1, of the printed bill, as amended in Assembly May 10, 1967, after "or" insert:

in any public place or on any public street

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 2, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

(3) Members of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of their duties.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 2, line 24, after "firearm" insert:

, or who are members of shooting clubs while hunting on the premises of such clubs

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 3, line 3, strike out "who are authorized"
and insert:

holding a valid license

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 3, strike out lines 20 and 21, and insert:

place within 150 yards of any occupied dwelling house,
residence, or other building or any barn or other outbuilding
used in connection therewith, except that it does not include
any privately owned property as to persons expressly authorized
to have such loaded firearm thereon by the owner or person
lawfully in possession of the property.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 3, line 23, after "shell" insert:

in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but
not limited to,

AMENDMENT NO. 7

On page 3, line 29, after "business" insert:

, or any person in lawful possession of private property from having
a loaded firearm on such property

AMENDMENT NO. 8

On page 3, between lines 29 and 30, insert:

(g) Nothing in this section shall prevent any person from carrying a loaded firearm in an area within an incorporated city while engaged in hunting, during such time and in such area as the hunting is authorized by a permit issued by the city council.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

On page 3, line 31, strike out "peace officer" and insert:

sheriff, constable, marshal, policeman, member of the California Highway Patrol, and an employee of the State Department of Justice listed in Section 517 who is designated as a peace officer, whether active or honorably retired, any other duly appointed peace officer, full-time/^{paid} peace officer of another state or the federal government who is carrying out official duties while in California, or any person summoned by any such officer to assist in making arrests or preserving the peace while he is actually engaged in assisting such officer,

AMENDMENT NO. 10

On page 3, line 34, strike out "possess" and insert:

carry

AMENDMENT NO. 11

On page 3, strike out lines 39 to 42, inclusive, and insert:

arm within the State Capitol, any legislative office, any office of the Governor or other constitutional officer, any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing, or upon the grounds of the State Capitol, which is bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento,

AMENDMENT NO. 12

On page 3, line 45, strike out "or the State" and strike out lines 46 and 47, and insert:

or within any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, except that such firearms may be possessed within or upon such grounds by members of reserve officers' training corps when engaged in training activities under the direct supervision of school authorities or by persons as part of a course of instruction in a school while under direction or supervision of local police authorities.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

On page 3, line 49, strike out "peace officer" and insert:

sheriff, constable, marshal, policeman, member of the California Highway Patrol, and an employee of the State Department of Justice listed in Section 817 who is designated as a peace officer, whether active or honorably retired, any other duly appointed peace officer, full-time paid peace officer of another state or the federal government who is carrying out official duties while in California, or any person summoned by any such officer to assist in making arrests or preserving the peace while he is actually engaged in assisting such officer,

AMENDMENT NO. 14

On page 4, line 1, strike out "possess" and insert:

CARRY

AMENDMENT NO. 15

On page 4, line 4, after "family," insert:

with respect to the Governor's Mansion or any other residence of the Governor, or any other constitutional officer or a member of his immediate family with respect to such officer's residence.

AMENDMENT NO. 16

On page 4, line 7, after "Governor" insert:

, or the residence of any other constitutional officer

AMENDMENT NO. 17

On page 4, line 10, after "Governor" insert:

, or the residence of any other constitutional officer

AMENDMENT NO. 18

On page 4, strike out line 19, and insert:

or shell in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but not limited to, in the firing chamber

AMENDMENT NO. 19

On page 4, line 25, after "Sec. 5." insert:

If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.

Sec. 6.

5/11/67
Req. #19550

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AS AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 10, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, line 19, of the printed bill as amended in Assembly May 10, 1967, after the second comma insert:

Air Force,

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 3, line 34, strike out "possess" and insert:

carry

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 3, between lines 47 and 48, insert:

This section shall not apply to any person who brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, any shooting range or facility of a school, college, or university, at the direction or with the permission of the school, college, or university authorities.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 4, line 1, strike out "possess"
and insert:

carry

To	DM	Message	For Civics Class
Date	5/10	Time	1:35
Phone Call Record		w/William Mulford.	
Mr.	Beverly Butswinger	Biography + Gun bill	
of	2125 Outlet St.	AB 1591	
Phone	Sacramento	sent 5-17-67	
		Message Taken By	Ek
TELEPHONED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PLEASE PHONE	<input type="checkbox"/>
CALLED TO SEE YOU	<input type="checkbox"/>	WILL CALL AGAIN	<input type="checkbox"/>
WANTS TO SEE YOU	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEE ME	<input type="checkbox"/>

MAY 10 1967

Req. #19365

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In line 1 of the title of the printed bill, strike out "add Sections 405.5" and insert:

amend Section 2006 of the Fish and Game Code, and to add Sections 171c, 171d,

AMENDMENT NO. 2

In line 2 of the title, after "firearms" insert:

, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert:

Section 1

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "while on a public street or in a public place within any city" and insert:

or in a vehicle while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or in an inhabited area of unincorporated territory

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 2, after line 16, insert:

(5) Patrol special police officers appointed by the police commission of any city, county, or city and county under the express terms of its charter who also under the express terms of the charter (i) are subject to suspension or dismissal after a hearing on charges duly filed with the commission after a fair and impartial trial, (ii) must be not less than 21 years of age nor more than 40 years of age, (iii) must possess physical qualifications prescribed by the commission, and (iv) are designated by the police commission as the owners of a certain beat or territory as may be fixed from time to time by the police commission.

(6) Persons who are authorized to carry concealed weapons pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code.

(7) Private investigators, private patrol operators, and operators of a private patrol service who are licensed pursuant to Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 7500) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code.

(c) In order to determine whether or not a firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section, peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by

anyone on his person or in a vehicle while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or inhabited area of an unincorporated territory. Refusal to allow a peace officer to inspect a firearm pursuant to the provisions of this section constitutes probable cause for arrest for violation of this section.

(d) As used in this section "inhabited area" means any place within 100 yards of a structure regularly occupied by any person as a dwelling or as a place of business.

(e) A firearm shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in the firing chamber, magazine, or clip thereof attached to the firearm.

(f) Nothing in this section shall prevent any person engaged in any lawful business, or any officer, employee, or agent of such person, from having a loaded firearm within such person's place of business.

Sec. 2. Section 171c is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171c. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, or a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, or the State Capitol, or any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, or the State Capitol, which is bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento.

Sec. 3. Section 171d is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171d. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code, or the Governor or a

member of his immediate family, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of the Governor's mansion or any other residence of the Governor.

Sec. 4. Section 2006 of the Fish and Game Code is amended to read:

2006. It is unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in any vehicle or conveyance or its attachments which is standing on or along or is being driven on or along any public highway or other way open to the public.

A rifle or shotgun shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in the firing chamber but not when the only cartridges or shells are in the magazine, magazine, or clip thereof attached to the firearm.

The provisions of this section shall not apply to peace officers or members of the armed forces of this State or the United States, while on duty or going to or returning from duty.

Sec. 5. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting such necessity are:

An organized band of men armed with loaded firearms has recently entered the Capitol of the State of California, knocked aside an Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the Assembly and invaded the Chambers of the Assembly, thereby creating a serious threat to the orderly function of the government of the state. Existing laws are not adequate to prevent such serious interruptions in the orderly processes of the government of this state and threats to the safety and welfare of the officers of this state. It is, therefore, imperative that this statute, which will make unlawful actions such as those of the armed band which invaded the State Capitol, take effect immediately.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

REQUEST FOR CHANGES IN LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE CONTROL OF FIREARMS

Recent activities in the City of Oakland involving the carrying of concealed firearms, rifles and shotguns by individuals and youth groups who are presenting constant and aggravated problems to this Department, and posing a threat to the citizens of the community, indicate a dire need for the enactment of new legislation for the effective control of such weapons.

More than 100 incidents were reported to the Juvenile Division of this Department within the past year and this can only be considered a sampling of the firearm problem among youths. All of the major youth clubs and gangs in the City have been involved with firearms by possession, rude display or use within that period of time.

Many other incidents involving firearms among juveniles, young adults and gangs have come to the attention of this Department. For example:

1. A student took a loaded shotgun to school in an attempt to kill her teacher.
2. Officers at a downtown teen dance removed numerous firearms, knives and clubs from patrons.
3. Recreation directors have removed firearms from juveniles attending teen club meetings.
4. Members of a juvenile gang committed two armed robberies with a shotgun and fired the weapon at a victim.
5. A youth was murdered on the street with a pistol. Gang members are suspect.
6. A youth was recently arrested for burglary and auto theft. In his possession was one rifle, one pistol and 150 rounds of ammunition.
7. A juvenile gang conceals sawed-off shotguns by strapping them over the top of a vehicle's gas tank.
8. A gang incident broke up when one gang member fired a shotgun at others.
9. A juvenile group fired at rivals from a rooftop with a shotgun.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

-2-

10. Another such group was reported to be in possession of 13 pistols.
11. A gang fight at a high school resulted in two pistols being displayed.
12. A gang member was shot in the chest by a rifle wielded by an opponent.

In addition, the number of narcotic addicts and other criminals who are armed with pistols or revolvers at the time of their arrest is increasing at an alarming rate.

The major concern of this Department, however, is the increasing evidence of the flagrant disregard and disrespect for constituted authority on the part of certain militant negro groups in this City. The group which is causing the most acute problems is the Black Panther Party for Self Defense. This is an extremely militant, anti-white political organization that has established a headquarters in Oakland at 5624 Grove Street. At one meeting, 22 negro juveniles and young adults attended and were armed with various weapons. To date, there has been no violation of existing laws concerning the possession of firearms. The concealable weapons have always been carried in plain view. When stopped and questioned by members of the Oakland Police Department, they have been extremely hostile towards officers and made statements to the effect that "the only good white man is a dead white man."

On November 27, 1966, a vehicle containing a leader and two identified members of the Black Panther Party was stopped for a traffic violation. Lying on the rear seat, in open view, officers observed one (1) .17 cal. Derringer pistol, one (1) Beretta 25 cal. automatic pistol, one (1) 22 cal. revolver, and one (1) 30 cal. U.S. carbine.

On February 21, 1967, 20 armed negroes, identified as members of the Black Panther Party, appeared at the San Francisco Airport as an escort and bodyguard for Betty Shabazz, widow of the late Malcolm X, assassinated member of the Black Muslims.

On February 21, 1967, an identified male negro spoke at a Berkeley, California High School rally which was attended by approximately 300 students, and made the following statement, "We are proud to be black and we don't hide behind our women. One day it will be molotov cocktails; next, hand grenades and bullets. If we can't have our freedom, then white America will die."

The next speaker, also an identified male negro and member of the Black Panther Party, who was wearing a holstered pistol on his belt, made the following statement after patting the pistol on his side. "We have this, but you can't fight just with guns. The next step is to go into the black community and organize for your needs. If we don't get them, then we can dissolve this Union of America."

Another leader of the Oakland Black Panther Party recently made the statement at a rally at the University of California that he could muster 50 armed negroes ready for action on one hour's notice.

On March 4, 1967, three members of the Black Panther Party were involved in an accident in the City of Oakland. One was armed with an automatic pistol in a shoulder holster in plain view. These subjects were antagonistic toward police and attempted to provoke an incident regarding the weapon which was being carried.

On March 9, 1967, at the Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center in Oakland, a negro youth group known as the "Cowboys" was holding a meeting when the Director observed approximately 30-35 young adults approaching the center. Approximately 8 or 10 were observed to be armed. The leader of this group was informed by the Director that weapons were not allowed at the center. The leader then ordered the armed members to deposit the weapons in one of their vehicles, posted a member as guard and the remaining members entered the meeting.

On April 17, 1967 at 12:01 P.M., members of the Black Panther Party were observed showing what appeared to be weapons and ammunition to Helms Junior High School students, who were on school premises, in the City of San Pablo. Following this, members entered the school, made derogatory remarks about the school and demanded of the principal that he bring forth a school counselor who took disciplinary action against a student.

On April 18, 1967, three members of the Black Panther Party were stopped by officers when they were observed displaying a shotgun in their moving vehicle. This was at 9:40 P.M. in the vicinity of Merritt Business College in Oakland when groups of adult students were on their way home from school. The driver was in possession of a shotgun, and one passenger was carrying a loaded .45 cal. automatic pistol on his belt, in open view. Shouting in a loud voice to students, the driver said, "We are here to protect you against these white baby killers." He made continual reference to a burglar who had been shot in Richmond and the Hunters Point shooting in San Francisco in 1966. Students were invited to attend the next meeting of the Black Panther Party to "learn how to shoot the white Facist Police."

On April 20, 1967, approximately 15 members of the Black Panther Party accompanied by several negro women, appeared at the Contra Costa County Administration Building at Martinez and demanded to see Sheriff Young. They were armed with shotguns and pistols at the time and insisted on entering the building with these weapons. Their alleged presence was to protest the shooting of a young negro burglar in Richmond. Deputies and the Undersheriff were subjected to verbal abuse and called "white devils and dogs."

On April 25, 1967 at 6:30 P.M., a male negro was kidnapped from his home at gunpoint by several heavily armed negroes who were reportedly members of the Black Panther Party.

Two identified Black Panther Party leaders emphasized that their prime objective is to arm the negro community to full capacity for the purpose of backing all plays by the negro community and to act as a deterrent to all organizations, including the Oakland and San Francisco Police Departments.

Leaders of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense are actively involved in left-wing causes. They have been identified openly selling "The Red Guard Handbook," a publication of Communist China, on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley.

On September 26, 1966, and for a week previous, picketing activity at Port Chicago protesting the war in Vietnam aroused the ire of residents of Clyde, a suburb, who armed and organized themselves as The Citizens Patrol for Protection of Clyde, to prepare for eventualities. Several automobiles were fired upon and shots were fired into a house.

The Constitution of the United States provides that a "well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Like all the provisions of the Bill of Rights, this has been held to be a restriction only on the power of Congress and the Federal Government, and not on the power of the states (Presser v. Illinois, 116 U.S. 252; U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 553). Numerous state constitutions have been reportedly held to confer a collective and not an individual right to bear arms. They do not restrict a state from requiring an individual to obtain a license to carry a firearm. They do not prevent a state from regulating an individual in the manufacture, transport, disposition and possession of weapons in order to preserve the peace and prevent crime (People v. Persce, 204 N.Y. 397; People v. Warder of City Prison, 154 app. Div. 413; Commonwealth v. Patson, 231 pa. 46, affirmed, 232 U.S. 138).

More than a quarter of a million serious crimes are committed with weapons annually in the United States, and the number is increasing steadily. FBI statistics show that during the period 1962-65, a firearm was used as a weapon in 56% of the 36,000 willful killings in the United States. The basic problem is the handgun, which was used in 70% of the murders. A shotgun was used in 20% and a rifle in 10%. Of the 278 police officers killed by criminals in 1960-65, 96% of these deaths resulted from the use of guns, 78% of which were handguns. Northeastern states, where strict gun controls exist, reported 36% of their murders were caused by guns. The rest of the country, where minimum gun controls exist, reported between 55% and 64% of their murders resulted from the use of firearms.

In murder, the availability and easy accessibility of a firearm appear to be major factors in the problem. Because of its lethal nature, a gun makes murder easy. While a hardened criminal will obtain a firearm regardless of the controls applied, most authorities agree controls would make acquisition more difficult and would deter the majority who are so inclined. In addition to

murder, in 1965 there were 34,700 aggravated assaults with guns and over 68,400 armed robberies, two-thirds of which involved firearms.

Laws regulating firearms in California are permissive as compared to some other high population density states. Some types of firearms are generally prohibited, such as sawed-off shotguns and machine guns, however, conventional pistols and revolvers are not subject to such strict control and rifles and shotguns are subject to minimal control. A dealer in concealable firearms must be licensed, but individuals other than dealers can make casual sales without a license.

There are restrictions on the sale of such firearms to aliens, felons, narcotic addicts, mental patients and minors under 18. It is not necessary to obtain a license or permit to own or possess a concealable firearm and only a formality, involving a delay in delivery, is required. Generally, a license is required to carry such firearm concealed.

In California, the carrying of a concealable firearm upon the person or concealed within a vehicle, without a license providing for such concealment, is a violation of the law. The requirement for a license does not apply, however, to the carrying of firearms openly. Additionally, rifles and shotguns may be carried openly without restriction. This permissiveness in the law presents problems for the law enforcement officer.

It is recognized that the particular needs for the effective regulation and control of firearms may vary between jurisdictions. For this reason, the authority to enact ordinances or other regulations to correct specific problems in an affected area should rest with that jurisdiction. There is a definite need, however, for the passage of additional laws by the State Legislature to provide uniformity in all jurisdictions for basic controls as follows:

1. To maintain current identity of all owners of concealable firearms, consideration should be given to require their registration with the State, and notification to that agency in the event of sale or transfer, much the same as is required with vehicles. When an individual who is in possession of such a weapon on the streets is stopped by a law enforcement officer, he must then produce evidence that he is in fact the registered owner of the weapon. This procedure will also call to the attention of State authorities, automatically, purchases by other than legitimate dealers of large numbers of concealable weapons, and those which are contraband. In addition, a better control would be effected concerning the possession of a concealable firearm by aliens, addicts and convicted felons who are by law prohibited from possessing same.
2. Current procedures followed by individuals who desire to purchase a concealable firearm should be amended. In addition to existing requirements, individuals should be compelled to be fingerprinted and photographed by the law enforcement jurisdiction involved.

There are no such requirements at present, and pistols and revolvers may be obtained by presenting fictitious evidence of identification at the time of the purchase.

On December 30, 1958, an ordinance of the City of Oakland, No. 5698, which contained these requirements, was repealed by the City Council. The reason for this action resulted from complaints from local merchants that purchasers were going to neighboring cities with less stringent requirements to obtain such weapons. State laws providing the same control that resulted from Oakland's Gun Purchase Permit Ordinance, if applied from the State level, would be uniform in enforcement and provide more adequate identification procedures.

Because of the ever-increasing transient nature of the criminal element today, regulations governing the purchase of firearms in one city have little effect since the buyer need only go to another jurisdiction where weapons regulations are not as restrictive or non-existent. Modern freeway and transportation facilities enable the criminal element to travel the length and breadth of the State with ease, and law enforcement agencies must constantly improve upon their mutual aid and cooperation procedures to effectively combat criminal activity.

3. Section No. 12025 of the California Penal Code should be amended to increase the penalty of carrying a concealed firearm without a license from a misdemeanor to a felony. Section No. 12020 P.C. makes it a felony to carry a black-jack, dagger, slig shot, brass knuckles or other less offensive or dangerous weapons, while it is only a misdemeanor to carry a loaded revolver or pistol.
4. Although a concealable firearm, sawed-off shotgun, machine gun and tear gas weapon is defined, the Deadly Weapons Control Law, for the purposes of this statute, should also include a definition of the term "firearm." Under Section 901 (3) of the Federal Firearms Act, a "firearm" means any weapon, by whatever name known, which is designed to expel a projectile or projectiles by the action of an explosive and a firearm muffler or silencer, or any part or parts of such weapon. It is recommended that this definition, excluding the words "and a firearm muffler or silencer, or any part or parts of such weapon" be adopted.

The statute already contains specific sections for the control of these devices. In addition, however, the definition should include gas or air operated rifles, revolvers and pistols capable of propelling a projectile with sufficient penetrating force to cause grievous bodily injury or death. Simple air rifles, commonly known as BB guns, which lack this force should be excluded. An increasing number of these pellet guns are being used in the commission of armed robbery.

The primary purpose of this request for additional legislation is to provide law enforcement officers with better tools for the control of the possession of firearms by individuals, groups or organizations who have no apparent reason or need for carrying such weapons, particularly those who have openly expressed an intention to use the weapons at an opportune moment against the police or other constituted authority.

It is not the intention of law enforcement agencies to deprive recognized sportsmen's organizations or individuals from participating in legitimate activities involving the use of firearms to include hunting, fishing, competitive or other shooting on established ranges, and persons who are engaged in the collection of antique or other firearms as a hobby or for other legitimate purposes as defined in Section 12027(h) of the Deadly Weapons Control Law. Proposed legislation would merely provide needed controls without restricting such activities.



BLACK POWER

a position paper by SY LANDY and CHARLES GAPPER
FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Originally presented as a position paper at the convention of the Students for a Democratic Society, this essay will soon be reprinted in the SDS newspaper, New Left Notes.

IN DEFENSE OF BLACK POWER

by

Sy Landy and Charles Capper

Sy is the Chairman of the New York Independent Socialist Club, a contributor to New Politics, and a former commentator on WBAI.

Charlie is a former chairman of Johns Hopkins SDS, a member of the ISC, and a graduate student in history at Berkeley. He was formerly on the staff of the Baltimore ERAP Project, U-Join.

BLACK POWER

IN THE MIDST of the debate over the call for "Black Power" in White America, radical Negro leaders have declared that they cannot give a detailed definition of the term. This position is not only consistent with the concept of Black Power -- in fact, it reveals the very essence of the concept: that the Negro people will themselves determine the direction of their own movement in the course of struggle.

BLACK POWER MARKS the beginning of a new stage in the struggle of a people toward social liberation, a stage as important today as was the Civil War and Reconstruction a century ago. For the Negro in America, the American heritage has meant centuries of slavery, transformed at last into corporate 'free enterprise' slavery, poverty, and physical terror. But beyond even the lynchings and poverty, the blood and hunger, has been the systematic attempt not only to crush the Negro but to make him accept his degradation as his just due. History and tradition weaved a blanket of social lies that smothered the Negro in his own supposed inhumanity, his fitness only for manual labor, his awareness of social and even physical dependence on the power and wealth of White America, his incapability of running his own life.

MUCH MORE IMPORTANT than explicit theories of Negro inferiority has been the conscious and unconscious racism that permeates the lives of whites living in a society built on the stooped backs of black people. Even more tragic, a great many Negroes have themselves accepted the racist concept of their own inferiority. Deliberately deprived of their African heritage, virtually denied the history of their own past rebellions, forced into patterns of deference by the need to survive, forced into the most menial jobs, forced into filthy slums and dirt road shacks, many American Negroes found it easy to accept the myth of their inferiority. It is a tribute to the human race in general and the Negro people in particular that such a system was not completely effective, that they could not be beaten down totally even by the vast powers aligned against them.

Though the white radical can empathize to a degree with the self-liberating effect of Black consciousness on the Negro people, only he who has been burdened with the myth of his own inferiority can know what that liberation really means. The experience of the Negro belongs to the Negro; only he knows how he feels, and only he can, in the course of struggle against the forces that oppress him, determine what he wants and how he intends to get it. In part, that is Black Power.

BEFORE ONE CAN even begin to discuss the political importance of Black Power, it is absolutely essential to understand the importance of this sense of Black consciousness in the building of a mass Negro movement.

A FEW YEARS AGO a sensational 'discussion' raged in the American press on "Black Nationalism". The greatest problem with this discussion was that a good deal of it was irrelevant. The crucial question for whites should have been, "Why?" Why were the Muslims, and before them the Garveyites, able to get such sizable and deep-rooted support and participation in the ghetto? Why were so many Negroes who did not join these groups so ambivalent and defensive, yet also so respectful toward them? Why did the spirit of "Nationalism" pervade so much of the internal life of even the most "integrated" civil rights organization?

A BASIC REASON for this phenomenon was the need for self-identification and self-respect. American black society had for too long accepted the idea that Negroes were incapable of uniting and leading their own groups. Traditional civil rights organizations might "do good things", but the black man at the bottom could not

identify himself with them. What appears to the white community to be an integrated organization often appears to the grass roots of the black community to be white-dominated.

CENTRAL, THEN, to the appeal of "Black Nationalism", even for those who rejected it, has been the hunger for Black pride. Back to Africa, a separate state, Muslimism -- all were believed in sincerely by some, but these ideas themselves hardly account for the popularity of nationalism. They were surface symbols of militancy, of a refusal to kneel to the white man.

BLACK POWER has a longer history in the Negro community. In the North we are familiar with it as an impulse, often unclear, sometimes conservative, sometimes radical, but always present. The Negro Church, even with its frequent ties to whites, even with its frequent implied message that "White is Good, Black is Bad", gained support as an instrument of Negroes. The growth of Negro political machines inside the old parties represented (and depended on) the aspiration for group identity, even if most of the benefits were at best vicarious. Even Uncle Tom's were preferred to direct white control. The Negro press and fraternal groups are also wavering but perceptible indications that the Negro wanted his own institutions and his own power groups.

This trend is even more marked in the South. The central feature of Segregation was not separation of the races, it was the domination by whites of powerless Negroes. Black institutions were controlled by the white power structure. Established black community leaders depended for their power on the support they had in the white community. A "friend" of the whites could command some influence on a day-to-day level. A white could work his pleasure on the black community; the reverse was impossible. Segregation was not simply two separate communities; it was more closely akin to a ranch, on which the black cattle were penned off and fed as long as they suited the needs of their white owners; if they did not, they were slaughtered.

WHITE AMERICA HAS shown the Negro that he needs both identity and power. From this lesson springs the need and the motive for a Negro movement, led by and responsible to Negroes.

II

REPLIES THE LIBERAL, we have always urged support for civil rights organizations that are dedicated to bettering the lot of Negroes. Somehow SNCC and other Black Power militants seem to want a different kind of movement, they don't seem to want to integrate into American society. As we will show, this movement is of necessity different from other civil rights organizations in its relations to middle-class white America. And this difference, not the phony charge of "racism in reverse", is at the heart of much of the white reaction to Black Power -- a reaction that not only reveals SNCC's alienation from middle-class white America, but also the white liberal's commitment to it. But let's first take up this question of assimilation into American society from an historical perspective. Let us ask whether Black Power radically deviates from the American experience?

THE ANSWER, we think, is that it does and it doesn't.

ON THE ONE HAND, it should not seem strange, for almost all minority groups in the United States have gone through analogous processes. Very few groups have simply "translated", "assimilated", or "integrated" into the dominant society. In fact, behind the gauze coverlet of the great "melting pot", "all-Americans-unhyphenated-together-in-brotherhood", and "every-man-considered-as-an-individual" has always been the reality of FIREARMS POLICY COALITION RESOURCES make up our own

society. Every politician making up a slate pays due heed to group self-identification patterns. The Irish consolidated themselves as a group, took over the church and gave it new content as an Irish institution, and formed and controlled many political institutions; the Jews built their manifold and powerful organizations; the Italians cohered their consciousness as Italians rather than as fellow villagers when they reached these shores - and so on. For separate groupings American society did not provide the option of simply blending in; such a choice only is possible when a group becomes strong enough internally to utilize its force and command respect inwardly and outwardly.

IN THIS WAY is the Negro's course similar to that of other groups. However, there are significant differences. The most obvious is that the color line makes the gulf between white and black sharper. Moreover, the other minorities came with intact cultures to be eroded over time, while the African's language and culture was decimated if not completely destroyed. And finally, the Negro was treated to the process of proclaimed inferiority, far more than others. Fourth, the other groups could begin to translate in by increasingly adapting to middle-class standards and by rising on the socio-economic ladder on a large scale. For the vast numbers of Negroes largely kept unskilled or semi-skilled and living in an increasingly fixed and stratified economy, this course is basically not open to them.

THESE FACTORS MEAN that the fight of the Negro is harder, sharper, and of necessity, more radical. For, if the goal is the self-raising of 20 million Black Americans, it can only be accomplished by a drastic and thorough change of the whole society -- its politics, its economy, its culture.

ONE LAST POINT should be made in relation to the European ethnic minorities which is crucial to an understanding of the similarities and differences vis-a-vis the Negro. The European minority groups had outside allies even while they crystallized their power. The ethnic groups were frequently hostile to each other, nevertheless, over the long period of time, they tended to buttress each other and fight for common needs. Then, too, despite periods of intense hostility, a loose alliance with the labor movement aided the process. Given the difficulty of the Negro's revolution and, at the same time, his minority position in American society, the problem of alliances is more difficult, but crucially important.

III

BEFORE ONE CAN even talk about alliances, however, it is important to understand the absolute necessity for building an internally unified, strong, and self-respecting Negro movement. Only then, when Negroes have something strong enough that other groups can ally with it and not simply dominate it, can one consider the problems of alliances. The central problem with the Negro movement has been that there has not really been one capable of digging roots into Black communities and responding to the socio-psychological and political needs of the Negro masses. Black power, as we have seen in the preceding sections, is a radical response to that radical need.

BUT GIVEN THE NECESSARY development of such a movement, we still then pass to the problems of alliances. For some time certain leaders within and without the Civil Rights movement have declared that the Southern Negro is in coalition with labor, the church groups, liberals, etc., within the political compass of the Democratic Party. They call for the intensification of this alliance and condemn the idea of Black Power as a method of isolating the Negro and destroying profitable alliances. They say it means that the Negro wants to go it alone and that this would be disastrous. Let us see.

LET US LOOK FIRST at the sort of alliances that the idea of Black Power, even at this early stage, implies; second, at the nature of the coalitionist alliances upon which the traditional civil rights groups have been based; and third, a more detailed and speculative analysis of the potential alliances growing out of the new Negro movement based on the idea of Black Power.

AT ONE LEVEL, the idea of Black Power clearly addresses itself to the question of white student allies.

A RECENTLY PUBLISHED SNCC position paper puts it: "This is not to say that the whites have not had an important role in the movement. In the case of Mississippi, their role was very key in that they helped give the Blacks the right to organize, but that role is now over, and it should be." White students and others have participated in a variety of situations in the South and have been crucial in quite a number. Now the concept of Black Power has been advanced and it means simply that a stage of struggle has been reached in which Negroes want control over their own fight, its policies, and its destiny. This decision is both strategic and democratic. Strategic in that it is based on the best way to build a strong Negro movement; democratic in that it states that Negroes should control their own organizations. Any white who feels that he has an "inherent right" to be part of the leadership of the movement is only expressing his own feelings about the inability and/or illegitimacy of Negroes to build and lead their own organizations.

AS WE HAVE SEEN, it became increasingly clear that the fight had to be waged by digging deeper and more permanent roots among the Negro people themselves in the South. Consequently, the position of whites in leadership roles became increasingly ambiguous. Their very presence, no matter how well-intentioned, was at some variance with the need for involvement of black people. The Negro, more than anyone, has had to go through the process of recognition that blacks are able to lead, have ideas, and can organize themselves. Articulate, advantaged, middle-class white students impede this process of recognition. Given this need and the conservatism of the Negro's allies -- labor, liberals, and so forth -- the development of mass black movements has become of crucial importance.

BITTER EXPERIENCE with "laws" and "gains" wrested from federal and state governments has shown that they have little content unless there is a powerful mass movement on the scene to force compliance. The need to involve masses of Negroes means a black movement, but it does not mean the end of alliances with white radicals or social movements of whites. Quite the opposite. The SNCC statements have explicitly advised white activists to organize in their own communities. In fact, the hope for this sort of black-white alliance depends in a real sense on the activity of white radicals in such predominantly white movements as the labor movement. Black Power is not a policy of self-isolation, but a strategy for building a strong, unified Negro movement and a call for more meaningful alliances.

BUT BEFORE we discuss more fully the nature of these (potential) new alliances, we should examine the nature of the coalitionist alliances of the old-line civil rights groups.

BLACK POWER COMES at a concrete time, in response to concrete conditions and concrete alliances. The trouble with the recent alliances is that they reduce the black ally to a subordinate status. It has become obvious that the price demanded by these allies is the abandonment of militancy and militant demands. The real worth of the labor bureaucrats and liberals as allies was demonstrated conclusively at the 1964 Democratic Party convention, when the Mississippi Freedom Democrats demanded to be seated as the only loyal delegation from that state. The Negroes' "friends" put pressure on them to capitulate. Such a capitulation would

have meant selling out and destroying the mass movement of Negroes in Mississippi, but that was secondary to the need of the labor bureaucrats and liberals to play ball with Johnson.

IN THE PRESIDENTIAL campaign that followed, the attempts by the lib-labs to high-pressure the Negro movement into a moratorium on demonstrations and militant activity underlined the nature of the "alliance". Fearful that such activity would create a white backlash in favor of Goldwater, they tried to present a picture of happy Negroes contented with their gains and making no further demands on White America. As we have seen, the moratorium did not prevent a white backlash; it merely persuaded it to vote for Johnson. A real alliance would have fought for the Negro, not for Johnson. At the least it could have forced Johnson to make some concessions to the Negro instead of moving to the right to incorporate the white backlash.

THE FACT THAT the AFL-CIO has still not cleaned its house of internal discrimination and its failure to fight for the low-seniority and unemployed workers (a large percentage of the Negro community is in these two categories) renders it an even more dubious ally at this time.

BUT EVEN THIS is not the worst aspect of the present "alliance" when we turn our gaze to the South.

CONTRARY TO the hopes of radicals, the struggle in the South did not come about as the result of a poor Negro-poor white alliance. The South has gone through a rapid transformation since World War II. It is now more urban than rural, if only by a few percentage points; whole areas are now highly industrialized. But while economic power has shifted to the cities, political power has lagged behind and tended to stay in the hands of small-town businessmen and lawyers and plantation owners in the black belt. The Democratic Party and the state legislatures were almost exclusively pork-barrel trading posts. When the threat of a CIO organizing drive receded, the urban upper and middle classes tried to change their political status from that of junior partner to rural and small town interests to senior partner. This was the reason for the reapportionment fights in the border and more industrial states. The spearhead of this fight was an alliance of financial, industrial, and mercantile interests plus the new, more sophisticated, middle classes.

THE NEGRO STRUGGLE of the '50s was concentrated in urban areas. Slowly an alliance emerged between the Negro leadership and the urban upper classes. For example, the "pro-civil rights" Mayor of Atlanta (the banking center of the South) is the former head of the Chamber of Commerce, and the Vice-Mayor formerly led the realty interests of the city. The pattern is duplicated through much of the developed South. Sometimes the coalition is easy; sometimes the business community is a most grudging "ally". The labor movement in the South plays virtually no role.

THIS COALITION has resulted in precious little for the Negro. The political complexion of his allies ranges from conservative Republican to Johnson Democrat. As a result, after agonizing struggles, the Negro's gains have been only token in most areas.

THE GOAL OF THE Southern white moderates is racial peace. But the impoverished Negro community needs a social, economic, and racial revolution. The urban white upper classes will go only so far and no farther. They tend to moderate their already-modest goals in order to keep their allies in the rural areas. The rural upper classes want to modernize and industrialize, so they are beginning to move toward tokenism to achieve social peace. As a result, the opposition to Negro demands is shifting from the town to the country. The town-oriented White Citizens Councils to lower levels of the white population in the form of the Klan.

6.

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE will hardly advocate a program that can make a difference in the daily life of the average poor Negro. In Atlanta, for example, where Negroes can vote more or less freely, until recently only a few saw voting as a meaningful way to change their lives. The cost of the alliance to the Negro was that the black community could not be organized. Any program of Black Power or of radical economic demands would be inconsistent with what could be cajoled from the business and middle-class groups that dominate the alliance.

WHERE THE NEGRO PEOPLE have been solidly organized on independent lines, as in the Mississippi Freedom Democrats and the Lowndes County Freedom Organization, their former white "allies" quickly disappeared from view. Phony alliances cannot continue when the real aspirations of the Negro are put forward.

IF THE PRESENT alliance pattern continues, it means the end of any possibility of developing deeply-rooted Negro organizations in the South. Instead, a coalition will come into being between white business and the upper levels of the Negro community. The great mass of Negroes will still be out in the cold.

THE REAL QUESTION for the Negro movement is not, whether or not to have alliances. The question is, what kind of alliances, with whom, and toward what ends?

IV

BLACK POWER MEANS, if carried through, the rupture of present alliances and changes in Negro leadership. Alliances between large social groupings are not broken sharply or in one day. Sections of departing allies hang on and serve as brakes on the movement. Moderate leaders hang on as long as they can. The publicity given them in the mass media give them the appearance of strength. They can even gain small successes by pressuring their white cohorts to give a little and avert a more militant leadership. Revolutions are processes that develop over time. They wane and wax. But if the present alliances disappear, whether slowly or rapidly, what new ones seem likely? Or will the Negro movement isolate itself? Where in the South, in America, can new social alliances be forged?

BLACK POWER DOES NOT preclude future alliances. The idea that it does arises from confusion. If the Negro community organizes itself, future allies will have to respect its power. They will not be able to subordinate it to their own needs. But this only means that any such alliance will be genuine.

IT IS ONLY in liberal mythology that meaningful alliances occur on the basis of brotherly love. The best cement for an alliance is common interest.

THE MOST FAR REACHING and integrated alliance that has ever involved the Negro in the South was the Populist Party. C. Vann Woodward and other historians have pointed to this fact, although the plebian Negro-white relationship was temporary and sporadic. The joint effort that occurred at that time was the result of a recognition of common interests by two separate organizations. A white farmers' organization and a black farmers' organization came together in the

Populist Party out of common necessity and forced mutual respect. The Southern poor white and the Negro loved each other no more then than now. Integration, to the extent that it occurred, was a side result; the mutual goal was economic, social, and political advancement.

SAMUEL LUBELL has documented the patterns of Negro and white voting in the South. He shows that, while Negroes and the upper strata of the white community vote similarly on racial issues, on economic issues the poor whites and Negroes tend to vote alike. We know that historically there are great class divisions in the white community, divisions that have often led to violence. We know that strains still exist -- unemployment, underemployment, and low wage levels oppress the poor white as well as the Negro. Moreover, there is growing resentment among poor whites toward the racial policies of the white upper class whose policy of tokenism affects only them and not the big shots.

CAN THE DIFFERENCES between the classes in the white community be crystallized so that a new alliance can occur between self-organized poor blacks and poor whites? Obviously, given the existing racial enmity, no one can give assurances of this. But there are possibilities that offer a way forward. The white worker and the white poor will not be organized on the basis of fighting for the rights of Negroes, but they can be organized to fight for their own needs.

WHEN SNCC CALLS FOR white students, especially white Southern students, to organize the white poor, it points to a necessity. This in itself will be vastly difficult, but unfortunately even more is necessary. In the 1880's and '90s, white plebians lent a hand in helping to organize black groups; the reverse is now needed. Obviously, this does not mean sending Negro organizers into white communities, but it does mean that Negro groups will have to adopt a particular stance toward the white under group. This stance will be built upon the truth, the way the Negro and white really feel:

- 1) "The Negroes you despise have organized to fight for their needs and are winning something. Will the poor white do the same, or is he a permanent patsy?"
- 2) "We aren't anxious to 'integrate' into the white community. We want the right to go where we please or sit where we like, but we don't intend to smash our own community to do it, because we have our pride. We will consider the idea of 'assimilation' when white movements worthy of respect are ready to help us in transforming society."

THE NEGRO, IN PRESSING his demands, will widen them and show that these demands have meaning for the poor white as well. For example, the South needs massive public works -- dams, power plants, hospitals, schools, libraries. These would give jobs to thousands of unskilled and semi-skilled workers, the bulk of the Southern labor force, both black and white. Not that the Federal or state governments, controlled by the Two-Party Establishment, is likely to heed these demands; they will come through with the needed billions only for the purpose of mass murder. But in the Negro community -- and perhaps in the white -- the idea will spread that people have a right to a job and a decent income. If the present government won't give it to them, they should establish one that will, one that they themselves control.

8.

ALREADY A CHANGE is taking place in the nature of Negro demands. The economic program associated with Black Power is still sketchy, but it is becoming more radical. SNCC is calling for black credit unions and cooperatives as well as independent political parties, and it is evident to SNCC and everyone else that this is only the beginning.

MOVEMENTS EVOLVE in the course of struggle. Generally, even working-class movements start with middle-class goals. Those who want to rise naturally try to follow in others' paths. They want the same things others have. When and if they learn that they cannot all become small businessmen or have two cars and the like, they either fall away or build a new group consciousness and more radical ways to raise themselves. The Negro movement from the beginning raised general demands for jobs and housing, but it never concentrated on a radical economic program. For those leading the fight at the time, this was not the most important thing. But the scene shifts radically as the need is felt to seek deeper roots and attract greater forces.

THE SIGNIFICANCE of this for future alliances is that the demands of the black movement will strike more chords among white workers and farmers and widen their awareness of their own needs.

THERE IS STILL another factor: in aiming at political power, the Negro will increasingly need to orient toward the city, where political power is concentrated. SNCC is having its biggest successes in the rural black belt, but the urban fight still looms. In the black belt, there is less need for allies. There are fewer to be found, even potentially, and in any case the Negro is not in a minority. But as the fight expands, as it must, and as more radical Negro forces enter the Southern cities, they meet a more complex situation. There organized black power will be not only in separate black institutions but asserting itself within white institutions like the Maryland Freedom Union where the white unions refuse even to organize masses of Negroes, there are important unions with large blocs of Negroes already involved. Here the organization of black caucuses may cause companion white ones to spring up. If inflation continues, the pressure now building up for more money among black and white workers could produce all sorts of struggles and all sorts of alliances inside unions.

AN ALTERNATE COURSE of events -- more racial bloodshed and the dashing of hopes for these new alliances -- is possible. But if it occurs, the blame will rest as much with the failure of white radicals to break from the old coalitionist alliances and help build a movement of white workers fighting for their needs, as it will with an anti-white perversion of the concept of Black Power.

ANTI-WHITE FEELING in the black community is hardly created by the slogan of Black Power. It is already there and boiling over. Black Power attempts to channel the rage and energies of the Negro community in the direction of political, economic, and social goals; its opposite is coups and programless riots. It seeks to transform riots into rebellions, aimed not at indiscriminate hostility but directed at the vitals of the rotten American power structure. To a great extent, the responsibility for simple anti-whitism lies with the conservative civil rights leaders who raise hopes for arms to deliver the goods because of their subordination of the movement to the political needs of the Democratic Party and the lib-lab

9.

coalition, thus adding to the enormous pent-up frustration of an oppressed people.

IT IS POSSIBLE that the sort of semi-nationalism now being advanced can be twisted into reactionary forms. The movement, especially in the North, could go down to defeat, obliterated by the armed power of the White Establishment; it could travel the dead-end street of anti-Semitism; it could break into small and warring fragments. History makes no guarantees of social progress. Because Black Power can be perverted if no white anti-Establishment insurgencies develop to aid the Negro movement, precisely for this reason it is essential for radicals to commit themselves to the building of a working-class movement willing to fight for its rights, its interests, its humanity, against its exploiters, in a society that is increasingly dehumanizing and barbarically oppressive. Opposition to Black Power -- which expresses such legitimate needs for a mass Negro movement -- can only lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy for the whites, a reactionary race war that will drown Negroes in blood. Such a warfare will end the hope of a catalytic force to aid in the creation of a non-exploitative, truly human society for white as well as black. It is to that end that we welcome the slogan of Black Power because it paves the way for potential new alliances to replace those that have hampered the Negro movement. It is to that end that we welcome white radical activity in helping to build a movement of whites that fights its exploitation as militantly as the Negro militant fights his. It is on the basis and from the experience of such struggles that a movement for a new, transformed America can be built.

Mrs. Hearst Quits *Oak. Trib. 5/8/67* Poverty War Post

Mrs. Randolph A. Hearst, wife of a San Francisco newspaper publisher and member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, today announced her resignation as an advisor to the War on Poverty program.

She cited the employment of Bobby Seale, leader of the Black Panthers, in an Oakland project, as one of her reasons. Seale was fired after he led an armed assault on the State Assembly at Sacramento last week.

Mrs. Hearst's resignation was in a telegram to Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in Washington.

"It is with extreme reluctance that I tender my resignation, effective immediately,

from the poverty program," Mrs. Hearst said in the wire.

"I have reached this conclusion because it has become increasingly apparent that the personnel selection and the programs associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity distinctly lack the responsible auditing practices essential in the disbursement of public funds.

The recent publicity concerning Bobby Seale, a well-known Black Panther, employed as a family counsellor at the North Oakland Area Service Center, is a case in point.

"I can only conclude that these recent events are merely indicative of an over-all attitude that is casual in the extreme.

Solons Are Furious At Capitol Gun-Toters

5/13/67 SAC. BEE

Swarming into the Assembly chamber with them was a knot of television and newspaper photographers. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee, presiding at the time, saw the men with cameras but, at first, did not notice the heavily-armed Negroes. Bee ordered the sergeant-at-arms to remove the photographers from the Assembly floor.

Moved Off Floor

Chief Sergeant-at-arms Tony Beard, his assistants and State Police officers moved the entire group off the floor.

Bee termed the incident "one of the most flagrant violations of the rules" he has ever seen in his 13 years as an assemblyman. He confirmed he noticed only the cameramen at first.

"When I saw all those TV cameras coming, it was almost unbelievable," he declared.

Bee said the demonstration was of no value to the group in their efforts to prevent Mulford's bill from being approved and actually may have helped its chances.

Does No Good

"Our job is to make the laws, and this type of thing does no good," he added.

Assemblyman Bill Greene, a liberal Democratic legislator from Los Angeles and himself a Negro active in civil rights movements, declared:

"This action was not militant. It was senseless. No person, black or white, can condone this action."

Assemblyman E. Richard Barnes, R-San Diego County, whose seat in the rear of the Assembly chamber was near the action, predicted:

"I think this incident will result in a strict law prohibiting the bringing of firearms into any state building. I think it

See Page A4, Col. 3

Invaders May Prompt New Law

Other stories related to the Black Panther incident in the Assembly are on page A4, A7 and A12.

By Martin Smith

An unprecedented invasion of the State Capitol by gun-wielding members of the militant Black Panther party for Self-Defense demonstrating against

a bill to prohibit carrying loaded weapons in public may have had the reverse effect and increased support of the measure.

Individual legislators speculated that the appearance of the armed band carrying loaded shotguns, rifles and sidearms has improved chances that the proposal, Assembly Bill 1591, eventually will be approved.

New Amendments

Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, author of the bill, yesterday had the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure delay action on the measure so he could prepare amendments to broaden and strengthen the proposal.

Among other things, he wants also to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly or Senate with a loaded weapon.

Approximately half of the 24 men—all from the Bay Area—ultimately arrested yesterday did force their way into the lower house as it was in session during the noon hour. They did so as a bitter debate was in progress on a labor relations bill affecting firemen.

SAC. BEE 5/3/67



Police officers members of a Black Panther group outside the Capitol Building after they arrested a man
illegally possessing a rifle in the area. (AP Wirephoto)

Solons Assail Armed Band Entering Capitol

From page A1

should be a felony. I will vote for it."

Lt. Ernest Holloway, a veteran on the State Police staff in the Capitol, said:

"Twenty-five years and I've never seen anything like this."

He noted previous incidents which were termed "invasions" of the Capitol included one by a group of striking lumber workers who appeared during the depression.

"They were peaceful," said the lieutenant. "We put them up at the Fair ground."

A civil rights sit-in in the Capitol in 1963 was recalled by Holloway but he said "that was nothing" compared to yesterday's tense incident.

Well-Organized

The Black Panther group was well-organized yesterday, said Holloway.

"They knew how far they could go," he said. "They were quoting the Constitution verbatim about their right to bear arms."

The men removed from the Assembly, accompanied by ever-growing numbers of newsmen and also by the rest of the armed band who had been outside on the west steps of the Capitol, were taken to the first floor police office in the Capitol.

There the guns of several men were taken from them, over their strong protests, and examined by officers. The weapons were loaded although no shells were in their firing chambers. Because the weapons were being carried openly without any attempt at concealment the half-dozen officers returned the weapons to the men.

Verbal Abuse

In the Capitol, the men who had their guns taken from them temporarily did not physically resist the officers but heaped verbal abuse on them, calling them "racist dogs."

Most of the band's members

ignored questions by newsmen. But one man, Bobby Seale, a spokesman for the organization, read a statement issued in the name of Huey P. Newton, "minister of defense" for the Black Panther Party for Self Defense.

Statement's Contents

The statement called "upon the American people in general and the black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

The statement accused the American government of waging a racist war in Vietnam and reactivating concentration camps which had been used to confine Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

The camps "are being prepared for black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary," according to the statement.

Other Contentions

After also attacking the United States for lynchings, the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, "genocide practiced on the American Indians" and enslavement of Negroes, the statement concluded:

"The Black Panther Party for Self Defense believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction."

The armed men, accompanied by several young women, returned to their bars after gathering briefly on the west steps of the Capitol again. Visiting school children gawked at them and their weapons while leaders of the youngsters attempted to get some groups inside the Capitol away from the crowd.

Mrs. Auther denied any of the members of the group had broken the law.

"We conducted ourselves as ladies and gentlemen," she told reporters in a sidewalk interview.

Mrs. Auther indicated the group was incensed over the slaying of a Negro burglary suspect in the Richmond area by a Contra Costa County deputy sheriff. She termed the slaying "murder."

Asked if she thought the demonstration would persuade any legislators to vote against AB 1591, she said:

"I think it wouldn't make any difference."

Purpose Of Bill

The bill to which the Black Panthers object would, except

in certain instances, prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in the use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Officer Goes Down

The only thing close to violence which actually occurred, instead of being threatened, was when the group stormed into the Assembly. At an outer swinging gate, an elderly deputy sergeant-at-arms, James Rooney, brother of Sacramento Police Chief Joseph Rooney, was knocked back when the Black Panthers moved through.

He fell into a chair. He got up unhurt but angry.

State police officers tightened security arrangements at yesterday afternoon's hearing on the Mulford bill, but it was a calm meeting.

Arrests Are Made

The arrests of the men occurred minutes later as they, in five automobiles, drove into a service station at 15th and L Streets across from Capitol Park. City police officers swarmed over the station, took away their guns and placed them in a paddy wagon.

A little used section of the State Government Code, prohibiting the disruption of the State Legislature while it is in session, was used to charge a number of men.

Police officers said one man pulled out his gun but was disarmed quickly. He was accused of assault with a deadly weapon.

One man arrested was identified as Eldredge Cleaver, a reporter for Ramparts magazine, a militant "New Left" publication. His attorney, Lawrence K. Karlton of Sacramento, said Cleaver was not carrying a gun, only a camera, and was present as a reporter.

Attorney's Comment

"They arrested everyone who was black," said Karlton. "He was the wrong color."

One of the women, Barbara Auther, of Berkeley, a pre-law student at the University of California, denied the Black Panther organization was a racist group. She was not arrested.

She said members, however, carry weapons wherever they go because of "police brutality."

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This reminder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish it in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpended cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed-off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many such controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a handgun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

S.F. CHRON.
**Capitol Flurry
In Gun Protest**

May 3, 1967

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly Chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with sergeants-at-arms and were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivet as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim faced, the group walked upstairs to the second floor, past open-mouthed employees and visitors. Two or three special

See Page 16, Col. 1

Panther Protest At State Assembly

From Page 1

guards followed them.

When the band reached the closed gates that stand about 50 feet in front of the Assembly chamber, a dozen of the Panthers burst through, knocking Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms Jim Rooney off his feet.

HALLWAYS

Some waited outside, some strode the hallways and a few pushed their way into the Assembly chamber.

Only a few of the legislators were actually aware of the intrusion. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee (Dem-Hayward), who was facing the door saw only a gaggle of news and television cameramen in what seemed to be a stampede.

Angrily he shouted for the sergeant-at-arms, Tony Beard, to remove the intruding photographers. But Assemblyman Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont) rose to inform the Assembly: "A serious incident has just occurred. People with weapons forced their way into this chamber and were ejected."

INVASION

Mulford described the invasion as a "direct attempt" to intimidate him.

His bill — prohibiting instruction in the use of firearms for the purpose of rioting and prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms on public streets and in public places by all except peace officers, guards and members of the armed forces — was scheduled for a hearing last night before the Assembly's Committee on Criminal Procedure.

Mulford said the incident had inspired him to toughen the bill.

LUNCH

Outside the Assembly chamber, the Panthers were met by State police who took them downstairs and began

Long Name For Little Dutch Prince

Utrecht

The first male heir to the Dutch throne in 116 years yesterday was named Prince Willem Alexander Claus George Ferdinand. He will be called Alexander.

The baby was born last Thursday to Crown Princess Beatrix and Prince Claus. He is the first child of the 29-year-old heiress to the throne.

Prince Claus announced his son's name when he registered his birth at the Utrecht Town Hall.

Both the princess and her son have been reported doing well. She is recovering in a private clinic.

Associated Press

confiscating their weapons. The guns were unloaded and returned when it was decided the Panthers had broken no laws.

The group started down the Capitol steps to meet their armed colleagues just as Governor Ronald Reagan was emerging to have a picnic lunch on the lawn with 30 youngsters from the Valley View Intermediate School in Pleasant Hill.

The Governor, the visiting children and their teachers were herded back into the Capitol by security officers and State police and the picnic was held in Reagan's office.

Later, Reagan said the Black Panthers had a right to bear arms, but added: "There's no reason why on a street today any citizen should be carrying a loaded weapon."

He called this a "ridiculous

way to solve problems among people of good will."

As the Governor was speaking, police, armed with riot guns and pistols moved in on about 25 of the Black Panthers who had assembled at a service station near the Capitol. They were disarmed, loaded into patrol wagons and taken to headquarters where some were booked for violating the Fish and Game Code which prohibits loaded guns in a vehicle.

When final inventory was taken, police said they had booked a total of 26 men between the ages of 17 and 25 on a variety of charges, including brandishing a gun in a threatening manner and possession of two sawed-off shotguns. Fifteen weapons were confiscated.

The Black Panthers offered no resistance. Bobby George Seale, 30, of Oakland, chairman of the organization, read a statement to newsmen which was signed by Huey P. Newton, 25, the party's "Minister of Defense."

It called on Americans — Negroes in particular — to "take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Seale said "the black people have prayed and demonstrated . . . and everything else. All their efforts have been answered by oppression. City Hall turns a deaf ear to pleas for help against this terror."

BILL

Meanwhile Mulford said it was "ridiculous to think my bill is aimed at any ethnic group. It is aimed at white people as much as any one."

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown Jr. (Dem-S.F.), a Negro, agreed the proposed legislation has no racial implications but questioned Mulford's motives in offering it.

Brown said Mulford had previously opposed such bills "until Negroes showed up in Oakland — his district — with arms and then he seeks restrictive legislation." Brown added he is acquainted with some of the Black Panther group and called them "decent kids."

Another Negro, Assemblyman Leon Ralph (Dem-L.A.) said he felt the bill is "aimed at Nazis, the KKK the Minutemen and others, and should be applied equally to all, black or white."

Bee, commenting later at the police station, said the Legislature is "certainly upset" by the whole episode.

"This," he said, "will help the bill pass."

Assembly Unit Passes Gun Control Bills; Another Is Deferred After Intrusion

By Wilson K. Lythgoe

Concerned over the ease with which a person can arm his own army, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee late last night acted to tighten rules and penalties of laws on larger military-type guns and ammunition.

Members of the committee, headed by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside County, were among those alarmed earlier in the day when armed Negroes shouldered their way into the Assembly carrying rifles and shotguns. The intruders said they were members of the Black Panther Party.

This incident and discovery and seizure of 77 tons of military arms in the home of William Thoresen in San Francisco overshadowed the hearing last night and another in the afternoon on firearms legislation.

Tense Atmosphere

The hearing amidst a charged atmosphere in the afternoon centered upon AB 1591 by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, which the armed Negroes said they were protesting.

This proposal would prohibit, except in certain instances, the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Mulford, himself, asked that the bill be put over, and said the Black Panther incident had caused him to consider amendments to broaden and toughen the bill.

Among other things, Mulford said he wanted to include an amendment to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly with a loaded weapon.

Special Attention

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Contra Costa County, noted that often when bills are put over that that is the last heard of them, but he said Mulford's bill would be worked on in conferences and in committee again to "stop the spread of this problem." He said Black Panther incidents had previously occurred in the bay area.

A Negro Assemblyman and member of the committee, John J. Miller, D-Oakland, decried what he termed to be a "circus atmosphere" and asked that the committee consider the bill in an objective manner "without reference to what happened this afternoon."

Mulford called it ridiculous to think that the legislation was aimed at any ethnic group, but despite an obvious attempt on his part and by other witnesses, the "Assembly incident" cropped up time and time again.

AB 1325 which would define hand rocket launchers as concealable firearms. Gas-operated pistols were amended out of the bill.

AB 1323 would ban possession of machine gun parts. The bill was amended so it would not apply to semi-automatic weapon parts.

Final Comments

Col. E. F. Sloan of Redwood City, representative of the National Rifle Association, said he supported the basic principles of the bills, and offered suggestions to make them more workable.

The only serious objection came from William Andrews, Berkeley attorney, who asked that gas-operated pistols not be defined as concealable firearms because they "are not a lethal weapon."

And Richard Spear, Oakland attorney and cannon collector, said he could live with the bill, AB 1326, after it was made plain he could keep his cannons under permit from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

On Larger Weapons

The Assembly committee last night approved the main parts of its package of bills to tighten laws on larger caliber guns and ammunition. Twenty-five of these weapons, ranging from a 50 mm mortar to sidearms, were displayed for committeemen.

The legislation, boosted by the office of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and authored by Biddle, is based on findings and recommendations of a two year study made by the committee.

But Charles O'Brien, deputy attorney general, said pistols, rifles and shotguns used as hunting weapons would not be changed by the measures.

He mentioned Minutemen in California as one group that the new legislation is aimed at, and Thoresen as an individual whom it could affect.

Return Arsenal

Under present law, he said, much of the arsenal taken from Thoresen may have to be returned. O'Brien said the present law is so weak that Thoresen was nearly arrested for possessing a fire hazard.

Assemblyman Floyd L. Wakefield, R-Los Angeles County, blamed gathering of arsenals on laxity of the federal government. He said this became evident after World War II when many military type weapons were allowed in from abroad.

"It's just too bad, as a demonstration in the Assembly showed us," Wakefield said.

The approved bills are:

AB 1326 which, for the first time, proposes to outlaw private possession of heavy military weapons, including antitank guns, bombs, booby traps and explosives.

Imported Weapons

AB 1324 to require Californians who buy concealable guns out of state to notify their local police or sheriff's officers and provide them with the same information required if they had bought the handguns in California.

5/3/67 SAC BEE

Black Panthers Believe Arming Is Needed To Fight 'White Oppression'

By Don Ferrell

Who are the Black Panthers and what do they stand for?

A check into their sketchy and somewhat vague background shows that the Black Panther Party is a spin-off of the Lowndes County, Ala., Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as its emblem.

The growing movement has since spread into other states and cities, including New York City, Detroit, Tennessee and San Francisco.

Before storming the Assembly Chamber in Sacramento yesterday the group—which can accurately be described as anti-white and revolutionary — had gained some small notoriety.

Previous Appearances

Last February, for instance, about 20 of them escorted the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown San Francisco. Later that day they caused a little nervousness among San Francisco officials when they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine.

But their latest public incident until yesterday was last month when a dozen or so armed Black Panthers showed up in Martinez

complaining about what they termed the murder of a Negro suspected of burglary in North Richmond.

Their goals, among other things, include an almost obsessed belief that the Negro community is oppressed by whites and that policemen are in reality an army which occupies Negro neighborhoods.

Other Convictions

They openly advocate arming the Negro community against policemen and other whites and oppose members of their race being sent to fight in the Vietnam war.

The Black Panthers also believe that all big businesses should be nationalized unless private enterprise makes jobs available for Negroes.

Most of those involved in yesterday's incident came from Oakland and it is estimated that about 40 Panthers live in the Bay Area.

Leader Participates

One of those in the group was Bobby George Seals, a leader in the Oakland Panther movement, who reportedly received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958 and served

a six-month term in military confinement for disrespect to an Air Force officer.

Until yesterday, none of the Black Panthers had been arrested because of carrying weapons because under California law it is not illegal to openly carry arms.

However, it is against the law to carry loaded guns in vehicles.

OAK TRIB. 5/11/67 'Panther' Leader's Job Under Scrutiny

A federal probe of the employment of Bobby Seale, leader of the Black Panthers in Oakland's War on Poverty program was asked today by Rep. Jerome Waldie, D-Contra Costa County.

Waldie said he has asked Larry Horan, regional director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, for a report "concerning the duties, hours, and days of employment" of Seale.

Seale was fired from his job as family counselor with the North Oakland Service Center after he led a raid of armed Panthers on the State Assembly at Sacramento last week.

"I can hardly conceive of a less qualified person for such a position than one who has engaged in such irresponsible and bizarre conduct as has Mr. Seale and his fellow Black Panthers," Waldie said.

Seale appealed to University of California students for money in a rally attended by

about 500 people on the lower plaza of the Berkeley campus yesterday.

Seale said the money — \$5,200 in all — is needed to bail out members of his organization who were jailed on conspiracy charges after their recent armed march on the State Assembly in Sacramento.

A half-dozen Panthers circulated containers among the audience, but while several students donated coins and dollar bills, a count of the receipts wasn't available.

In a talk received with occasional and mild applause, Seale decried the arrests as unwarranted and reiterated his group's intent of protecting the Negro community from "racist cops."

He suggested Caucasian students in the audience form a "White Panther Party" to fight alleged racism in their communities.

SAC UNION
5/3/67
**Panther Man
Tells Party
Philosophy**

OAKLAND (UPI)—The Black Panther Party for Self Defense was organized in the San Francisco Bay Area about six months ago, according to Huey Newton, who lists himself as its "defense minister."

The party was "stimulated" by the Lowndes County (Alabama) Freedom Party, which uses the black panther as an emblem. The party's Bay Area membership is estimated at about 40 and is loosely associated with similar groups in New York City, Detroit and Tennessee.

In a recent interview, the 25-year-old Newton explained the Panthers believe:

"Politics is defined as war without bloodshed. War is politics with bloodshed—when peaceful means are exhausted, then it evolves into physical conflict. The time is long past when we blacks have exhausted peaceful attempts to gain our desires for freedom and justice—and now we must prepare ourselves to meet the aggressions of the white power structure."

Newton has described himself as unsalaried but fulltime head of the party. He has an Oakland arrest record which includes petty theft and assault with a deadly weapon for which he spent six months in county jail.

Party Chairman Bobby George Seale, 30, is a part-time Panther. He is employed at \$422 monthly as a family counselor for the North Oakland Community Center of the Oakland Economic Development Council, the local war on poverty agency.

The Gun Wearing 'Black Panthers'

Page 4 Column 1 Source: L.A. Sunday Evening & Chronicle, April 28, 1967



BOBBY GEORGE SEAL (L) AND HUEY NEWTON
They make no bones about being with whites or about being revolutionaries

*It's All Legal**Sat. Sunday Examiner & Chronicle**4/30/67*

Oakland's Black Panthers Wear Guns, Talk Revolution

By JERRY BELCHER
Staff Writer

If a Hollywood director were to choose them as stars of a movie melodrama of revolution, he

would be accused of type-casting.

The leader, lithe, slender, saturnine and handsome. He looks out at the world with dark, slitted, suspicious eyes. He wears a uniform of

black beret, black leather jacket. Across his chest slants a bandolier of shells. In his hands, at port arms, a blunt, ugly riot gun.

The chief lieutenant, also lithe and slender but taller. Face grim and tight, set off by a thick mustache. He wears the same uniform. Slung jauntily from his left shoulder, a holstered .45 caliber automatic pistol.

But these two are not actors and this is not Hollywood. This is Oakland, California. The melodrama is real, the guns are real. The two young men are real revolutionaries.

BLACK PANTHER

The leader is 25 year old Huey Newton, a Negro who doesn't use that word but calls himself black. His lieutenant is 30 year old Bobby George Seale, also a Negro who doesn't use the word. Newton is "Minister of Defense" of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense. Seale is chairman of the party.

Neither makes any bones about being anti-white or about being revolutionary. "We are," says Newton, "a revolutionary party. The only solution for colonized people is a revolutionary transition. Bloodshed is not necessary . . . but revolution often leads to it."

HE LECTURES

Newton speaks from behind a table in the Black Panther headquarters at 5624 Grove Street, Oakland, a rented store-front with cheap red drapes cloaking the windows. He stands and lectures instead of sitting and being interviewed.

Seale stands silently beside him. On the table is the 12 gauge shot gun, the same as a riot gun.

—From Page 1

Seale's holstered .45 dangles from his shoulder.

This is a private meeting, but a reporter and a photographer are present by invitation. With Newton and Seale, standing around, are five other young Negroes. They are armed with pistols, shotguns or carbines.

IN PUBLIC

But the Black Panthers appear in public, too, and appear with the same guns.

In recent weeks, they have gained a certain notoriety. Twenty of them showed up to escort the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown on Feb. 21. The same day they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine on Broadway, and the scene was a little tense.

A dozen armed Black Panthers appeared in Martinez a week ago Thursday to protest to Contra Costa County Sheriff Walter Young about what they called the "murder" of a young Negro burglary suspect in North Richmond. The confrontation ended with no decision — and with no guns being fired.

MEETING HELD

Yesterday they held a quiet outdoor meeting in North Richmond to discuss the same shooting.

Some 150 Negroes listened as leaders of the group stood atop autos to make speeches and armed guards kept away all whites. The speakers reportedly advised the crowd what to do regarding the alleged police brutality.

While Contra Costa County deputies kept an eye on the gathering from a helicopter, no action was taken on the ground, since, a sheriff's spokesman said, the Black Panthers broke no laws and displayed their weapons openly.

NIGHTLY PATROLS

These are the three most publicized appearances of the Panthers. But there have been a number of other incidents — nightly patrols of Oakland's Negro districts by carloads of armed Panthers on the lookout for "racist police brutality"; rallies in the tense Negro ghetto of North Richmond; a show-up (guns were left in cars) at San Pablo's Walter Helms Junior High School, where school officials were accused of beating up a Negro student.

There have been other incidents. There undoubtedly will be more, wherever and whenever there is a hint of trouble between whites and Negroes. And if the Panthers stick by their platform, they'll stick by their guns.

UNDER LAW

What's more, if they don't pull the triggers, not much can be done about the guns, under California law.

Who are the Black Panthers, what are they and what do they want and mean?

The answers are hard to get, especially from the Panthers themselves. Newton, who calls himself the chief, answers questions only on his own terms.

In the Grove Street headquarters one day last week, he lectured for more than an hour — and answered only those questions which fitted his speech.

THEIR REALM

How many Black Panthers? He wouldn't say. There are Black Panthers, though, in New York City, Detroit, Tennessee, San Francisco.

(Best guess of outsiders is that there are about 40 Panthers in the Bay Area.)

What other Negro organizations are the Panthers affiliated with? No answer. (But the national headquarters of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee told The Examiner that SNCC knows of Black Panther groups in several cities of the nation — and supports them at least morally. Local NAACP officials said they know of the Panthers only from the newspapers.)

What do they stand for? Among other things, according to Newton, the Black Panthers believe:

- The black community is oppressed by the white power structure. Policemen constitute a colonial "army of occupation" in Negro neighborhoods and "they are murdering us in the streets."

- The Black Panthers oppose Negroes fighting the "white man's war in Vietnam." They advocate arming the black community against "white oppressors," and say they are actively doing so. They believe the white power structure owes American Negroes "\$5 trillion" in reparations, and could begin to pay it off by providing each black man with a \$40,000 home and two automobiles.

- Unless private enterprise provides jobs for Negroes, all big businesses should be nationalized.

These are but a few of the Black Panther planks.

The Black Panther Party was "stimulated" by the Lowndes County (Alabama) Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as an emblem, according to Newton. The Black Panther Party for Self Defense was organized in the Bay Area about six months ago, the defense minister says.

"WILL NOT STOP"

The symbolism: "The panther doesn't attack anyone," but when he's forced into a corner he will strike out and he will not stop until the aggressor is wiped out.

And politically, Newton explains, the Panthers believe: "Politics is defined as war without bloodshed. War is

politics with blood shed — when peaceful means are exhausted, then it evolves into physical conflict. The time is long past when we blacks have exhausted peaceful attempts to gain our desires for freedom and justice — and now we must prepare ourselves to meet the aggression of the white power structure.”

This is the attitude, this is what the Black Panthers say they want. Who are the Black Panthers?

Newton describes himself as unsalaried but full-time head of the party.

Seale is a part-time Panther. The rest of the time, he works as a family counselor for the North Oakland Community Center of the Oakland Economic Development Council, the local War on Poverty agency. He is paid \$422 a month.

Newton has an Oakland arrest record which includes petty theft (probation), burglary (dismissed) and assault with a deadly weapon (six months in the county jail.)

Seale's record is mostly one of minor traffic offenses, but includes a six month term in military prison for disrespect to an Air Force officer and a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958.

None of the Black Panthers has been arrested so far in any of their “self defense” forays with weapons. Why? Because under California law, they have not violated gun laws. They do not conceal the weapons, they do not carry loaded guns in vehicles — just guns and ammunition separately. It's legal.

HANDCUFFED

Law enforcement agencies are deeply concerned, but feel they are handcuffed. State Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch says that while he is not specifically worried about the Black Panthers, he feels there is no place in this day and age for “Wild West” exhibitions of firearms. “The time has come when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places,” the Democratic attorney general says.

A Republican, Assemblyman Don Mulford, has introduced legislation (Assembly Bill 1591) that would prohibit loaded firearms in public places. The bill is scheduled to go before the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure in Sacramento Tuesday.

Whether the Black Panthers will show up for the hearing is problematical.

HEADQUARTERS OFFICE
2800 SIXTEENTH ST.
SAN FRANCISCO 3

MARKET 1-1700

STATE HUMANE ASSOCIATION
OF CALIFORNIA
FEDERATION OF
CALIFORNIA ANIMAL WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS
INCORPORATED 1909

GERALD R. DALMADGE
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE

From the desk of

Don Mulford

1591 does restrict
State Humane Association
people somewhat in that
they are NOT specifically
exempted in bill. However,
they could still carry
non unloaded gun,
and if they saw someone
mutilating an animal,
load the gun and make
arrest as per Page 3,
subsection (c) —
lines 43-44-45.

Citizens Committee Formed to Urge Tighter Firearms Control

"The laws effecting the availability of firearms to the general public should serve the overall public interest and not just the convenience of particular groups. All levels of government have an urgent responsibility in this area. All should be working in the closest cooperation to make sure that the instrumentalities of our federal system advance the cause of public order and safety and the national interest in general." With these words James V. Bennett, retired Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, announced the formation of a citizens committee to alert the nation's attention to the need for tighter firearms controls.

CRPA MEMBERS NOTE

After reading this article it might be well for all sportsmen to refresh their memory on President Johnson's suggestions for firearms control (especially with reference to New York's Sullivan Law), which this committee endorses.

It is even suggested that federal laws be adopted to bring those states into line which have not adopted laws of their own.

The new organization, launched today in Washington, is to be known as the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy.

The Council's Board of Directors includes Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York, former Governor J. Millard Tawes of Maryland, Dr. Karl Menninger, Adlai E. Stevenson III, Charles P. Tift, Erwin D. Canham, and Judge David L. Bazelon, among others.

Mr. Bennett emphasized the need for the closest consistency in the wide assortment of federal, state, and local laws and regulations in this field. "This means," he said, "the need for responsible and effective laws in many more states and localities — only a few have taken the necessary steps — as well as federal legislation that ensures that such laws are not vitiated by mail order and other movements of firearms between one state and another." He said that the federal system is now being abused by irresponsible elements of our society. "This must be stopped without delay," he emphasized. In short, the Federal Government must help the states and localities, and vice versa. He said this ought to be an important facet of what the President has called "creative federalism."

The National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy pledged its efforts to a program of broad public education

regarding this controversial subject and invited the cooperation and support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Mr. Bennett cited various polls as indicating a strong desire for firearms regulations consistent with the imperatives of an industrial and highly urbanized society.

The National Council does not expect that its efforts can achieve complete prevention of the irresponsible use of firearms. This highly desirable goal will always be elusive, Mr. Bennett stated. The organization's officers and directors are convinced, however, that the policies urged by the Council will go a long way toward minimizing this blight on our society.

In its statement of purpose, the

Action By Mail

When somebody starts complaining about what he considers to be a public injustice against the law-abiding citizen, an all too traditional method of cooling him off is to say, "Well why not write your Congressman or Legislator about it?" This half-humorous question is supposed to suggest that it is futile for the average citizen to think he can do anything about anything, and that writing to your Congressmen or State Legislator is the height of futility. These are misconceptions which have little basis in reality.

Anybody who knows how lawmakers operate know how carefully they follow their mail. A thoughtful letter from an intelligent constituent invariably will get the most serious consideration, as well as a letter of response. An avalanche of protest mail which obviously is spontaneous will virtually guarantee corrective action by the lawmaker.

There have been repeated suggestions urging more law-abiding citizens to write to their elected officials. These suggestions merit the widest possible public circulation. Next time you have a serious complaint or a constructive idea about government operations try actually writing your lawmaker instead of joking about it. Your letter could turn out to be of more immediate importance than you realize but it does require ACTION on your part.

Elsewhere in this issue is a complete list of Legislators, Congressmen, State Constitutional Officers and Board of Equalization Members elected in November 1966. With their names are addresses

Council says it recognizes and respects the right of responsible, law-abiding persons to purchase, keep and bear arms in accordance with standards required for public safety. It maintains, however, that "the ready availability of firearms to criminals and other irresponsible and potentially dangerous persons is contrary to the public interest."

The new organization announced its general endorsement of the firearms recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. It also pledged its general support to the Administration's new legislative proposal on this subject, carrying the priority designation of S. 1.

FIREARMS CONTROL

(Extracted from President Johnson's Message to the Congress on Crime in America - February 6, 1967)

Any effective crime control program requires the enactment of firearms legislation

The National Crime Commission has underscored the emphatic need for the legislation I propose again this year. I urge the 90th Congress to place it high on its agenda in this session.

The legislation I am submitting is closely comparable in substance to that which was under consideration in the last Congress. I strongly recommend that the Congress enact legislation to:

Prohibit certain mail order sales and shipments of firearms, except between federal licensees;

Prohibit over-the-counter sales of firearms, other than rifles and shotguns, to any person who does not reside in the state in which the federal licensee does business;

Prohibit federal licensees from selling handguns to any person under 21, and from selling rifles and shotguns to any person under 18;

Curb imports into the United States of surplus military firearms and other firearms not suitable for sporting purposes.

This legislation is no panacea for the danger of human irrationality and violence in our society. But it will help to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands.

This legislation will not curtail ownership of firearms used either for sport or self-protection. But it will place a valuable restraint on random trade in handguns—the use of which has more and more characterized burglaries and other crimes. It will gain added strength as states pass firearms legislation and licensing laws similar to the Sullivan Law in New York.

To pass strict firearms control laws at every level of government is an act of simple prudence and a measure of a responsible society. Further delay is unconscionable.

8/10-17/66

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the Freedom of speech or of the press . . ."

DEDICATED TO A FREE AMERICA

BIRMINGHAM

BIRMINGHAM'S

-1st Amendment, Bill of Rights, U.S. Constitution.



INDEPENDENT

NEXT DAILY PAPER

INDEPENDENT NON-PARTISAN CONSERVATIVE

ARMS CONTROL LAW THE BEGINNING OF THE END

VOLUME 14 NUMBER 27

QUESTION: WHY ARE REPUBLICANS IN CALIFORNIA, TRYING TO PASS RED BRITISH FABIAN PRESCRIBED, UN CONSTITUTIONAL GUN LAWS. LEFT WING DEMOCRATS, PASSED ENOUGH RED PRESCRIBED LAWS IN CALIFORNIA, WHILE BROWN WAS GOVERNOR.

The Second Amendment of the United States of America states: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Obviously the founders of this great nation assumed that if we had the intelligence to rule ourselves, then we also had the intelligence to keep and bear firearms. That the right to keep and bear firearms was, and is, necessary to retain this right to govern ourselves.

Most dictators have begun their quest for power and control over the people by first collecting their personal arms under one guise or another, this also includes Adolph Hitler. Now they are ready to

begin collecting ours in this final stage of disarmament.

According to the National Rifle Association of America, S-1592 did not just regulate the mail order firearms sale, it gives the secretary of the treasury, or his delegate, unlimited power to surround all sales of guns by dealers with arbitrary and burdensome regulations and restrictions. It also would place a license fee of \$1000 on anyone engaged in the manufacture of ammunition. Apparently, and you can rest assured that if it is even a remote possibility, the federal government will take advantage of it. This would include clubs or individuals engaged in reloading ammunition. Anyone selling ammunition, even 22 caliber, would be compelled to have a \$100 dealer's license. This would eliminate the usual hardware and other small store sales.

There are many other bur-

densome and restrictive regulations subject to the discretion of the secretary of the treasury or his delegate.

Does this sound like they are trying to prevent firearms from falling into the hands of the criminally insane or children, or are they trying to so encumber the maintaining and firing of firearms by lawful citizens so as to eliminate them or the ammunition for them?

It only takes one or two rounds of ammunition to assassinate someone, but it would take years to eliminate all of the ammunition in this manner in order that a take-over by a totalitarian government would be greatly facilitated. Arms control would rapidly reduce the occupation hazards to the Chinese or whoever the United Nations plan on using to enslave us. Fantastic, then you had better read the plight of

Continued on page 5

AUGUST 10, 17 1966
Birmingham Independent

ARMS CONTROL

Continued from page 1

Katanga and the atrocities committed there by the United Nations' troops in the name of "peace."

This brings us to another paradox. The very man appearing most concerning about the rape of Katanga by the United Nations, is the very man who introduced this bill - none other than Senator Thomas J. Dodd from Connecticut.

Of course, any thinking, intelligent American knows that firearms laws disarm only the law-abiding citizenry. It will never bother the criminals since they operate outside the law anyway. It doesn't take many bullets to commit a crime but it would take a great many to defend ourselves against an invading army such as the United Nations.

Last, but not least, let's not leave out little Bobby Kennedy. He was head of the Justice Department and in charge of directing the FBI at the time of his brother's death. If he had been investigating the real extremists and subversives, (including the State Department and the CIA, inasmuch as the State Department helped get Oswald back into this country after he denounced his citizenship), his brother might well be alive today. He was too busy denouncing patriots for exposing traitors and trying to ram integration down our throats, that he did not bother to check on the comings and goings of Comrade Oswald.

Fabian socialists and communists think a lot alike. The Fabians believe in killing you in a kindly manner. For Bobby Kennedy to support anything is enough to turn any intelligent person against it.

Switzerland has never been invaded, they have compulsory military training for all able-bodied males and each is allowed to take his rifle home with him, after his tour of duty, for his own personal weapon. Coincidence, I think not. Remember the removal of personal firearms is the last step before the take-over of any country.

The communists have murdered 60 MILLION PEOPLE, they control the United Nations. Are YOU going to let a spineless Congress take away the last means you have of defending yourself and your children from these murderous butchers? Just defeating a firearms control bill is not enough; the men who support it should be prosecuted as subversive. (Editor's Note: This insane bill, as you well know, is already being pushed again since the shooting in Texas. Taking away the protection of the law-abiding citizens will NOT decrease crime. If guns are outlawed -- then why not automobiles, knives, matches, water, boats, etc. Makes just about as much sense.)

Rifle Club

Anti-Riot Plan --Shotguns in Urban Homes

New York Times

Washington

The National Rifle Association has urged its 800,000 members to form armed civilian posses to provide "a potential community stabilizer" against urban rioting.

The association has told its membership that "the best police on earth, alone, cannot stem the kind of mob violence that has swept many American cities."

Nine of the 11 urban disorders cited in the May issue of the association's magazine as "mob action on a scale unprecedented in the modern United States" were clashes involving Negroes.

The National Rifle Association describes itself as the "foremost guardian of the American tradition and constitutional right of citizens to 'keep and bear arms.'" Made up of sportsmen, hunters, target shooters, collectors and junior marksmen, it operates on a non-profit basis and seeks to educate people in the safe and efficient use of small arms for pleasure and protection.

SHOTGUN

For home protection, the magazine, "The American Rifleman," a monthly, recommends the 12-gauge shotgun, loaded with 27 pellets of No. 4 buckshot. But "there is a good deal to be said for a sledge or axe handle," the magazine says.

The current issue devotes five of 16 pages given to articles and comment on the association's drive against gun control legislation to the threat of civil disorder and intruders in the home.

The association has contended that legislation that would limit the sale and ownership of firearms is unconstitutional and would deprive homeowners of protection against individual criminals invading the home.

MOBS

The magazine's editorial, entitled "Who Guards America's Homes?" asserts that "there is little indication that congressional sponsors of proposed Federal gun control legislation have given any thought to the fate of citizens who may be trapped and beleaguered by howling mobs that brush aside police."

It cites figures showing that last July, 6700 national guardsmen in three states were summoned to help control disorders in Omaha, Chicago and Cleveland.

"What if the national guard were overseas in a major war, as it has been repeatedly in this century?" the editorial asks. "Who then supports the police? Who then guards the doors of American homes from senseless savagery and pillaging?"

CRISES

The editorial mentions "educational integration crises in the south" and "mob action" in "Chicago, Cleveland,

Omaha, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Rochester, N.Y., Birmingham, Ala., Newport, R.I., Daytona Beach, Fla., and many others" and says that these communities "have felt the lash of mass fury and rioting."

As a result of New York state's so-called Sullivan law, which generally forbids the possession of pistols, the editorial notes that in New York City "it is very nearly left entirely up to the cops to shoot it out with the robbers."

An editor's note preceding the shotgun advice and two others "teaching women defensive pistol shooting

and "the law of self defense" says that "this symposium is published simply to shed light on a question of our unsettled times. Its publication does not necessarily constitute an endorsement."

The note is signed by Ashley Halsey, Jr., editor of "The American Rifleman."

In February, 1958, he wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post called "Murder Weapons for Sale" in which he recounted how he had purchased by mail a "deactivated" submachinegun in the name of his two-year-old daughter. The article was critical of the laxity of gun control laws.

OAKLAND TRIBUNE, MAY 5, 1967

AB 15-91

AL MARTINEZ

Don't Step on The Soil Looseners



I don't like guns. They are handy all right when you are involved in a war (peace slogans lack range and accuracy), but otherwise they are dangerous playthings. I agree with Assemblyman Don Mulford that firearms should be regulated. It may never happen again. Agreeing with Don Mulford, I mean.

But my friend, Colonel Muzzleload (U.S. Army, ret.) is violently opposed to any law which restricts the right to own or bear firearms. "By God," he said to me, "before you know it, they're going to take away our pitchforks! It's a citizen's right to be at the ready!"

"Steady, Colonel," I said. "There's no need to get so excited." "But my collection," he said, "they'll want to take away my hobby!" "I didn't know you were a gun nu. . . er, gun collector." "Well," he said, "I have a few."

I asked if I could see them. "Uh, no," he said, "they're, er, busy right now." "Busy?" "What I mean is, they're, uh, resting." "Oh, come now, Colonel." He thought for a moment. "If you promise not to tell anyone. . ." I promised.

He led me down some stairs. "I've got a little room in the basement," he confided. He unlocked a steel door and opened it. I gasped. "Little room? Colonel, it's a warehouse! Turn on the light so I can see what you've got."

He flicked the lights on and off quickly. "As you saw," he said, pushing me toward the door, "I've got a couple pistols, a rusty saber, a Civil War musket. . ." Before he could get me out the door I turned on the lights again.

He had an arsenal larger than the Sixth Army's. "This is incredible," I said. "You're in an arms race with the

western world!" "Oh," he said, "I've picked up a few things here and there." "But why?" "For, um, decorative purposes. Yes, for decorative purposes."

"But the tanks, Colonel. What would you possibly do with tanks?" "Those tanks," he said, speaking slowly and thinking fast, "make the best fish pond fountains you have ever seen. The water is pumped into the hull and cascades out the cannon muzzle."

We walked around. "What about the mortar tubes?" I asked. He scratched his head. "Mortar tubes? Oh, you mean the fence posts." "Fence posts. I see. Don't tell me those anti-personnel mines are stepping stones." "Soil looseners."

He had rifles and bayonets and hand grenades (or tie racks, plant stakes and gopher bombs) by the thousands. He also had a B-52. I gasped when I saw it. "That," said the Colonel before I could speak, "is for crop-dusting." He smiled to himself. "Nothing gets to the dirty, Godless aphids the way that baby does."

"And those," I said pointing, "those nuclear bombs! Where'd you steal THEM?" "I have never stolen a thing in my life," he said indignantly. "I purchased them from the U.S. Defense Department." "They would never sell you nuclear bombs!" "They would if I joined NATO. So I did."

"Then these weapons, Colonel, aren't for decorative purposes at all." "Well, no. They're to fight crime and Communism and anything else that is bad. One of those fence posts," he added, rubbing his hands together, "will stop a whale of a lot of burglars."

Not to mention what the fish pond fountains could do to a pickpocket.—
almtz

Los Angeles

MAY 9, 1967

Times

Youthful Gunman Shot Dead
by Other Officers at Scene

BY GORDON GRANT

Times Staff Writer

A rookie police officer was shot and killed Monday night when a 16-year-old sniper opened fire at a patrol car from the shadows of a Van Nuys playground.

The sniper also was killed when the dead policeman's partner and an off-duty officer returned the gunfire at Van Nuys Recreation Center, 14301 Vanowen Ave.

Another policeman who was attempting to circle behind the sniper during the shooting was wounded in the leg by a ricocheting police bullet.

Roger R. Warren, 23, who was graduated from the Police Academy two weeks ago, was shot once in the heart and was dead on arrival at Valley Receiving Hospital, investigators said.

The youth, William McKinley Miller, of 7323 Tyrone Ave., Van Nuys, was shot at least three times and was dead at the scene.

He was found crouched behind a two-foot concrete wall at the sidewalk edge of the park with a .30.06 caliber rifle at his side, police said.

Officer Stops Patrol Car

Officer James P. Woodman said he and Warren were driving south in the 6900 block of Lennox Ave. when they noticed a figure in the darkened park near a barbecue pit.

Warren made a U-turn, stopped the patrol car and Woodman got out to investigate.

As he peered over a parked car at the curb next to the park, he said, he heard a "bang."

"I didn't realize what it was at first," he said. "Then I heard a couple more and yelled to Warren to

move the car away."

Warren replied, "I can't." He had been hit.

Woodman said he reached inside and shoved the idling car into gear in

hopes of getting his injured partner away from the danger. The car moved slowly down the street a

Det. Sgt. Bill Wischart, working off-duty as a security officer at Dale's Market across the street, heard the gunfire about 10:25 p.m. and came to Woodman's assistance.

Together they returned the fire with their service revolvers from behind parked cars about 30 feet from the concrete wall.

Officers Jerold Shust and Henry Acosta arrived in another patrol car and attempted to get behind the sniper inside the park.

The rifle fire ceased and the officers moved in to find the boy dead. He had fired about six shots, police said.

Shust Wounded

Shust was treated for a minor wound in the right leg at Valley Receiving Hospital.

Miller, a 6 foot, 1 inch, 225-pound youth, had been arrested a number of times by juvenile officers for glue sniffing, according to police records. He was not enrolled in school full-time but attended continuation classes on Saturdays at North Hollywood High School, police said.

Warren, married and the father of a young child, had been a member of the Police Department since Jan. 30. He was assigned to the Van Nuys Division April 23 after completing training at the Academy.

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

● THE DAILY CALIFORNIAN

'Black Panther' to Speak

A member of the Black Panther Party, out on bail on a charge of conspiring to disrupt a legislative house while in session, will speak at a noon rally tomorrow in the lower plaza sponsored by the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA).

Bob Seale, a leader of the Black Panther party, will present his group's side of the Tuesday incident when the Panthers, carrying firearms, "invaded" the State Assembly.


According to Pete Camejo, junior instructor and member of the

YSA, his organization received approval from Dean Donald R. Hopkins for the rally on the condition that the "off-campus speakers will not be armed with any variety of firearms, loaded or unloaded."

Camejo said this condition was a violation of the second amendment (right to bear arms) and it would be illegal to prevent the speakers from coming on campus.

Hopkins was not available for comment.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION



L.A. TIMES 5/9/67



5/12/67

Gun Control Bill Runs Into Trouble

By ED SALZMAN
Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Unexpected roadblocks were erected in the Assembly today against legislation designed to prevent members of the East-bay's Black Panther organization from carrying loaded guns in public.

The emergency measure, authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, ran into a hail of technical criticism from members of the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee.

Mulford pleaded for rapid action on the bill but was forced to settle for the formation of a three-man subcommittee charged with rewriting sections of the measure.

The bill, which received a

strong push following the Black Panther invasion of the Assembly chamber, would make it a misdemeanor for anyone to carry a loaded weapon in public and a felony to carry one in a public school, the capitol or the governor's home.

The Panthers came to Sacramento two weeks ago to protest the original relatively mild version of the Mulford bill. As a result of the invasion, the felony provisions were added.

Democrats and Republicans alike raised questions about provisions of the bill, although virtually the entire criminal procedure committee endorsed the measure in principle.

Most of the criticism centers on the definition of areas

in which loaded weapons would be prohibited.

"Are we going too far in our haste?" asked chairman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside.

"There are an awful lot of problems with the bill," he added.

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Richmond, a strong supporter of the measure suggested that each county board of supervisors be allowed to delineate "inhabited areas" from which loaded guns would be eliminated.

Assemblyman John J. Miller, D-Berkeley, warned that a hastily drafted bill "might land on the cutting room floor of the Supreme Court."

"This bill is going to be badly needed in the near future," pleaded Mulford, "There will be ample time to amend this bill as it proceeds."

But after seeing the opposition, Mulford agreed to work with the three-man subcommittee, which will be headed by Knox.

Mulford presented only one witness, E. F. (Ted) Sloan, western field representative for the National Rifle Assn. (NRA).

Sloan told the committee that the NRA has been misquoted and does not advocate the formation of armed posses to handle civil disturbances.

He said his organization has no opposition to Mulford's bill because it will not affect the law-abiding citizen, sportsman, hunter, or target shooters.

Meanwhile, steps were taken to protect the state capitol against invasion by armed bands. "Hot-line" telephones were installed to connect the state police with the governor's office and the Sacramento police.

And \$91,000 will be sought by the State Department of General Services to reorganize the police, which came under heavy criticism after the Black Panther visitation.

Page 12 - S.F. Examiner
Wed. May 10, 1967

Guns-in-Public Bill Toughened

SACRAMENTO — A bill to outlaw armed mobs such as the "Black Panthers" who invaded the Capitol a week ago moved toward the law-books today, strengthened by tougher language and support from the Governor.

It was this measure — by Assemblyman Don Mulford,

Piedmont Republican — that triggered the brazen crashing of the Assembly chambers by a band of militant Bay Area Negroes armed with loaded pistols, rifles and shotguns.

Two dozen now are waiting trial on felony charges of conspiring to interrupt a ses-

sion of the Legislature.

They said they stormed the Capitol to protest Mulford's bill which originally would merely have made it a misdemeanor to carry a loaded firearm within the limits of a city.

But the East Bay legislator appeared before the Assem-

bly Criminal Procedure Committee yesterday with amendments to make his bill even tougher.

The committee adopted his changes which would:

- Make it a felony to take a loaded firearm into any

— Turn to Page 12, Col. 2

— From Page 1

public school — including university and college campuses — or the State Capitol or any legislative hearing room anywhere in the state.

- Make it a felony to take any loaded firearm into the Governor's mansion or other residence of the Governor or on their staff housing grounds.

- Outlaw possession of loaded firearms in inhabited unincorporated areas as well as within city limits. The inhabited areas outside a city are defined as any where within 100 yards of a home or business establishment.

The revisions also include express permission for a person to have a loaded gun for protection within his home or place of business.

HEARING

The changes were adopted by the committee without debate and the revised bill will come before it again tomorrow for a full dress hearing.

The committee action came shortly after Gov. Reagan told Capitol newsmen he indorses Mulford's proposal of the "Black Panther" invasion of the Legislature, he declared.

"I think such behavior is absurd. I think they ought to take a look in the mirror

at themselves — the idea in a country like ours that grown men and women think they have got to run around playing cowboys with guns on their belts.

"They come in and try to impress a Legislature! If it weren't so terribly serious, you'd have to laugh at it — but it is terribly serious."

POSSE DUTY

The Governor bristled at a suggestion by the National Rifle Association that citizens should arm themselves for potential posse duty in view of current civil unrest and riots.

"You don't settle anything by the citizens taking the law

into their own hands," Reagan declared.

But he made it clear he has little if any sympathy with much of the gun-restricting legislation that has been proposed nationally.

He favors a tightening of interstate gun shipments but opposes registration of all firearms.

CRIME GUNS

"People kill people," he said. "Guns don't kill them. And a very small percentage, actually, of our crimes of violence are committed with a gun. They are committed with other weapons."

"You can't outlaw the weapons; the wrong fellow has got the weapons. And in my own mind, I like the idea that the law-abiding can have protection in their homes."

"I would be opposed to anything that would make it more difficult for the law-abiding to have that protection."

Page 14—S. H. Examiner
Wed., April 26, 1967 ☆

Crime Drop Laid to Gun Curb

Two-Year Trial In Philadelphia

PHILADELPHIA — (AP) — Two years ago, Philadelphia restricted the sale of rifles and shotguns as a crime deterrent.

Police admit no scientific measure is possible to determine effectiveness of the restriction, but they cite statistics showing homicides dropped 13.2 percent in the nation's fourth largest city in 1966 over the previous year.

All serious crimes dropped 6.4 percent.

The law bars the sale of weapons to habitual drunks, narcotics addicts and persons convicted of violent crime.

90 DAYS IN JAIL

Opponents of the ordinance, which provides a \$300 fine and 90 days in jail for anyone caught possessing an unregistered rifle or shotgun, claim it's unenforceable.

Irv Joffe, a one-time Philadelphia gun dealer who moved his shop to suburban Delaware County when sales began to lag, claims the law is violated 65,000 to 85,000 times a year by residents who sell their weapons privately without bothering to have them registered.

The law, which requires prospective rifle and shotgun owners to be fingerprinted and photographed by police, has put 19 gun dealers out of business in the last year, according to Joffe.


LOST TAXES

Dealers also claim the law has cost the city \$3 million in taxes lost.

Supporters generally take the view of Ephraim Gomberg, executive vice president of the Crime Commission of Philadelphia.

"If only one serious crime was averted by the ordinance, the law is justified," said Gomberg.

He cites police statistics showing that in 1966 the department denied weapons permits to 144 of the more than 5000 applicants.



U.S. Gun-Control Plan One of World's Mildest

Crime Expert Finds Laws in Other Lands Stricter Than Proposed for This Country

BY JOHN H. AVERILL
Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON—Crime authorities see an immense irony in the long and bitter congressional struggle to enact a gun-control law.

For the fifth straight year, a Senate subcommittee is grappling with a bill to apply some measure of federal control over the almost unfettered trafficking in firearms in the United States.

Yet crime experts note that even if the bill is enacted it will be by far the weakest gun control law of any major industrialized nation.

Of all the major powers, the United States is the only one that lets it be possible for almost anyone, from a child to a maniac, to buy a gun if he has the money. And in many instances it doesn't take much money.

Through the thriving mail-order gun business, it is possible to buy any weapon from a small pistol to a heavy machine gun or even a cannon. No questions asked.

Foreign Laws Stricter

In contrast, other major powers exert the most stringent control over the sale and possession of firearms, including hunting weapons. Many countries require a person to have a permit or license even to purchase ammunition.

Thus, in comparison with laws in other lands, many crime authorities view the gun-control bill proposed by the Johnson Administration as a most tepid step.

In brief, the Administration bill would:

1 — Prohibit interstate mail-order sale of firearms to individuals.

2 — Prohibit over-the-counter sale of handguns to a nonresident of a state.

3 — Require anyone purchasing a firearm from a dealer to provide identification and proof of age. For handguns, the age requirement would be 21 and for rifles and shotguns, 18.

4 — Require federal licensing of all firearm dealers, importers and manufacturers.

5 — Prohibit the importation of all military surplus handguns and the regulation of all other imported firearms.

6 — Provide for stringent control over such military weapons as antitank guns, bazookas and mortars.

Mild Provisions Noted

Law enforcement officials noted that as mild as these provisions are, the bill never has been able to win the approval of a congressional committee. Even the shock of the Kennedy assassination proved insufficient to overcome the opposition of certain right-wing groups and sportsmen's organizations, principally the National Rifle Assn.

To those who denounce the Administration bill as an unfair infringement on a gun owner's rights, crime experts suggest a look at the laws in some other countries.

Such an insight was

provided last Tuesday by Ephraim R. Gomberg, executive vice president of the Philadelphia Crime Commission. In testimony before the Senate judiciary subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency, Gomberg told of his findings during visits to France, Britain and the Netherlands.

In France, Gomberg testified, no one is allowed to own revolvers or rifles or to buy or sell them unless he is a police or public service officer or a member of the military.

"There is no such thing as the mail-order purchase of firearms without a government permit," Gomberg said. "Hunters are allowed to purchase shotguns, but they must be legitimate hunters, certified as such in the communities in which they live."

Low Homicide Rate

As a consequence, Gomberg noted, "In Paris there were only 76 homicides and attempted homicides involving firearms in 1966."

In Britain, Gomberg found laws almost equally as strict.

"All automatic and rifled guns are under strict control," he said, "and firearms certificates for their use are issued by police only for very restricted purposes."

Amplifying on this, a spokesman for the British Embassy in Washington said an annually renewable license is required to buy or sell any kind of gun in Britain.

But even the strict British laws appear relatively mild in comparison with those of Holland. Crime expert Gomberg said the Dutch government forbids the manufacture, purchase and ownership of all shoulder and handguns.

"Hunters and gun club members may be licensed to use guns and may have them in their possession only while going to or from hunting and gun club meetings," Gomberg said.

Soviet Laws Told

Almost identical laws are in effect in the Soviet Union, except that members of hunting societies are permitted to purchase rifles and shotguns. It is impossible for a civilian to buy a handgun in the Soviet Union.

"One of the prime arguments of those who oppose gun-control legislation in the United States," Gomberg said, "is that licensing and registration of guns are evil because an invading army will know precisely where to find all of the guns owned by the defending Americans."

Gomberg said he mentioned this argument to his Dutch police friends, whose country has experienced foreign invasion.

"They smiled and said that the possession of a gun by a Dutchman during invasion meant instant death," Gomberg said.

Nor are strict gun-control laws confined to the three countries cited by Gomberg.

A Library of Congress study also found extremely restrictive laws in West Germany, Japan and Norway.

Sobriety Required

In all three countries, a license is required even to purchase ammunition. In West Germany, one license is needed to purchase arms for hunting and a second one to carry a gun or ammunition.

In Norway, a license for the purchase or possession of a weapon or ammunition "may be granted only to sober and reliable persons who have reasonable

LA. TIMES 7-25-67

grounds for the possession of firearms."

Japan, according to the study, goes even further and requires a special permit just to use a pistol for signaling in athletic games. Any person in Japan who carries or transports a gun must carry with him the permit and registration, which are subject to police inspection on request, the study said.

Why, it is often asked, is the United States, as the most developed nation the world has ever known, so far more lax than other major powers in its tolerance of firearm ownership?

Congressional students of the subject are inclined to feel the answer lies in the nation's frontier heritage. From the earliest days, Americans tended to rely on the gun for survival.

But those days are gone forever.

As Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark told the juvenile delinquency subcommittee last week:

"We are not the pioneer venturing into the wilderness, dependent on his rifle for food and protection. We are 200 million highly urbanized and interdependent citizens of the most technologically advanced and affluent nation in history. We must control the indiscriminate flow of firearms to those

who use them for crime." ghettos, Clark asked poignantly, "When will we act?"

Gun Control Law On Reagan's Desk

The Mulford Act, a California gun control law, is on President Reagan's desk. The law, which would require gun owners to register their firearms, is expected to be signed into law by the president in the next few days. The law is the result of a long and contentious process that has involved numerous hearings and debates in the California legislature. The law is expected to have a significant impact on the gun rights community in California.

Gun Curbs Plan Moves to Assembly

Conspiracy Charge Faces Gun-Toters

SACRAMENTO — Five juveniles and 19 adults, members of the "Black Panther Party for Self Defense," were charged with conspiracy yesterday after forcing their way into the State Capitol with loaded weapons.

Only two, well-known activists Mark Comfort, 33, of 6914 Lockwood St., and Bobby Seal, 30, of 809 57th St., both Oakland, were released on \$2,200 bail. The others were held overnight in the city jail or Juvenile Hall.

Bail of \$2,200 each was also set for seven others after attorneys contacted municipal judges, but Comfort and Seal were the only ones who posted bond during the evening.

The rest of the group was expected to appear in Municipal Court today, probably before Judge Arthur Eissinger, for settling of bail.

Besides the blanket conspiracy charge, a felony, the group was also booked initially on various other charges which were later dropped. They included carrying concealed weapons, brandishing a weapon in a threatening manner and possession of loaded weapons in vehicles.

Most of the dropped charges were misdemeanors but one, possession of a sawed-off shotgun, was a felony.

While the conspiracy charge was filed against all 24 members of the group, additional charges were levied against Eldridge Cleaver, 31, 3301 Broadway St., San Francisco, and Reginald Forte, 18, 1120 54th St., Oakland.

Cleaver was charged with

violation of parole and booked en route to his parole officer in San Francisco. Forte was charged with assault with a deadly weapon against a police officer.

Police said the rest of the group, charged solely with conspiracy, included:

- Johnny Bethéa, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;
- Ardell Butler, 17, 1038 61st St., Oakland;
- Kenneth Carter, 19, 1184 82nd Ave., Oakland;
- Bruce Cockerhan, 18, 1014 54th St., Oakland;
- Albert Commo, 21, 1342 85th St., Oakland;
- Emery Douglas, 23, 900 Haight St., San Francisco;
- George Dowell, 23, 1360 Filbert St., Richmond;
- James Dowell, 17, 104 Market Ave., Richmond;
- Sherwin Forte, 19, 1135 54th St., Oakland;
- Truman Harris, 18, 1900½ Herman St., Berkeley;
- Oleander Harrison Jr., 17, 5816 Grove St., Apt. D, Oakland;
- Ernest Hatter, 18, 1472 81st St., Oakland;
- Mikel Hall, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;
- Bobby Hutton, 17, 898 56th St., Oakland;
- Lafayette Robinson, 17, 1223 77th Ave., Oakland;
- John Sloan, 30, 1823 63rd St., Berkeley;
- Willie Thompson, 20, 109 Hunter Ave., Oakland;
- Lee Torris, 22, 104 Market St., Richmond;
- Warten Tucker, 19, 554 63rd St., Oakland;
- Benney Yates, 19, 54th St., Oakland.

SACRAMENTO (UPI)—The Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee has approved legislation clamping new restrictions on the sale and possession of anti-tank guns, cannons, bazookas mortars machine guns, zip guns and other exotic armaments.

Action came late last night after the committee heard an appeal by Deputy State Atty. Gen. Charles A. O'Brien to arm law enforcement with legal tools to curb the accumulation of private arsenals by individuals and paramilitary groups.

The committee approved legislation by chairman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside, which would:

—Require registration with the state of the mail order sale of concealable weapons.

—Outlaw the possession of machine guns and machine gun parts.

—Require a state permit to possess bombs, grenades, rockets, missile cannons and similar devices.

—Broaden the scope of the state's dangerous weapons control law to include any parts of such weapons.

Assemblyman Robert W. Crown-D-Alameda, said he favored such legislation, but "I wish it had gone farther. I would be much happier if it did require some sort of registration of weapons that are now in the state."

"We're walking away from the real problem," he said.

O'Brien told the committee he was "happy to admit" the attorney general's office was conducting "a crusade against private military groups in California," adding that he could see "no legitimate constitutional reason for tolerating the dangers that exist due to the lack of these laws.

"Some well-meaning citizens seem bitterly determined to confuse patriotism with armed paranoia," he said.

Displayed before committee members was a wide-ranging assortment of weaponry confiscated by law enforcement agencies in recent months.

O'Brien centered a major part of his testimony on the recent seizure in San Francisco of a massive 77-ton cache of weapons from a home owned by William E. Thoresen.

O'Brien said Thoresen in the past 11 years has been arrested at least 11 times on charges including assault, grand larceny, sex perversion, setting explosives, possession of blackjack and brass knuckles and resisting arrest.

"I present this record because I believe that we should consider the present law which allows such a man to legally own a military arsenal," he said.

'Panther' Invasion Riles Legislature

(Photo on A-2)

SACRAMENTO, May 3 (AP)—A stunned California Legislature surveyed its security precautions today while Negroes who burst into the Capitol bearing a variety of loaded guns at noontime yesterday were summoned to court.

Twenty-six youths aged 17 to 25 were arrested by city police with drawn revolvers and hauled to the police station in a paddy wagon shortly after they left the Capitol agog Tuesday.

They were accused of possessing two illegal sawed-off shotguns, brandishing weapons in a threatening manner, disrupting the Legislature in session and carrying a fully loaded weapon in a car.

CAPITOL ACTION

At the Capitol today, support mounted among amazed and disgruntled lawmakers for tightening security and imposing more severe penalties on those who disrupt an Assembly or Senate session.

It was a noon-hour session of the Assembly that a dozen of the armed youth—members of the "Black Panther Party"—succeeded in penetrating briefly before they were ushered out and several of the loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns taken away by two state policemen in a mild struggle.

No guns were fired at any time, and the armed men took care while in the Capitol not to threaten overtly anyone with the guns.

They remained silent except for a spokesman, Bobby Seale, 25, of Oakland. He said they appeared to defend their constitutional right to bear arms, criticized "racist Oakland police" and opposed a bill outlawing the carrying of loaded weapons in public.

No one could remember

STATE 'PANTHER' PROBLEM

(Continued from Page 1)

anything like it happening before. Reaction ranged from simple amazement to anger. A Democratic Negro assemblyman from the Watts district of Los Angeles, Bill Greene—considered a militant advocate of Negro rights—commented: "This action was not militant, it was senseless. No person black or white can condone this action."

Jim Rooney, one of three sergeants-at-arms manning the swinging gates that block off the Assembly chamber door 50 feet away, said that suddenly "a wave of them just rushed

in and shoved us out of the way."

He was knocked into a chair by someone in the traveling mob of about 50 Black Panther members, reporters and television cameramen.

The man presiding when the armed men burst into the rear of the chamber, speaker pro tem Carlos Bee, D-Hayward, remarked later: "The Legislature is certainly upset by the whole episode. People must be identified and have passes to come onto the floor. Any citizen can get a pass and there is no reason for anyone to push through in this manner."

Assemblyman Don Mulford-Piedmont, author of the control bill the group protest said he was "shocked beyond belief. It's a direct attempt to coerce me. This whole thing is an affront to the people."

The bill was taken under session. Mulford said he would seek to include a provision to make it a felony to disrupt legislative house in session.

Capitol Gun-Toters Draw Solons' Fury

Incident May Prompt New Control Law

Other stories related to the Black Panther incident in the Assembly are on pages A4, A7, A12 and C1.

By Martin Smith

An unprecedented invasion of the State Capitol by gun-wielding members of the militant Black Panther party for self-defense demonstrating against a bill to prohibit carrying loaded weapons in public may have had the reverse effect and increased support of the measure.

Individual legislators speculated that the appearance of the armed band carrying loaded shotguns, rifles and sidearms has improved chances that the proposal, Assembly Bill 1591, eventually will be approved.

New Amendments

Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, author of the bill, yesterday had the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure delay action on the measure so he could prepare amendments to broaden and strengthen the proposal.

Among other things, he wants also to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly or Senate with a loaded weapon.

Approximately half of the 24 men — all from the bay area — ultimately arrested yesterday did force their way into the lower house as it was in session during the noon hour. They did so as a bitter debate was in progress on a labor relations bill affecting firemen.

Swarming into the Assembly chamber with them was a knot of television and newspaper photographers. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee, presiding at the time, saw the men with cameras but, at first, did not notice the heavily-armed Negroes. Bee ordered the sergeant-at-arms to remove the photographers from the Assembly floor.

Moved Off Floor

Chief Sergeant-at-Arms Tony Beard, his assistants and State Police officers moved the entire group off the floor.

Bee termed the incident "one of the most flagrant violations of the rules" he has ever seen in his 13 years as an assemblyman. He confirmed he noticed only the cameramen at first.

"When I saw all those TV cameras coming, it was almost unbelievable," he declared.

Bee said the demonstration was of no value to the group in their efforts to prevent Mulford's bill from being approved and actually may have helped its chances.

'Does No Good'

"Our job is to make the laws, and this type of thing does no good," he added.

Assemblyman Bill Greene, a liberal Democratic legislator from Los Angeles and himself a Negro active in civil rights movements, declared:

"This action was not militant. It was senseless. No person, black or white, can condone this action."

Assemblyman E. Richard Barnes, R-San Diego County, whose seat in the rear of the Assembly chamber was near the action, predicted:

"I think this incident will result in a strict law prohibiting the bringing of firearms into any state building. I think it

Solons Assail Armed Band For Entering Capitol

From page A1

should be a felony. I will vote for it."

Lt. Ernest Holloway, a veteran on the State Police staff in the Capitol, said:

"Twenty-five years and I've never seen anything like this."

He noted previous incidents which were termed "invasions" of the Capitol included one by a group of striking lumber workers who appeared during the depression.

"They were peaceful," said the lieutenant. "We put them up at the fair ground."

A civil rights sit-in in the Capitol in 1963 was recalled by Holloway but he said "that was nothing" compared to yesterday's tense incident.

Well-Organized

The Black Panther group was well-organized, said Holloway.

"They knew how far they could go," he said. "They were quoting the Constitution verbatim about their right to bear arms."

The men removed from the Assembly, accompanied by ever-growing numbers of newsmen and also by the rest of the armed band who had been outside on the west steps of the Capitol, were taken to the first floor police office in the Capitol.

There the guns of several men were taken from them, over their strong protests, and examined by officers. The weapons were loaded although no shells were in their firing chambers. Because the weapons were being carried openly without any attempt at concealment the half-dozen officers returned the weapons to the men.

Verbal Abuse

In the Capitol, the men who had their guns taken from them temporarily did not physically resist the officers but heaped verbal abuse on them, calling them "racist dogs."

Most of the band's members

ignored questions by newsmen. But one man, Bobby Seale, a spokesman for the organization, read a statement issued in the name of Huey P. Newton, "minister of defense" for the Black Panther party for Self-Defense.

Statement's Contents

The statement called "upon on the American people in general and the black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

The statement accused the American government of waging a racist war in Vietnam and reactivating concentration camps which had been used to confine Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II. The camps "are being prepared for black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary," according to the statement.

Other Contentions

After also attacking the United States for lynchings, the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, "genocide practiced on the American Indians" and enslavement of Negroes, the statement concluded:

"The Black Panther party for Self-Defense believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction."

The armed men, accompanied by several young women, returned to their cars after gathering briefly on the west steps of the Capitol again. Visiting school children gawked at them and their weapons while leaders of the youngsters attempted to get some groups inside the Capitol away from the hubbub.

Arrests Are Made

The arrests of the men occurred minutes later as they, in five automobiles, drove into a service station at 15th and L Streets across from Capitol Park. City police officers swarmed over the station, took away their guns and placed them in a paddy wagon.

A little used section of the State Government Code, prohibiting the disruption of the state legislature while it is in session, was used to charge a number of men.

Police officers said one man pulled out his gun but was disarmed quickly. He was accused of assault with a deadly weapon.

One man arrested was identified as Eldredge Cleaver, a reporter for Ramparts magazine, a militant "New Left" publication. His attorney, Lawrence K. Karlton of Sacramento, said Cleaver was not carrying a gun, only a camera, and was present as a reporter.

Attorney's Comment

"They arrested everyone who was black," said Karlton. "He was the wrong color."

One of the women, Barbara Auther, of Berkeley, a pre-law student at the University of California, denied the Black Panther organization was a racist group. She was not arrested.

She said members, however, carry weapons wherever they go because of "police brutality."

Mrs. Auther denied any of the members of the group had broken the law.

"We conducted ourselves as ladies and gentlemen," she told reporters in a sidewalk interview.

Mrs. Auther indicated the group was incensed over the slaying of a Negro burglary suspect in the Richmond area by a Contra Costa County deputy sheriff. She termed the slaying "murder."

Asked if she thought the demonstration would persuade any legislators to vote against AB 1591, she said:

"I think it wouldn't make any difference."

Purpose Of Bill

The bill to which the Black Panthers object would, except

in certain instances, prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in the use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Officer Goes Down

The only thing close to violence which actually occurred, instead of being threatened, was when the group stormed into the Assembly. At an outer swinging gate, an elderly deputy sergeant-at-arms, James Rooney, brother of Sacramento Police Chief Joseph Rooney, was knocked back when the Black Panthers moved through.

He fell into a chair. He got up unhurt but angry.

State police officers tightened security arrangements at yesterday afternoon's hearing on the Mulford bill, but it was a calm meeting.

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This reminder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish them in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpended cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a hand gun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

Police Arrest 24 Capitol Invaders, Get 11 Weapons

The police arrested 24 persons and seized 11 shotguns, rifles and pistols in rounding up the Bay area Black Panthers who charged into the State Assembly chamber carrying weapons yesterday afternoon. Reginald W. Forte, 18, of Oakland, was

charged with conspiracy to commit a crime and assault with a dangerous weapon upon a police officer. Detectives Joseph Del Ponte and Donald Shiers reported Forte raised a loaded .38 caliber revolver nearly out of a holster in a move toward them until they grabbed the weapon and disarmed him.

Eldridge Cleaver, 31, of San Francisco was booked in the city jail for possible parole violation. The officers said he is on parole in San Francisco for two counts of assault with intent to commit murder, two counts of assault on rape and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon.

Others Charged

All the others were charged with conspiracy. They are:

Sherwin Forte, 19, of Oakland; John Bethea, 18, of Oakland; Bruce Cocherhan, 18, of Oakland; George E. Dowell, 28, of Richmond; Willie Thompson, 20, of Oakland; Warren Tucker, 19, of Oakland; John Sloan, 30, of Berkeley; Ernest Hatter, 18, of Oakland; Truman Harris, 18, of Berkeley; Mikel Hall, 18, of Oakland; Benny Yates, 19, of Oakland; Albert Commo, 21, of Oakland; Kenneth Carter, 19, of East Oakland; Emery Douglas, 23, of San Francisco; Torris Lee, 22, of Richmond; Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland; Mark Comfort, 33, of Oakland; Oleander Harrison, 17, of Oakland; Bobby Hutton, 17, of Oakland; Lafayette Robinson, 17, of East Oakland; Ordell Butler, 17, of Oakland, and James Dowell, 17, of Richmond.

Seale and Comfort were released last night on \$2,200 bail. The five 17-year-olds were taken to the Juvenile Center.

The arrest reports stated all were part of the group which knocked two sergeants-at-arms to one side and forced their way into the State Assembly chambers.

Sets \$2,200 Bail

Municipal Judge Arthur Elssinger this morning set bail at \$2,200 on each of the adults except Cleaver, whom he said could be released on his own recognizance. However, Cleaver has a parole "hold" against him which means he will remain in custody until parole officials permit him to be released.

Attorneys Lawrence Karl of Sacramento and Beverly Etrod of San Francisco pleaded unsuccessfully for reduction of bail for Comfort, who was released last night on \$2,200 bail.

Attorney S. Carter McMillan of Sacramento also asked the court unsuccessfully for a reduction in the bail for the other defendants.

Miss Axelrod, in pleading Cleaver said he was arrested "by mistake" because he was with the Black Panthers or assignment as a reporter for Ramparts magazine.

Assembly Unit Okays Gun Control Bills; Another Is Deferred After Intrusion

By Wilson K. Lythgoe

Concerned over the ease with which a person can arm his own army, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee late last night acted to tighten rules and penalties of laws on larger military-type guns and ammunition.

Members of the committee, headed by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside County, were among those alarmed earlier in the day when armed Negroes shouldered their way into the Assembly carrying rifles and shotguns. The intruders said they were members of the Black Panther Party.

This incident and discovery and seizure of 77 tons of military arms in the home of William Thoresen in San Francisco overshadowed the hearing last night and another in the afternoon on firearms legislation.

Tense Atmosphere

The hearing amidst a charged atmosphere in the afternoon centered upon AB 1591 by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, which the armed Negroes said they were protesting.

This proposal would prohibit, except in certain instances, the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Mulford, himself, asked that the bill be put over, and said the Black Panther incident had caused him to consider amendments to broaden and toughen the bill.

Among other things, Mulford said he wanted to include an amendment to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly with a loaded weapon.

Special Attention

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Contra Costa County, noted that often when bills are put over that that is the last heard of them, but he said Mulford's bill would be worked on in conferences and in committee again to "stop the spread of this problem." He said Black Panther incidents had previously occurred in the bay area.

A Negro Assemblyman and member of the committee, John T. Miller, D-Oakland, decried what he termed to be a "circus atmosphere" and asked that the committee consider the bill in an objective manner "without reference to what happened this afternoon."

Mulford called it ridiculous to think that the legislation was aimed at any ethnic group, but despite an obvious attempt on his part and by other witnesses, the "Assembly Incident" cropped up time and time again.

On Larger Weapons

The Assembly committee last night approved the main parts of its package of bills to tighten laws on larger caliber guns and ammunition. Twenty-five of these weapons, ranging from a 50 mm mortar to sidearms, were displayed for committeemen.

The legislation, boosted by the office of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and authored by Biddle, is based on findings and recommendations of a two year study made by the committee.

But Charles O'Brien, deputy attorney general, said pistols, rifles and shotguns used as hunting weapons would not be changed by the measures.

He mentioned Minutemen in California as one group that the new legislation is aimed at, and Thoresen as an individual whom it could affect.

Return Arsenal

Under present law, he said, much of the arsenal taken from Thoresen may have to be returned. O'Brien said the present law is so weak that Thoresen was nearly arrested for possessing a fire hazard.

Assemblyman Floyd L. Wakefield, R-Los Angeles County, blamed gathering of arsenals on laxity of the federal government. He said this became evident after World War II when many military type weapons were allowed in from abroad.

"It's just too bad, as a demonstration in the Assembly showed us," Wakefield said.

The approved bills are:

AB 1326 which, for the first time, proposes to outlaw private possession of heavy military weapons, including anti-tank guns, bombs, booby traps and explosives.

Imported Weapons

AB 1324 to require Californians who buy concealable guns out of state to notify their local police or sheriff's officers and provide them with the same information required if they had bought the handguns in California.

AB 1325 which would define hand rocket launchers as concealable firearms. Gas-operated pistols were amended out of the bill.

AB 1323 would ban possession of machine gun parts. The bill was amended so it would not apply to semi-automatic weapon parts.

Final Comments

Col. E. F. Sloan of Redwood City, representative of the National Rifle Association, said he supported the basic principles of the bills, and offered suggestions to make them more workable.

The only serious objection came from William Andrews, Berkeley attorney, who asked that gas-operated pistols not be defined as concealable firearms because they "are not a lethal weapon."

And Richard Spear, Oakland attorney and cannon collector, said he could live with the bill, AB 1326, after it was made plain he could keep his cannons under permit from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

Black Panthers Believe Arming Is Needed To Fight 'White Oppression'

By Don Ferrell

Who are the Black Panthers and what do they stand for?

A check into their sketchy and somewhat vague background shows that the Black Panther Party is a spin-off of the Lowndes County, Ala., Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as its emblem.

The growing movement has since spread into other states and cities, including New York City, Detroit, Tennessee and San Francisco.

Before storming the Assembly Chamber in Sacramento yesterday the group—which can accurately be described as anti-white and revolutionary—had gained some small notoriety.

Previous Appearances

Last February, for instance, about 20 of them escorted the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown San Francisco. Later that day they caused a little nervousness among San Francisco officials when they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine.

But their latest public incident until yesterday was last month when a dozen or so armed Black Panthers showed up in Martinez

complaining about what they termed the murder of a Negro suspected of burglary in North Richmond.

Their goals, among other things, include an almost obsessed belief that the Negro community is oppressed by whites and that policemen are in reality an army which occupies Negro neighborhoods.

Other Convictions

They openly advocate arming the Negro community against policemen and other whites and oppose members of their race being sent to fight in the Vietnam war.

The Black Panthers also believe that all big businesses should be nationalized unless private enterprise makes jobs available for Negroes.

Most of those involved in yesterday's incident came from Oakland and it is estimated that about 40 Panthers live in the bay area.

Leader Participates

One of those in the group was Bobby George Seals, a leader in the Oakland Panther movement, who reportedly received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958 and served

a six-month term in military confinement for disrespect to an Air Force officer.

Until yesterday, none of the Black Panthers had been arrested because of carrying weapons because under California law it is not illegal to openly carry arms.

However, it is against the law to carry loaded guns in vehicles.

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

Black Panther Episode Was A Senseless Thing

The Black Panthers who barged into the Capitol this week showing off loaded guns in a coarse act of public intimidation should learn more about the Constitution and Bill of Rights they used as their shields and battle cries.

Pleading repeatedly for "constitutional rights! constitutional rights!" these misguided exponents of armed force committed an intolerable injustice to their cause and defiled the very documents they quoted.

There are times when civil rights are turned into civil wrongs, and this was one of them. The Constitution does not specifically say a citizen cannot carry a gun, but it also does not specifically allow a citizen to use a gun to frighten the populace, to disturb the community tranquility, disrupt the orderly processes of government, or even to provoke publicity.

Nor does the constitutional provision for free speech guarantee a citizen the right to shout "fire!" in a crowded theater and thereby panic the audience.

The thing about loaded guns is that they have the propensity for going off at the wrong times. The final mechanical function of a gun is to kill or injure and no unloaded gun ever fired a bullet.

There was but one consoling factor in this episode. The State Police, the Assembly sergeants at arms and the city police acted with reserve and did not meet the provocation with the force they lawfully could have employed. The gunfire which could have erupted — accidentally or otherwise — could have injured or killed bystanders, including some school children who were visiting the Capitol to learn more about their government.

Society cannot and will not tolerate these kinds of bully-boy tactics whether they be performed by Black Panthers, Nazis, Minutemen, KKKs or any other bands of self-appointed law enforcers.

Assemblyman Bill Greene of Los Angeles County, a Negro active in civil rights movements, had the proper observation when he called the action senseless and one which no person, black or white, can condone.

EQUAL RIGHTS
Los Angeles Times
 LIBERTY UNDER THE LAW TRUE INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM

4-Part II

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 4, 1967

2★

Stronger Gun Laws Needed

The need for effective, comprehensive weapons control laws was never better illustrated than when a band of Negroes armed with loaded shotguns, pistols and rifles forced its way into the Assembly chamber at Sacramento.

The performance shocked not only those legislators and others in the Capitol who were supposed to be intimidated thereby but all law-abiding Californians who did not think such things possible in this enlightened day and age.

Ostensibly the so-called "Black Panther Party for Self Defense" was on the scene to protest a proposed law which would make it unlawful to carry a loaded weapon within a city.

The Black Panthers insisted the bill was "racist." But neither that view nor their actions found takers among Negro legislators. Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles), felt the bill was aimed at other groups and that it should "be applied equally to all, black or white." Assemblyman Bill Greene, whose district includes the Watts area, branded the action "senseless" and added that "no person, black or white, can condone this."

As a result of the unseemly demonstration it is probable that the measure will be made even more restrictive or an even broader act passed.

That the Black Panthers should lay stress on the constitutional right to bear arms under the circumstances which obtained at Sacramento, makes their position completely farcical.

Certainly the authors of the Bill of

Rights never had in mind such groups as the Black Panthers, the American Nazis, the Minute Men or the KKK when they wrote, in the Second Amendment:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

On the other hand, perhaps they foresaw the need for a well-regulated militia to protect against the emergence of just such groups in the future.

Under existing California statutes it is a violation of the Fish and Game Code to carry a loaded weapon in an automobile. There is, however, absolutely no law which prohibits carrying loaded weapons in plain sight on the public streets or anywhere else including, obviously, the chambers of any state, county or city legislative body. There is, of course, a law against disrupting a legislative session. But that hardly meets the situation.

Several days before the Sacramento demonstration Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch declared that there is no place in this day and age for "Wild West" exhibitions of firearms:

"The time has come," Lynch said, "when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places."

The Times agrees. The present situation is ridiculous—and fraught with danger.

Even the National Rifle Assn., that most militant defender of the right to possess arms, should agree that incidents such as occurred in Sacramento and which may occur elsewhere, cannot be tolerated in modern society.

Capitol Flurry In Gun Protest

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with sergeants-at-arms and were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivet as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim faced, the group walked upstairs to the second floor, past open-mouthed employees and visitors. Two or three special

See Page 16, Col. 1.

Panther Protest At State Assembly

From Page 1

guards followed them.

When the band reached the closed gates that stand about 50 feet in front of the Assembly chamber, a dozen of the Panthers burst through, knocking Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms Jim Rooney off his feet.

HALLWAYS

Some waited outside, some strode the hallways and a few pushed their way into the Assembly chamber.

Only a few of the legislators were actually aware of the intrusion. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee (Dem-Hayward), who was facing the door saw only a gaggle of news and television cameramen in what seemed to be a stampede.

Angrily he shouted for the sergeant-at-arms, Tony Beard, to remove the intruding photographers. But Assemblyman Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont) rose to inform the Assembly. "A serious incident has just occurred. People with weapons forced their way into this chamber and were ejected."

INVASION

Mulford described the invasion as a "direct attempt" to intimidate him.

His bill — prohibiting instruction in the use of firearms for the purpose of rioting and prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms on public streets and in public places by all except peace officers, guards and members of the armed forces — was scheduled for a hearing last night before the Assembly's Committee on Criminal Procedure.

Mulford said the incident had inspired him to toughen the bill.

LUNCHEON

Outside the Assembly chamber, the Panthers were met by State police who took them downstairs and began

confiscating their weapons. The guns were unloaded and returned when it was decided the Panthers had broken no laws.

The group started down the Capitol steps to meet their armed colleagues just as Governor Ronald Reagan was emerging to have a picnic lunch on the lawn with 30 youngsters from the Valley View Intermediate School in Pleasant Hill.

The Governor, the visiting children and their teachers were herded back into the Capitol by security officers and State police and the picnic was held in Reagan's office.

Later, Reagan said the Black Panthers had a right to bear arms, but added: "There's no reason why on a street today any citizen should be carrying a loaded weapon."

He called this a "ridiculous way to solve problems among people of good will."

As the Governor was speaking, police, armed with riot guns and pistols moved in on about 25 of the Black Panthers who had assembled at a service station near the Capitol. They were disarmed, loaded into patrol wagons and taken to headquarters where some were booked for violating the Fish and Game Code which prohibits loaded guns in a vehicle.

When final inventory was taken, police said they had booked a total of 26 men between the ages of 17 and 25 on a variety of charges, including brandishing a gun in a threatening manner and possession of two sawed-off shotguns. Fifteen weapons were confiscated.

The Black Panthers offered no resistance. Bobby George Seale, 30, of Oakland, chairman of the organization, read a statement to newsmen which was signed by Huey P. Newton, 25, the party's "Minister of Defense."

It called on Americans — Negroes in particular — to "take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies . . . are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Seale said "the black people have prayed and demonstrated . . . and everything else. All their efforts have been answered by oppression. City Hall turns a deaf ear to pleas for help against this terror."

BILL

Meanwhile Mulford said it was "ridiculous to think my bill is aimed at any ethnic group . . . It is aimed at white people as much as anyone."

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown Jr. (Dem-S.F.), a Negro, agreed the proposed legislation has no racial implications but questioned Mulford's motives in offering it.

Brown said Mulford had previously opposed such bills "until Negroes showed up in Oakland — his district — with arms and then he seeks restrictive legislation." Brown added he is acquainted with some of the Black Panther group and called them "decent kids."

Another Negro, Assemblyman Leon Ralph (Dem-L.A.) said he felt the bill is "aimed at Nazis, the KKK the Minute men and others, and should be applied equally to all, black or white."

Bee, commenting later at the police station, said the Legislature is "certainly upset" by the whole episode.

"This," he said, "will help the bill pass."

Friday, May 5, 1967 CCCAA
 SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Ugly Words at S. F. State --A Pro-Panther Rally

By Maitland Zane.

Two hundred curious students at San Francisco State College witnessed an ominous spectacle yesterday — an array of Negro speakers preaching the "inevitability" of racial strife.

Le Roi Jones, the poet and playwright, was the best known at the rally, held to raise bail money for the armed "Black Panthers" who invaded the State Legislature Tuesday.

For him and the other speakers, policemen — particularly Oakland policemen — are "killers," President Johnson is a "mass murderer" and white people in general "fiends and handits."

Jones affects loud clothes, a beard and a Jomo Kenyatta pillbox hat with gold embroidery.

JOHNSON

After reading a scatological and sometimes hilarious poem about President Johnson and his family, Jones urged "black people" to arm themselves for what he clearly hopes will be an armed "confrontation" with the hated whites.

"You'd better get yourself



LE ROI JONES
 Whites are 'fiends'

a gun if you want to survive the white man's wrath," said Jones.

"Those white policemen aren't here to protect you — they're there to kill you."

Earlier, Ed Bullins, a local Negro playwright and director of the Black Panther Party's "Black House" here, called the people of his race "a captive nation."

"We're going to take control of our own community," said Bullins.

MULFORD

"We're going to run our own schools, and police our own community. We're going to refuse to recognize white laws. We're not going to have any whites coming in our community, even those of good faith."

The only real applause of the rally went to Barbara Arthur, a young Negro woman who said the "power structure was shook" when the Black Panthers invaded the State Capitol.

According to her, the Panthers were merely "concerned citizens" demonstrating their opposition to the firearms bill proposed by Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont).

Only a few Negro students were among the noon-hour crowd at the open-air rally held in the Commons area.

Capitol Gun-Toters Draw Solons' Fury

Incident May Prompt New Control Law

Other stories related to the Black Panther incident in the Assembly are on pages A4, A7, A12 and C1.

By Martin Smith

An unprecedented invasion of the State Capitol by gun-wielding members of the militant Black Panther party for Self-Defense demonstrating against a bill to prohibit carrying loaded weapons in public may have had the reverse effect and increased support of the measure.

Individual legislators speculated that the appearance of the armed band carrying loaded shotguns, rifles and sidearms has improved chances that the proposal, Assembly Bill 1591, eventually will be approved.

New Amendments

Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, author of the bill, yesterday had the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure delay action on the measure so he could prepare amendments to broaden and strengthen the proposal.

Among other things, he wants also to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly or Senate with a loaded weapon.

Approximately half of the 24 men — all from the bay area — ultimately arrested yesterday did force their way into the lower house as it was in session during the noon hour. They did so as a bitter debate was in progress on a labor relations bill affecting firemen.

Swarming into the Assembly chamber with them was a knot of television and newspaper photographers. Assembly Speaker Pro Tom Carlos Bee, presiding at the time, saw the men with cameras but, at first, did not notice the heavily-armed Negroes. Bee ordered the sergeant-at-arms to remove the photographers from the Assembly floor.

Moved Off Floor

Chief Sergeant-at-Arms Tony Beard, his assistants and State Police officers moved the entire group off the floor.

Bee termed the incident "one of the most flagrant violations of the rules" he has ever seen in his 13 years as an assemblyman. He confirmed he noticed only the cameramen at first.

"When I saw all those TV cameras coming, it was almost unbelievable," he declared.

Bee said the demonstration was of no value to the group in their efforts to prevent Mulford's bill from being approved and actually may have helped its chances.

'Does No Good'

"Our job is to make the laws, and this type of thing does no good," he added.

Assemblyman Bill Greene, a liberal Democratic legislator from Los Angeles and himself a Negro active in civil rights movements, declared:

"This action was not militant. It was senseless. No person, black or white, can condone this action."

Assemblyman E. Richard Barnes, R-San Diego County, whose seat in the rear of the Assembly chamber was near the action, predicted:

"I think this incident will result in a strict law prohibiting the bringing of firearms into any state building. I think it

Solons Assail Armed Band For Entering Capitol

From page A1

should be a felony. I will vote for it."

Lt. Ernest Holloway, a veteran on the State Police staff in the Capitol, said:

"Twenty-five years and I've never seen anything like this." He noted previous incidents which were termed "invasions" of the Capitol included one by a group of striking lumber workers who appeared during the depression.

"They were peaceful," said the lieutenant. "We put them up at the fair ground."

A civil rights sit-in in the Capitol in 1963 was recalled by Holloway but he said "that was nothing" compared to yesterday's tense incident.

Well-Organized

The Black Panther group was well-organized, said Holloway.

"They knew how far they could go," he said. "They were quoting the Constitution verbatim about their right to bear arms."

The men removed from the Assembly, accompanied by ever-growing numbers of newsmen and also by the rest of the armed band who had been outside on the west steps of the Capitol, were taken to the first floor police office in the Capitol.

There the guns of several men were taken from them, over their strong protests, and examined by officers. The weapons were loaded although no shells were in their firing chambers. Because the weapons were being carried openly without any attempt at concealment the half-dozen officers returned the weapons to the men.

Verbal Abuse

In the Capitol, the men who had their guns taken from them temporarily did not physically resist the officers but heaped verbal abuse on them, calling them "racist dogs."

Most of the band's members

ignored questions by newsmen. But one man, Bobby Seale, a spokesman for the organization, read a statement issued in the name of Huey P. Newton, "minister of defense" for the Black Panther party for Self-Defense.

Statement's Contents

The statement called "upon the American people in general and the black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

The statement accused the American government of waging a racist war in Vietnam and reactivating concentration camps which had been used to confine Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II. The camps "are being prepared for black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary," according to the statement.

Other Contentions

After also attacking the United States for lynchings, the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, "genocide practiced on the American Indians" and enslavement of Negroes, the statement concluded:

"The Black Panther party for Self-Defense believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction."

The armed men, accompanied by several young women, returned to their cars after gathering briefly on the west steps of the Capitol again. Visiting school children gawked at them and their weapons while leaders of the youngsters attempted to get some groups inside the Capitol away from the hubbub.

Arrests Are Made

The arrests of the men occurred minutes later as they, in five automobiles, drove into a service station at 15th and L Streets across from Capitol Park. City police officers swarmed over the station, took away their guns and placed them in a paddy wagon.

A little used section of the State Government Code, prohibiting the disruption of the state legislature while it is in session, was used to charge a number of men.

Police officers said one man pulled out his gun but was disarmed quickly. He was accused of assault with a deadly weapon.

One man arrested was identified as Eldredge Cleaver, a reporter for Ramparts magazine, a militant "New Left" publication. His attorney, Lawrence K. Karlton of Sacramento, said Cleaver was not carrying a gun, only a camera, and was present as a reporter.

Attorney's Comment

"They arrested everyone who was black," said Karlton. "He was the wrong color."

One of the women, Barbara Auther, of Berkeley, a pre-law student at the University of California, denied the Black Panther organization was a racist group. She was not arrested.

She said members, however, carry weapons wherever they go because of "police brutality."

Mrs. Auther denied any of the members of the group had broken the law.

"We conducted ourselves as ladies and gentlemen," she told reporters in a sidewalk interview.

Mrs. Auther indicated the group was incensed over the slaying of a Negro burglary suspect in the Richmond area by a Contra Costa County deputy sheriff. She termed the slaying "murder."

Asked if she thought the demonstration would persuade any legislators to vote against AB 1591, she said:

"I think it wouldn't make any difference."

Purpose Of Bill

The bill to which the Black Panthers object would, except

in certain instances, prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in the use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Officer Goes Down

The only thing close to violence which actually occurred, instead of being threatened, was when the group stormed into the Assembly. At an outer swinging gate, an elderly deputy sergeant-at-arms, James Rooney, brother of Sacramento Police Chief Joseph Rooney, was knocked back when the Black Panthers moved through.

He fell into a chair. He got up unhurt but angry.

State police officers tightened security arrangements at yesterday afternoon's hearing on the Mulford bill, but it was a calm meeting.

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This reminder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish them in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpanded cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a handgun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

Police Arrest 24 Capitol Invaders, Get 11 Weapons

The police arrested 24 persons and seized 11 shotguns, rifles and pistols in rounding up the bay area Black Panthers who charged into the State Assembly chamber carrying weapons yesterday afternoon. Reginald W. Forte, 18, of Oakland, was charged with conspiracy to commit a crime and assault with a dangerous weapon upon a police officer. Detectives Joseph Del Ponte and Donald Shierts reported Forte raised a loaded .38 caliber revolver nearly out of a holster in a move toward them until they grabbed the weapon and disarmed him.

Eldridge Cleaver, 31, of San Francisco, was booked in the city jail for possible parole violation. The officers said he is on parole in San Francisco for two counts of assault with intent to commit murder, two counts of assault on rape and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon.

Others Charged

All the others were charged with conspiracy. They are:

Sherwin Forte, 19, of Oakland; John Behea, 18, of Oakland; Bruce Cocherhan, 18, of Oakland; George E. Dowell, 28, of Richmond; Willie Thompson, 20, of Oakland; Warren Tucker, 19, of Oakland; John Sloan, 30, of Berkeley; Ernest Hatler, 18, of Oakland; Truman Harris, 18, of Berkeley; Mikel Hall, 18, of Oakland; Benny Yates, 19, of Oakland; Albert Commo, 21, of Oakland; Kenneth Carter, 19, of East Oakland; Emery Douglas, 23, of San Francisco; Torris Lee, 22, of Richmond; Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland; Mark Comfort, 33, of Oakland; Oleaner Harrison, 17, of Oakland; Bobby Hutton, 17, of Oakland; Lafayette Robinson, 17, of East Oakland; Ordell Butler, 17, of Oakland, and James Dowell, 17, of Richmond.

Seale and Comfort were released last night on \$2,200 bail. The five 17-year-olds were taken to the Juvenile Center.

The arrest reports stated all were part of the group which knocked two sergeants-at-arms to one side and forced their way into the State Assembly chambers.

Sets \$2,200 Bail

Municipal Judge Arthur E. Elssinger this morning set bail at \$2,200 on each of the adults, except Cleaver, whom he said could be released on his own recognizance. However, Cleaver has a parole "hold" against him which means he will remain in custody until parole officials permit him to be released.

Attorneys Lawrence Karlton of Sacramento and Beverly Axelrod of San Francisco pleaded unsuccessfully for reduction of bail for Comfort, who was released last night on \$2,200 bail.

Attorney S. Carter McMorris of Sacramento also asked the court unsuccessfully for a reduction in the bail for the other defendants.

Miss Axelrod, in pleading for Cleaver said he was arrested "by mistake" because he was with the Black Panthers on an assignment as a reporter to Ramparts magazine.

Assembly Unit Okays Gun Control Bills; Another Is Deferred After Intrusion

By Wilson K. Lythgoe

Concerned over the ease with which a person can arm his own army, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee late last night acted to tighten rules and penalties of laws on larger military-type guns and ammunition.

Members of the committee, headed by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside County, were among those alarmed earlier in the day when armed Negroes shouldered their way into the Assembly, carrying rifles and shotguns. The intruders said they were members of the Black Panther Party.

This incident and discovery and seizure of 77 tons of military arms in the home of William Thoresen in San Francisco overshadowed the hearing last night and another in the afternoon on firearms legislation.

Tense Atmosphere

The hearing amidst a charged atmosphere in the afternoon centered upon AB 1591 by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, which the armed Negroes said they were protesting.

This proposal would prohibit, except in certain instances, the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Mulford, himself, asked that the bill be put over, and said the Black Panther incident had caused him to consider amendments to broaden and toughen the bill.

Among other things, Mulford said he wanted to include an amendment to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly with a loaded weapon.

Special Attention

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Contra Costa County, noted that often when bills are put over that that is the last heard of them, but he said Mulford's bill would be worked on in conferences and in committee again to "stop the spread of this problem." He said Black Panther incidents had previously occurred in the bay area.

A Negro Assemblyman and member of the committee, John J. Miller, D-Oakland, decried what he termed to be a "circus atmosphere" and asked that the committee consider the bill in an objective manner "without reference to what happened this afternoon."

Mulford called it ridiculous to think that the legislation was aimed at any ethnic group, but despite an obvious attempt on his part and by other witnesses, the "Assembly incident" cropped up time and time again.

On Larger Weapons

The Assembly committee last night approved the main parts of its package of bills to tighten laws on larger caliber guns and ammunition. Twenty-five of these weapons, ranging from a 50-mm mortar to sidearms, were displayed for committeemen.

The legislation, boosted by the office of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and authored by Biddle, is based on findings and recommendations of a two-year study made by the committee.

But Charles O'Brien, deputy attorney general, said pistols, rifles and shotguns used as hunting weapons would not be changed by the measures.

He mentioned Minutemen in California as one group that the new legislation is aimed at, and Thoresen as an individual whom it could affect.

Return Arsenal

Under present law, he said, much of the arsenal taken from Thoresen may have to be returned. O'Brien said the present law is so weak that Thoresen was nearly arrested for possessing a fire hazard.

Assemblyman Floyd L. Wakefield, R-Los Angeles County, blamed gathering of arsenals on laxity of the federal government. He said this became evident after World War II when many military type weapons were allowed in from abroad.

"It's just too bad, as a demonstration in the Assembly showed us," Wakefield said.

The approved bills are:

AB 1326 which, for the first time, proposes to outlaw private possession of heavy military weapons, including anti-tank guns, bombs, booby traps and explosives.

Imported Weapons

AB 1324 to require Californians who buy concealable guns out of state to notify their local police or sheriff's officers and provide them with the same information required if they had bought the handguns in California.

AB 1325 which would define hand-rocket launchers as concealable firearms. Gas-operated pistols were amended out of the bill.

AB 1323 would ban possession of machine gun parts. The bill was amended so it would not apply to semi-automatic weapon parts.

Final Comments

Col. E. F. Sloan of Redwood City, representative of the National Rifle Association, said he supported the basic principles of the bills, and offered suggestions to make them more workable.

The only serious objection came from William Andrews, Berkeley attorney, who asked that gas-operated pistols not be defined as concealable firearms because they "are not a lethal weapon."

And Richard Spear, Oakland attorney and cannon collector, said he could live with the bill. AB 1326, after it was made plain he could keep his cannons under permit from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

Black Panthers Believe Arming Is Needed To Fight 'White Oppression'

By Don Ferréll

Who are the Black Panthers and what do they stand for?

A check into their sketchy and somewhat vague background shows that the Black Panther Party is a spin-off of the Lowndes County, Ala., Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as its emblem.

The growing movement has since spread into other states and cities, including New York City, Detroit, Tennessee and San Francisco.

Before storming the Assembly Chamber in Sacramento yesterday the group—which can accurately be described as anti-white and revolutionary—had gained some small notoriety.

Previous Appearances

Last February, for instance, about 20 of them escorted the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown San Francisco. Later that day they caused a little nervousness among San Francisco officials when they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine.

But their latest public incident until yesterday was last month when a dozen or so armed Black Panthers showed up in Martinez

complaining about what they termed the murder of a Negro suspected of burglary in North Richmond.

Their goals, among other things, include an almost obsessed belief that the Negro community is oppressed by whites and that policemen are in reality an army which occupies Negro neighborhoods.

Other Convictions

They openly advocate arming the Negro community against policemen and other whites and oppose members of their race being sent to fight in the Vietnam war.

The Black Panthers also believe that all big businesses should be nationalized unless private enterprise makes jobs available for Negroes.

Most of those involved in yesterday's incident came from Oakland and it is estimated that about 40 Panthers live in the bay area.

Leader Participates

One of those in the group was Bobby George Seals, a leader in the Oakland Panther movement, who reportedly received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958 and served

a six-month term in military confinement for disrespect to an Air Force officer.

Until yesterday, none of the Black Panthers had been arrested because of carrying weapons because under California law it is not illegal to openly carry arms.

However, it is against the law to carry loaded guns in vehicles.

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

Black Panther Episode Was A Senseless Thing

The Black Panthers who barged into the Capitol this week showing off loaded guns in a coarse act of public intimidation should learn more about the Constitution and Bill of Rights they used as their shields and battle cries.

Pleading repeatedly for "constitutional rights! constitutional rights!" these misguided exponents of armed force committed an intolerable injustice to their cause and defiled the very documents they quoted.

There are times when civil rights are turned into civil wrongs, and this was one of them. The Constitution does not specifically say a citizen cannot carry a gun, but it also does not specifically allow a citizen to use a gun to frighten the populace, to disturb the community tranquility, disrupt the orderly processes of government, or even to provoke publicity.

Nor does the constitutional provision for free speech guarantee a citizen the right to shout "fire!" in a crowded theater and thereby panic the audience.

The thing about loaded guns is that they have the propensity for going off at the wrong times. The final mechanical function of a gun is to kill or injure and no unloaded gun ever fired a bullet.

There was but one consoling factor in this episode. The State Police, the Assembly sergeants at arms and the city police acted with reserve and did not meet the provocation with the force they lawfully could have employed. The gunfire which could have erupted — accidentally or otherwise — could have injured or killed bystanders, including some school children who were visiting the Capitol to learn more about their government.

Society cannot and will not tolerate these kinds of bully-boy tactics whether they be performed by Black Panthers, Nazis, Minutemen, KKKs or any other bands of self-appointed law enforcers.

Assemblyman Bill Greene of Los Angeles County, a Negro active in civil rights movements, had the proper observation when he called the action senseless and one which no person, black or white, can condone.

EQUAL RIGHTS
Los Angeles Times
 LIBERTY UNDER THE LAW TRUE INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM

4-Part II

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 4, 1967

2★

Stronger Gun Laws Needed

The need for effective, comprehensive weapons control laws was never better illustrated than when a band of Negroes armed with loaded shotguns, pistols and rifles forced its way into the Assembly chamber at Sacramento.

The performance shocked not only those legislators and others in the Capitol who were supposed to be intimidated thereby but all law-abiding Californians who did not think such things possible in this enlightened day and age.

Ostensibly the so-called "Black Panther Party for Self Defense" was on the scene to protest a proposed law which would make it unlawful to carry a loaded weapon within a city.

The Black Panthers insisted the bill was "racist." But neither that view nor their actions found takers among Negro legislators. Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles), felt the bill was aimed at other groups and that it should "be applied equally to all, black or white." Assemblyman Bill Greene, whose district includes the Watts area, branded the action "senseless" and added that "no person, black or white, can condone this."

As a result of the unseemly demonstration it is probable that the measure will be made even more restrictive or an even broader act passed.

That the Black Panthers should lay stress on the constitutional right to bear arms under the circumstances which obtained at Sacramento, makes their position completely farcical.

Certainly the authors of the Bill of

Rights never had in mind such groups as the Black Panthers, the American Nazis, the Minute Men or the KKK when they wrote, in the Second Amendment:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

On the other hand, perhaps they foresaw the need for a well-regulated militia to protect against the emergence of just such groups in the future.

Under existing California statutes it is a violation of the Fish and Game Code to carry a loaded weapon in an automobile. There is, however, absolutely no law which prohibits carrying loaded weapons in plain sight on the public streets or anywhere else including, obviously, the chambers of any state, county or city legislative body. There is, of course, a law against disrupting a legislative session. But that hardly meets the situation.

Several days before the Sacramento demonstration Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch declared that there is no place in this day and age for "Wild West" exhibitions of firearms.

"The time has come," Lynch said, "when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places."

The Times agrees. The present situation is ridiculous—and fraught with danger.

Even the National Rifle Assn., that most militant defender of the right to possess arms, should agree that incidents such as occurred in Sacramento and which may occur elsewhere, cannot be tolerated in modern society.

Capitol Flurry In Gun Protest

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with sergeants-at-arms and were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivet as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim - faced, the group walked upstairs to the second floor, past open - mouthed employees and visitors. Two or three special

See Page 16, Col. 1.

Panther Protest At State Assembly

From Page 1

guards followed them.

When the band reached the closed gates that stand about 50 feet in front of the Assembly chamber, a dozen of the Panthers burst through, knocking Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms Jim Rooney off his feet.

HALLWAYS

Some waited outside, some strode the hallways and a few pushed their way into the Assembly chamber.

Only a few of the legislators were actually aware of the intrusion. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee (Dem-Hayward), who was facing the door saw only a gaggle of news and television cameramen in what seemed to be a stampede.

Angrily he shouted for the sergeant-at-arms. Tony Beard, to remove the intruding photographers. But Assemblyman Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont) rose to inform the Assembly. "A serious incident has just occurred. People with weapons forced their way into this chamber and were elected."

INVASION

Mulford described the invasion as a "direct attempt" to intimidate him.

His bill — prohibiting instruction in the use of firearms for the purpose of rioting and prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms on public streets and in public places by all except peace officers, guards and members of the armed forces — was scheduled for a hearing last night before the Assembly's Committee on Criminal Procedure.

Mulford said the incident had inspired him to toughen the bill.

LUNCH

Outside the Assembly chamber, the Panthers were met by State police who took them downstairs and began

confiscating their weapons. The guns were unloaded and returned when it was decided the Panthers had broken no laws.

The group started down the Capitol steps to meet their armed colleagues just as Governor Ronald Reagan was emerging to have a picnic lunch on the lawn with 30 youngsters from the Valley View Intermediate School in Pleasant Hill.

The Governor, the visiting children and their teachers were herded back into the Capitol by security officers and State police and the picnic was held in Reagan's office.

Later, Reagan said the Black Panthers had a right to bear arms, but added: "There's no reason why on a street today any citizen should be carrying a loaded weapon."

He called this a "ridiculous way to solve problems among people of good will."

As the Governor was speaking, police, armed with riot guns and pistols moved on about 25 of the Black Panthers who had assembled at a service station near the Capitol. They were disarmed, loaded into patrol wagons and taken to headquarters where some were booked for violating the Fish and Game Code which prohibits loaded guns in a vehicle.

When final inventory was taken, police said they had booked a total of 26 men between the ages of 17 and 25 on a variety of charges, including brandishing a gun in a threatening manner and possession of two sawed-off shotguns. Fifteen weapons were confiscated.

The Black Panthers offered no resistance. Bobby George Seale, 30, of Oakland, chairman of the organization, read a statement to newsmen which was signed by Huey P. Newton, 25, the party's Minister of Defense.

It called on Americans — Negroes in particular — to "take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies . . . are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Seale said "the black people have prayed and demonstrated and everything else. All their efforts have been answered by oppression. City Hall turns a deaf ear to pleas for help against this terror."

BILL

Meanwhile Mulford said it was "ridiculous to think my bill is aimed at any ethnic group . . . It is aimed at white people as much as any one."

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown Jr. (Dem-S.F.), a Negro, agreed the proposed legislation has no racial implications but questioned Mulford's motives in offering it.

Brown said Mulford had previously opposed such bills "until Negroes showed up in Oakland — his district — with arms and then he seeks restrictive legislation." Brown added he is acquainted with some of the Black Panther group and called them "decent kids."

Another Negro, Assemblyman Leon Ralph (Dem-L.A.) said he felt the bill is "aimed at Nazis, the KKK the Minutemen and others, and should be applied equally to all black or white."

Bee, commenting later at the police station, said the Legislature is "certainly upset" by the whole episode.

"This," he said, "will help the bill pass."

Friday, May 5, 1967 CCCCAA
 SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Ugly Words at S. F. State --A Pro-Panther Rally

By Matiland Zane

Two hundred curious students at San Francisco State College witnessed an ominous spectacle yesterday — an array of Negro speakers preaching the "inevitability" of racial strife.

Le Roi Jones, the poet and playwright, was the best known at the rally, held to raise bail money for the armed "Black Panthers" who invaded the State Legislature Tuesday.

For him and the other speakers, policemen — particularly Oakland policemen — are "killers." President Johnson is a "mass murderer" and white people in general "fiends and bandits."

Jones affects loud clothes, a beard and a Jomo Kenyatta pillbox hat with gold embroidery.

JOHNSON

After reading a scatological and sometimes hilarious poem about President Johnson and his family, Jones urged "black people" to arm themselves for what he clearly hopes will be an armed "confrontation" with the hated whites.

"You'd better get yourself



LE ROI JONES
 Whites are 'fiends'

a gun if you want to survive the white man's wrath," said Jones.

"Those white policemen aren't here to protect you — they're there to kill you."

Earlier, Ed Bullins, a local Negro playwright and director of the Black Panther Party's "Black House" here, called the people of his race "a captive nation."

"We're going to take control of our own community," said Bullins.

MULFORD

"We're going to run our own schools, and police our own community. We're going to refuse to recognize white laws. We're not going to have any whites coming in our community, even those of good faith."

The only real applause of the rally went to Barbara Arthur, a young Negro woman who said the "power structure was shook" when the Black Panthers invaded the State Capitol.

According to her, the Panthers were merely "concerned citizens" demonstrating their opposition to the firearms bill proposed by Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont).

Only a few Negro students were among the noon-hour crowd at the open-air rally held in the Commons area.

THE TRUTH ABOUT GUNS

A public service presentation of
THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION.



SAN FRANCISCO GUN EXCHANGE, INC.

"The Firearms Center of The West"

MODERN and ANTIQUE GUNS

RELOADING SUPPLIES

75 FOURTH STREET :: 932-6097

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

WHAT NRA IS

The National Rifle Association of America, founded in 1871, is an independent non-profit organization supported by membership fees. Its purposes are to educate public-spirited citizens in the safe and efficient use of small arms for pleasure and protection; to foster firearms accuracy and safety in law-enforcement agencies, in the Armed Services, and among citizens subject to military duty; and to further the public welfare and national defense.

- HARLON B. CARTER, *NRA President*
- HAROLD W. GLASSEN, *NRA Vice President*
- FRANKLIN L. ORTH, *Executive Vice President*
- LOUIS F. LUCAS, *Executive Director & Treasurer*
- FRANK C. DANIEL, *Secretary*
- MORTON C. MUMMA, *Chairman, NRA Public Relations Committee*

OK
Too slow,
Representation
at this
time

Copyright National Rifle Association of America 1967

Provided the original intent is not changed, copyright is waived on the use, in whole or part, of material in these pages.

Is There A "Gun Problem?"

No. There is a *crime* problem. It is worldwide and involves all forms of violence. "Crime is indeed universal and is not a social phenomenon peculiar only to the United States," says the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for Dec., 1966. It indicates that within this decade, violent or armed crimes increased 60% in France, 41% in Sweden, 35% in the U. S., 20% in South Australia, and sharply in England, Scotland, Wales.

In the course of crime, 9 women in Boston and 6 in Cincinnati were strangled in the past several years with silk stockings. Eight nurses were killed in Chicago last July—principally with a knife. America's biggest single mass murder, in 1955, took 44 lives—with a bomb planted in an airplane.¹

The U. S. crime problem is entangled with abruptly changing moral values, family breakdowns, poverty and ignorance, big city slums, alcoholism and automobiles, narcotics and much else. Any real solution must view the problem as a whole.

¹ Second largest, 34 killed by a bomb in a plane in 1960.

②

Well, What Should Be Done About The *Crime* Problem?

Prompt, unswerving enforcement of existing laws would do much to solve it. Effective punishment has diminished until criminals laugh at the law—all law including gun laws.¹

There are an estimated 20,000 State and local laws already in effect that can be invoked in their respective localities to control misuse of firearms. The National Rifle Association and others, including spokesmen for law enforcers, favor stiffer penalties for violence involving misuse of firearms.

The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for December, 1966, after citing that firearms are used in crime in the U. S. more often than in England, says: "This difference . . . can be attributed, in part, to an English law providing for an extra penalty in addition to the penalty for the substantive offense for an offender convicted of using a firearm in the commission of crime."

This is substantially what the NRA has strongly and repeatedly urged.

¹ Charles J. Whitman, the Austin killer, violated an existing Federal law by having a sawed-off shotgun. New laws proposed last year would not have stopped him or some others like him.

③

Does Availability of Guns Create Crime?

NOT necessarily. The FBI Uniform Crime Report¹ says "the factors which cause crime are many and vary from place to place. . . ." The statement lists as "some of the conditions" which affect the amount and type of crime the following:

Density and size of the community population and the metropolitan area of which it is a part.

Composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex and race.

Economic status and mores of the population.

Relative stability of population, including commuters, seasonal, and other transient types.

Climate, including seasonal weather conditions.

Educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.

Effective strength of the police force. Standards governing appointments to the police force.

Policies of the prosecuting officials and the courts.

Attitude of the public toward law enforcement problems.

The administrative and investigative efficiency of the local law enforcement agency.

¹ FBI Uniform Crime Report released July 28, 1966, Page VIII.

4

How About Federal Firearms Laws?

The National and Federal Firearms Acts,¹ both passed with NRA support, provide a distinct measure of control wherever invoked.

Contrary to assertions that the NRA seeks to "block all legislation," it has repeatedly backed conscientious measures for the public welfare. It is on record as favoring federal legislation to curb shipment of firearms into states where their delivery violates state law, to ban "destructive devices" such as antitank guns and bazookas, and to impose mandatory prison terms for those who commit specified criminal acts involving the misuse of firearms. But anti-gun spokesmen² have declared that even the so-called Dodd Bill represented only "*a beginning.*" They do *not* reveal their real goal. Many conscientious people think the ultimate goal is virtually the elimination of the private ownership of firearms in America. arms in America.

¹ The National Firearms Act (1934) outlaws machineguns and sawed-off shotguns and rifles except by special license. The Federal Firearms Act (1938, amended later) regulates interstate commerce in firearms. The Federal Aviation Act (1958) restricts the carrying of firearms on airliners. U. S. Post Office regulations ban the mail shipment of pistols to the general public.

² U. S. Senator Edward Kennedy (Mass.) quoted in Senate Report 1866, 89th Congress, Oct. 19, 1966, Page 87.

5

Why Does NRA Object To Registration And Licensing By Police?

To require police departments to grant or deny applications for firearms ownership imposes on them, we think, an unfair burden of deciding who is a law-abiding citizen and who is not. Except in foreign police states, this is a function of the courts.

Registration and licensing measures that deny firearms permits to certain categories of people place the police in position of being blamed if they issue a permit to anyone, other than in those categories, who suddenly misuses a firearm. To guard against this blame, police in several areas of the United States where registration is now in force sometimes refuse to issue any permits. An impossible situation results.

As to the ineffectiveness of firearms registration in curbing crime, law enforcement records indicate that most criminals steal both the cars and the firearms that they use. Car registration seldom or never seems to deter them. Nor does firearms registration where it has been attempted.

What About Constitutional Rights?

Under the U.S. Constitution and many State Constitutions, there is much basis for *individual law-abiding citizens* to own and bear arms.

The Second Amendment (U.S.) states *in full*: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

Anti-gun spokesmen claim "militia" means only the National Guard and like organizations.¹ They could hardly be more wrong. The nation has 2 kinds of militia, organized and *unorganized*. The latter consists of virtually *all able-bodied males*. See:

¹ Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Volume II, 1961

mi-lit-ia \mī'lish-ə/ *n* -a [L, military service, warfare, fr. *milit*, *miles* soldier + *-ia* -y] 1 *abr* *n* : military practice or system. *h* : military service **2** **ARMAMENT** 2 *abr* : a particular military force 3 **HOME RESERVE** 4 : the whole body of able-bodied male citizens declared by law as being subject to call to military service

Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary, 1963

mi-lit-ia (mī'lish'ə) *n*. 1. A body of citizens enrolled and drilled in military organizations other than the regular military forces, and called out only in emergencies. 2. U.S. Able-bodied male citizens between eighteen and forty-five years of age not members of the regular military forces, and legally subject to call for military duty. Abbr. *mil.* [*< L*, military service *< miles*, *militis* soldier]

A Dictionary of American English, Volume III, 1942. (5th Impression 1965)

*** Militia.**

1. *a.* An organization, primarily for local defense, consisting, usually, of men who meet periodically for military drill and exercise. [1660-] +*b.* The whole body of adult male citizens capable of bearing arms.

Any assertion that the unorganized militia or able-bodied American man-

hood lacks the right to bear arms because it is not "well-regulated" is equally in error. It *is regulated* by (a) Selective Service and (b) current manpower needs of the Armed Forces. Seldom has the right to own and learn to use arms been more essential to young Americans than *now*. In "regulating" the unorganized militia, the Government recognizes this by sponsoring, with NRA, DCM civilian firearms training.

Further, all-rights not exercised by the U.S. Government under the Second Amendment revert to the States and "the people" under the Tenth Amendment. Fully 2/3rds of State Constitutions authorize their citizens to have firearms "for the defense of home, person or property," or the like. Some others do so by statute.

¹ Senators Dodd, Bayh, Edward Kennedy, Tydings, Fong, Jayts, Smathers, and E. V. Long signed a statement (Page 68, Report 1866, 89th Congress) asserting that "no body of citizens other than the organized State militia, or other military organization provided for by law, may be said to have a constitutional right to bear arms."

8

Is There Really A "Firearms Menace?"

Of the nearly 2 million Americans who die each year:

One in 3 passes away of heart disease.

One in 6 is taken by cancer.

One in 38 dies a motor vehicle fatality.

Only 1 in 195 meets his end from a shot fired accidentally or willfully and unjustifiably.

Only 1 in 2,329 of all fatalities is caused by a criminal shooting during a holdup or other crime.¹

Odds against the average American being maliciously or accidentally killed by a firearm run more than 26,000 to 1.²

Nearly half of all Americans killed in accidents during a typical year are motor vehicle victims. Falls, fires and drownings account for the next largest groups, in order. Only 2% of all accidental deaths involve firearms.

¹ Computed from FBI Uniform Crime Reports and National Safety Council reports.

² Computed from above and Bureau of Vital Statistics data. The murder-manslaughter rate increased (1965) less than that of every other major crime.

9

Aren't Far More People Killed With Guns Now?

Only on *television*. Actually, instead of widespread slaughter, the rate of homicides from firearms has *decreased by half* from 1930 to 1965.¹ Although the population is now much larger, gun fatalities are fewer.

Back in 1930, the rate was 5.7 firearms homicides per 100,000 population. In 1965, the last year on record, it was 2.9.

In 1930, when the nation had 123,077,000 people, 6,995 were killed by firearms and explosives.

In 1965, with 193,800,000 people, 5,634 died from shots or blasts.

The rate of firearms homicides would be even lower except that a few sensational cases swell the total.

There is *less* basis for new firearms laws now, despite a slight upturn in rate during the 1960's, than in most years past.

The only big increase of any kind has been in hysterical anti-gun propaganda.

¹ Statistical Abstract of the U. S., 1966; also compilations by the NRA Legislative Service, Jack J. Basil.

⑩

How Have Anti-Gun Authors Juggled Figures?

A book author ran up the annual total of "shooting deaths" to 17,000 by a means somewhat like counting car exhaust suicides as motor vehicle fatalities: He added 9,500 firearms suicides to the accidental and willful shootings.

In the distortion that ensued, four monthly magazines misused the 17,000 figure as follows:

One¹ asserted editorially that "18,000 murders are committed by criminals" with guns. (*Felony* murders that year totalled 772, FBI Uniform Crime Reports.)

Two² said 17,000 Americans were *accidentally* shot. (The National Safety Council figure for fatal firearms accidents is 2,200.)

Yet another magazine³ asserted 17,000 "*were killed,*" as if deliberately shot down by others. (Actually 11,700 died in suicides or accidents, all of the former and some of the latter by their own hand.)

¹ Harold H. Roswell in *National Police Gazette*, Nov. 1966.

² Stanley S. Jacobs in *Together* (Methodist) and *Presbyterian Life*, Dec. 1966.

³ Alan Barth in *The Reader's Digest*, Jan. 1967.

⑪

An Editorial Asking Fairness To Firearms Owners

(THE AMERICAN RIFLEMAN, December 1966)

IN an era of fresh air in American human relations, when we are briskly ventilating away old prejudices, hurtful customs, and belittling ethnic slang, it is a curious reversal of form to see one of the largest elements of our population deliberately misrepresented and slurred. We refer to the 30 or 40 million Americans—one-sixth or one-seventh of all of us—who exercise their constitutional right to own and bear firearms.

For the past several years, these law-abiding people have been constantly held up and shamed as being somehow warped, anti-social, and out of step with our times—this at a time when 350,000 Americans are battling in Vietnam largely with firearms. In particular, some big-city dwellers, their legislators, and their news media have sought, like small children who must classify everyone on television as a "goody" or "baddy," to brand legitimate ownership of firearms as evil or undesirable.

The fact that several notably shocking crimes in recent years have involved guns can hardly justify a methodical emotional assault on the good names of millions of Americans. Yet there continues a calculated campaign to smear lawful gun ownership with a sinister suggestion of illegality.

One nationally syndicated cartoonist has persistently featured the National Rifle Association hand-in-hand with criminal elements. Such misrepresentations were published three times in less than a month as part of an editorial campaign.

Even distorted facts are now being misquoted by firearms critics, com-

12

pounding the overall misrepresentation. A book of glib half-truths fixed the annual firearms toll at 17,000 by including 9,500 suicides with 5,600 homicides and 2,000 accidental firearms fatalities; a compilation about as fair as if all car-exhaust suicides were added to our toll of 49,000 highway deaths. Fact-twisting fell to a new low when one magazine, apparently garbling the 17,000 figure, asserted that "18,000 murders are committed by criminals who purchased their weapons by merely buying them in stores the way they would a piece of candy." The magazine publisher had the temerity to tag onto this misstatement, "If you agree with this editorial, send it to your Congressman."

A nationally-known survey of opinion meanwhile reported a high public demand for a Federal firearms measure—whipped up in part, no doubt, by the tidal wave of phony publicity—but neglected to say that the demand was 5% less than in a previous survey 18 months earlier.

Abetted by all the hypnotic propagandizing and brainwashing, the State of New Jersey and the City of Philadelphia, Pa., have enacted the most drastic gun control laws in the nation. These laws are now being touted as "models" to be copied elsewhere. Support for such moves has been drummed up by a "smear by association" technique of suggesting that a gun equals crime, and therefore gun ownership equals criminality or crime potential. Some of the same lofty elements who objected loudest to "guilt by association" in questions of national patriotism now lend themselves to this smear

13

by association regardless of the damage it does to individual rights.

As a result, the firearms control laws in the State of New Jersey and City of Philadelphia invade individual privacy far beyond any other form of licensing or registration. Hundreds of thousands of law-abiding citizens, in order to enjoy sports with firearms, must be fingerprinted and photographically "mugged," and must give signed, witnessed statements of their personal habits and sometimes medical certificates attesting to their sanity. Purchasers and owners of rifles and shotguns, as well as pistols, are asked to do this. The New Jersey law applies even to air rifles. No other licensing is so stringent. Although cars kill 49,000 persons a year, some of them by hit-run, applicants for driver's licenses are not required to be fingerprinted. Although most State laws disfranchise insane persons, applicants for voting certificates are not required to produce verification of their sanity. Only in firearms control are such requests made.

Law-abiding citizens who would exercise their constitutional rights under the Second Amendment sometimes are literally grouped with criminals. One applicant for a permit found himself at a police fingerprinting bureau in a waiting line between a prostitute and a manacled knifing suspect.

At a time when our courts insist upon an almost sacred respect for the rights and sensitivities of felons and crime suspects, it is strange that multitudes of law-abiding citizens should be vilified and stripped of their traditional American right to self-respect. ■

⑭

*One Little Test, Please.***When You Look At A Gun,
What Do You See?**

1. A "lethal weapon?"
2. A form of protection?
3. An item for sport or pastime?

Most Americans think of guns as sports items like fishing rods or tennis rackets; some as a last resort for personal defense. Yet the anti-gun commentators and writers refer even to specialized skeet guns and single-shot smallbore target rifles as "lethal" or "murderous" *weapons*, as if their only purpose was to kill.

(Actually, any inanimate object can be used as a weapon by an infuriated person. Golf clubs have become "lethal weapons" in certain killings. So have cars. A New York State court ruled that a heavy paint-brush, hurled by an angry house painter, constituted a weapon.)

⑮

**How Does The National Rifle
Association Help?**

Far from being "just a bunch of shooters for fun," the NRA through its nearly 95,000 conscientious unpaid instructors has taught safety and accuracy in recent years to:

Almost one-tenth (36,637) of U. S. law enforcement officers, so they will shoot only when they must and hit only where they aim.

More than 21,000 wives, mothers and others under the NRA Home Firearm Safety Program designed to avert accidents at home.

Some 3,142,526 hunters in U. S. and Canada under the NRA Hunter Safety Program.

In helping millions of Americans to use firearms cautiously for pleasure and protection, the NRA has contributed materially to reducing the U. S. fatality rate from firearms accidents 15% in 1955-65.¹

¹ National Safety Council Report.

16

Why Are So Many Americans Interested In The NRA?

Shooting in its various forms is the world's second largest sport, next only to track.

The National Rifle Association, with its 805,000 active members, is the largest organization of sportsmen in the United States and probably in the world.

Aside from the military, protection and historical importance of firearms, shooting is one of the largest participation sports in the United States.

17

How Is National Defense Strengthened By NRA?

Actually, firearms and ammunition distributed through the Army's Director of Civilian Marksmanship represent a prime investment in national defense. By this means, the NRA as a free service gives thousands of young Americans pre-military marksmanship training at home. This saves time and money. It also saves lives and aids in winning wars. In citing the superiority of Army and Marine Corps riflemen, General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U. S. Army, has stated: "There is a reason for this, and the work of *The National Rifle Association* is no small part of it."

The program administered by the DCM and NRA makes firearms instruction available annually to more than 400,000 Americans—equivalent to all our manpower in Viet-Nam or a fourth of all Americans in the Armed Services. Its cost is only a trifle in our multi-billion-dollar defense program.

"NRA Rifle Training As A Lifesaver"

(THE AMERICAN RIFLEMAN, November 1966)

WHAT does a 50-foot NRA range for .22 rifles in Oklahoma have to do with the combat effectiveness and survival of a Marine in Viet-Nam? In the young life of R. S. Hildreth, almost everything.

Hildreth at 17 qualified as an NRA junior sharpshooter. He fired his score at Tulsa on a 50-foot NRA range.

Hildreth at 19 qualified as a hero. He fired against a Viet Cong machinegun at 175 feet.

With only his rifle, he "literally fought a duel" with the machinegun crew. When his accurate marksmanship wiped them out, other Viet Cong manned the weapon. Hildreth coolly picked them off in turn.

The Silver Star Medal was awarded him for his "resolute fighting spirit, bold initiative and unwavering dedication to duty . . . in the face of overwhelming odds." What the citation clearly implied, without saying, was: "He had faith in his rifle and himself."

Never in this century has American marksmanship been more important and vital than in the crazy jungle conflict in Viet-Nam. And never has the urgency for homefront rifle training been clearer.

As brought out in the Arthur D. Little Company research report to the Department of the Army, "We found that the more marksmanship instruction trainees received prior to service, the higher their record scores" in military shooting.

Under the programs administered through the Director of Civilian Marksmanship and NRA, nearly 6,000 civilian clubs participate in making

firearms instruction available to more than 400,000 Americans annually. The participants fire annually 62,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition issued by the DCM.

The 1966 national convention of the American Legion, composed of men who know war, commended the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the NRA "for their work in organizing adult and junior clubs, furnishing trained instructors, and conducting marksmanship tournaments throughout the country."

The veterans' organization noted that "actual experience has proven that men entering military service with previous rifle training are more capable in combat, thus improving their chances for survival. . . ."

Those words should make people like J. A. Perrin, Jr., of Loveland, Ohio, an NRA Life Member, feel pretty good. Joe, Jr., saw to it that Joe, 3rd, learned to shoot well enough to win the junior Expert Rifleman Medal at the age of 9. Although Joe, 3rd, had not fired a shot in the 10 years since then, he easily qualified as Expert with a service rifle as a Marine "boot" at Parris Island.

Wherever Joe, 3rd, serves next, he stands a better chance of coming home alive and hearty because of what his dad calls "good old NRA training."

That is what the National Rifle Association is about.

It is not all that NRA does, but if it were, it would be enough. ■

NRA Heroes In Vietnam



1st Lt. Anthony P. Tokarz,
USMC, NRA Member.




1st Lt. Walter J. Marm, Jr.,
USA, NRA Smallbore Expert.



1st/Sgt. Clovis C. Coffman,
Jr., USMC, NRA Member.



S/Sgt. Roger Swindler, USA,
NRA Competitor.



President Johnson presents Sgt. Charles B. Morris, USA,
an NRA Member, with the Distinguished Service Cross.

NRA HONOR ROLL

Medal of Honor

1st Lt. Walter J. Marm, Jr., USA, NRA
Smallbore Expert

Distinguished Service Cross

Sgt. Charles B. Morris, USA, NRA Member

Navy Cross

1st Sgt. Clovis C. Coffman, Jr., USMC,
NRA Member

Silver Star

1st Lt. John A. Albrecht, USMC, NRA
Member

Capt. William B. Feille, USMC, NRA
Member

LCpl. R. S. Hildreth, USMC, NRA Junior
Sharpshooter

Sgt. Felix Lopez, USMC, NRA High Power
Rifle Competitor

1st Lt. A.-P. Tokarz, USMC, NRA Member

Bronze Star with V for Valor

1st Lt. David C. Neese, USA, NRA Junior
Distinguished Expert Rifleman

S/Sgt. Roger Swindler, USA, NRA Rifle
Competitor

SP4 Eugene Van Voltinburg, USA, NRA
Member

20

"The Truth About Guns"

Produced by

The NRA Office of Publications

Ashley Halsey, Jr., Director

John A. Harper, Jr., Ass't Director

In Conjunction with

The NRA Office of Public Affairs

John R. Hess, Jr., Director

This brochure will fit in a legal size (No. 10) envelope and can be mailed first-class for 10¢ or third-class for 4¢. Additional copies are available at 25¢ each, 5 for \$1, 30 for \$5, 100 for \$15. Address Office of Public Affairs, NRA, 1600 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

April 28, 1967

MAY 1 1967

Mr. Mulford:



It is a pleasure to send the enclosed

material which you requested
on "THE BLACK PANTHERS"

CITY OF RICHMOND

CITY HALL

RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA


232-1212

We'll continue keeping you posted!

C. E. BROWN, CHIEF OF POLICE

no files

Don Mulford



BLACK PANTHER PARTY

5624 BROVE ST.
OAKLAND, California

FOR SELF DEFENSE

WHAT WE WANT WHAT WE BELIEVE

WHAT WE WANT NOW:

1. WE WANT FREEDOM. WE WANT POWER TO DETERMINE THE DESTINY OF OUR BLACK COMMUNITY.
2. WE WANT FULL EMPLOYMENT FOR OUR PEOPLE.
3. WE WANT AN END TO THE ROBBERY BY THE WHITE MAN OF OUR BLACK COMMUNITY.
4. WE WANT DECENT HOUSING FIT FOR SHELTER OF HUMAN BEINGS.
5. WE WANT EDUCATION FOR OUR PEOPLE THAT EXPOSES THE TRUE NATURE OF THIS DECADENT AMERICAN SOCIETY. WE WANT EDUCATION THAT TEACHES US OUR TRUE HISTORY AND OUR ROLE IN THE PRESENT DAY SOCIETY.
6. WE WANT ALL BLACK MEN TO BE EXEMPT FROM MILITARY SERVICE.
7. WE WANT AN IMMEDIATE END TO POLICE BRUTALITY AND MURDER OF BLACK PEOPLE.
8. WE WANT FREEDOM FOR ALL BLACK MEN AND WOMEN HELD IN FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, AND CITY PRISONS AND JAILS.
9. WE WANT ALL BLACK PEOPLE WHEN BROUGHT TO TRIAL, TO BE TRIED IN COURT BY A JURY OF THEIR PEER GROUP OR PEOPLE FROM THEIR BLACK COMMUNITIES, AS DEFINED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.
10. WE WANT LAND, BREAD, HOUSING, EDUCATION, CLOTHING, JUSTICE AND PEACE.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

WHAT WE BELIEVE:

1. WE BELIEVE THAT BLACK PEOPLE WILL NOT BE FREE UNTIL WE ARE ABLE TO DETERMINE OUR DESTINY.
2. WE BELIEVE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS RESPONSIBLE AND OBLIGATED TO GIVE EVERY MAN EMPLOYMENT OR A GUARANTEED INCOME.

WE BELIEVE THAT IF THE WHITE AMERICAN BUSINESS MEN WILL NOT GIVE FULL EMPLOYMENT, THEN THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION SHOULD BE TAKEN FROM THE BUSINESS MEN AND PLACED IN THE COMMUNITY SO THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMUNITY CAN ORGANIZE AND EMPLOY ALL OF ITS PEOPLE AND GIVE A HIGH STANDARDS OF LIVING.
3. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS RACIST GOVERNMENT HAS ROBBERED US AND NOW WE ARE DEMANDING THE OVERDUE DEBT OF FORTY ACRES AND TWO MULES. FORTY ACRES AND TWO MULES WAS PROMISED 100 YEARS AGO AS RETRIBUTION FOR SLAVE LABOR AND MASS MURDER OF BLACK PEOPLE. WE WILL ACCEPT THE PAYMENT IN CURRENCY WHICH WILL BE DISTRIBUTED TO OUR MANY COMMUNITIES. THE GERMANS ARE NOW AIDING THE JEWS IN ISRAEL FOR THE GENOCIDE OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE. THE GERMANS MURDERED 6,000,000 MILLION JEWS. THE AMERICAN RACIST HAS TAKEN PART IN THE SLAUGHTER OF OVER 50,000,000 MILLION BLACK PEOPLE; THEREFORE, WE FEEL THAT THIS IS A MODEST DEMAND THAT WE MAKE.
4. WE BELIEVE THAT IF THE WHITE LANDLORDS WILL NOT GIVE DECENT HOUSING TO OUR BLACK COMMUNITY THEN THE HOUSING AND THE LAND SHOULD BE MADE INTO COOPERATIVES SO THAT OUR COMMUNITY, WITH GOVERNMENT AIDE, CAN BUILD AND MAKE DECENT HOUSING FOR ITS PEOPLE.
5. WE BELIEVE IN AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM THAT WILL GIVE TO OUR PEOPLE A KNOWLEDGE OF SELF. IF A MAN DOES NOT HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF HIMSELF AND HIS POSITION IN THE WORLD, THEN HE HAS LITTLE CHANCE TO

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

RELATE TO ANYTHING ELSE.

6. WE BELIEVE THAT BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO FIGHT IN THE MILITARY SERVICE TO DEFEND A RACIST GOVERNMENT THAT DOES NOT PROTECT US. WE WILL NOT FIGHT AND KILL OTHER PEOPLE OF COLOR IN THE WORLD WHO, LIKE BLACK PEOPLE, ARE BEING VICTIMIZED BY THE WHITE RACIST GOVERNMENT OF AMERICA. WE WILL PROTECT OURSELVES FROM THE FORCE AND VIOLENCE OF THE RACIST POLICE AND THE RACIST MILITARY, BY WHATEVER MEANS NECESSARY.
7. WE BELIEVE WE CAN END POLICE BRUTALITY IN OUR BLACK COMMUNITY BY ORGANIZING BLACK SELF DEFENSE GROUPS THAT ARE DEDICATED TO DEFENDING OUR BLACK COMMUNITY FROM RACIST POLICE OPPRESSION AND BRUTALITY. THE SECOND AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GIVES US A RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS. WE THEREFORE BELIEVE THAT ALL BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD ARM THEMSELVES FOR SELF DEFENSE.
8. WE BELIEVE THAT ALL BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD BE RELEASED FROM THE MANY JAILS AND PRISONS BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT RECEIVED A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL.
9. WE BELIEVE THAT THE COURTS SHOULD FOLLOW THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SO THAT BLACK PEOPLE WILL RECEIVE FAIR TRIALS. THE 14th AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION GIVES A MAN A RIGHT TO BE TRIED BY HIS PEER GROUP. A PEER IS A PERSON FROM A SIMILAR ECONOMICAL, SOCIAL, RELIGIOUS, GEOGRAPHICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, HISTORICAL AND RACIAL BACKGROUND. TO DO THIS THE COURT WILL BE FORCED TO SELECT A JURY FROM THE BLACK COMMUNITY FROM WHICH THE BLACK DEFENDENT CAME. WE HAVE BEEN, AND ARE BEING TRIED BY ALL WHITE JURIES THAT HAVE NO UNDERSTANDING OF THE "AVERAGE REASONING MAN" OF THE BLACK COMMUNITY.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

10. WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS, IT BECOMES NECESSARY FOR ONE PEOPLE TO DISSOLVE THE POLITICAL BONDS WHICH HAVE CONNECTED THEM WITH ANOTHER, AND TO ASSUME AMONG THE POWERS OF THE EARTH, THE SEPARATE AND EQUAL STATION TO WHICH THE LAWS OF NATURE AND NATURE'S GOD ENTITLE THEM, A DECENT RESPECT TO THE OPINIONS OF MANKIND REQUIRES THAT THEY SHOULD DECLARE THE CAUSES WHICH IMPEL THEM TO THE SEPARATION.

WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF-EVIDENT, THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL, THAT THEY ARE ENDOWED BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN UNALIENABLE RIGHTS, THAT AMONG THESE ARE LIFE, LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS. THAT TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS, GOVERNMENTS ARE INSTITUTED AMONG MEN, DERIVING THEIR JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED, --THAT WHENEVER ANY FORM OF GOVERNMENT BECOMES DESTRUCTIVE OF THESE ENDS, IT IS THE RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO ALTER, OR TO ABOLISH IT, AND TO INSTITUTE NEW GOVERNMENT, LAYING ITS FOUNDATION ON SUCH PRINCIPLES AND ORGANIZING ITS POWERS IN SUCH FORM, AS TO THEM SHALL SEEM MOST LIKELY TO EFFECT THEIR SAFETY AND HAPPINESS.

PRUDENCE, INDEED, WILL DICTATE THAT GOVERNMENTS LONG ESTABLISHED SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED FOR LIGHT AND TRANSIENT CAUSES; AND ACCORDINGLY ALL EXPERIENCE HATH SHEWN, THAT MANKIND ARE MORE DISPOSED TO SUFFER, WHILE EVILS ARE SUFFERABLE, THAN TO RIGHT THEMSELVES BY ABOLISHING THE FORMS TO WHICH THEY ARE ACCUSTOMED. BUT WHEN A LONG TRAIN OF ABUSES AND USURPATIONS, PURSUING INVARIABLY THE SAME OBJECT, EVINCES A DESIGN TO REDUCE THEM UNDER ABSOLUTE DESPOTISM, IT IS THEIR RIGHT, IT IS THEIR DUTY, TO THROW OFF SUCH GOVERNMENT, AND TO PROVIDE NEW GUARDS FOR THEIR FUTURE SECURITY.

FIREARMS POLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

BLACK
PANTHER
PARTY
FOR
SELF
DEFENSE

BURN BABY BURN
BY MARVIN X

TIRED
SICK AND TIRED
AND TIRED OF BEING SICK AND TIRED

LOST
LOST IN THE WILDERNESS
OF WHITE ASS AMERICA

ARE THE MASSES ASSES?

COOL!
"COOL" SAID THE MASTER TO THE SLAVE,
"DON'T ROB AND STEAL I'LL BE YOUR
DRIVING WHEEL"
COOL!
AND HE WHEELED US INTO 350 YEARS OF
BLACK MADNESS

TO HOGGUTTS, CONKED HAIR, AND COVODISES
TO BLEACHING CREAMS AND UNCLE THOMASES

TO THE STREETS

TO WATTS

TO KILLLLLLLLLL!!!!

BOOMMMMMM.....
TWO HONKIES GONE

MOTHERFUCK THE POLICE
AND PARKER'S SISTER TOO

BLACK PEOPLE
TIRED, SICK AND TIRED
AND TIRED OF BEING
FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

COME ON CHULL'NS
DON'T MINE THE TAGS
GET ALL DEM BOSS RAGS

GET ALL DAT MOTHERFUCK'N PLUCK
GET THEM GUNS TOO
WE DON'T GIVE A FUCK

BURN, BABY, BURN

COOK OUT OF SIGHT!

FINEBURGS

WHITEFRONT

WINEBURGS

BLACKFRONT

SAFEWAY
NOWAY

BURN!

BURN BABY BURN

IN TIME
HE'LL
LEARN

7456000
3495

THE BLACK PANTHER MOVEMENT

In recent weeks, activities of the gun-toting Black Panthers have caused serious concern to Law Enforcement Agencies. Although the Black Panther movement has been known of for some time, it is only recently that there has been demonstration of a show of force. Reference is made to three (3) incidents:

1. Black Panther members entered a meeting, held on April 17, 1967, which had been called by the Welfare Rights Organization for the purpose of bringing together the District Attorney and members of the Dowell family to discuss the death of Denzil DOWELL, killed by a Deputy Sheriff of Contra Costa County on April 1, 1967. That meeting was held in the building of the Council of Community Services.
2. On April 20, 1967, in the City of Martinez, a number of Black Panthers, all bearing arms, attempted to enter the office of the Sheriff so that they might discuss the Dowell shooting.
3. On April 22, 1967, at the corner of Filbert and Chesley in North Richmond, armed members of the Black Panthers appeared for the purpose of recruiting new members into their group.

There have been other incidents in the East Bay where armed Black Panthers have come into contact with police officers. Details of the incidents will be set forth later in this report. We mention them at this time merely to point out the recent activities of the Black Panthers.

To better understand the Black Panther movement, particularly as it exists in the East Bay, one must go back to its origin.

The Black Panther Party started in Alabama in 1966 (?). It was organized as a political party by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Its purpose was to enter Negro candidates in counties where Negroes had a potential voting majority. The "Black Panther" was chosen as a symbol as they felt they needed a visual name that would depict the Southern Negro. It is supposed to represent courage, determination and freedom.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Since the founding of SNCC, other organizations have supported it. The magazine, "The Young Socialist", in its issues for May, June and July of 1966, offered them support. This magazine is published by the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA). In one of their issues it was indicated that the YSA in Berkeley was supporting the Black Panther party by selling buttons.

Although the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee implies non-violence, it is generally known that they do, in fact, advocate violence. Stokley Carmichael, the National Director of SNCC, preaches hate of the white man, as well as the use of force by the Negro to obtain what is "justly" his. Mr. Carmichael is a young Negro, well educated and a fiery orator. He appeared at the Contra Costa College a few months ago, at the invitation of the Associated Students. Some 700 or 800 attended and about 90% were Negro. Mr. Carmichael's audiences are always large and he is in constant demand as a speaker. He is given extremely good coverage by the press, newspapers and television.

SNCC, an organization based in Alabama, was organized for the purpose of voter registration and to encourage Negroes to run for various public offices. As stated before, non-violence has given way to violence which is advocated by their leader, Carmichael. There is no SNCC organization in the Bay Area. There is, however, a group known as "The Friends of SNCC" who have offices in Berkeley. It is understood that the purpose of this organization is to act in support of SNCC in Alabama. There is an extensive list of supporters to whom they mail monthly notices of SNCC activities. Much of the information they impart is contained in reports from Loundes County, Alabama, as well as in their newspaper, "The Movement". In addition, they collect money, food and clothing for the needy Negroes of the South.

The local leaders of the Black Panther Party are known for their dislike of the whites. They have demonstrated their hate and openly advocated

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

violence, even to the point of attempting overthrow of our government.

Bobby Seale, reported to be the leader of the Oakland Black Panther party, came to our attention in August, 1965. At that time, he was identified with the Western Student Movement. This organization is located in North Richmond. Its purpose is to tutor elementary school children of that community. At that time, it was funded through OEO with \$59,000 Federal funds and approximately \$6,000 from the Rosenberg Foundation.

The Western Student Movement resulted in issuance of fliers, inviting the public to a debate to be held at Shields Park in North Richmond. The subject for debate was, "Violence Versus Non-Violence". The principal speakers were Ken Freeman, Hermon Blake and Ron Bridgeport. All spoke and all advocated the use of violence by the Negro to focus attention upon their demands and "get what is rightfully theirs". Bobby Seale was also present, but took only a small part in the program. Both Seale and Freeman are not identified with the Black Panther party.

Also in 1965, a publication entitled "Soulbook" was issued. It was produced in Berkeley by the Afro-American Research Institution". Members of the Editorial Board were Donald Freeman, Isaac Moore, Ernest Allen, Jr., Carroll Holmes, Ken Freeman and Bob Hamilton. Bobby Seale is listed as Distribution Manager and is credited with all printing.

It is interesting to note that an organization known as "The Revolutionary Action Movement" (RAM) includes as members many of the same people as the Afro-American Research Institution. Further, they subscribe to beliefs such as were expressed by the speakers in Shields Park and contained in the publication, "Soulbook", i.e., hatred of whites and the condoning of violence. Literature distributed by RAM in the Berkeley-Oakland area contains identification of the following persons as officers: Ernest Allen Jr., Kenneth Freeman,

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Donald Freeman, Carol Freeman, Isaac Moore and Bob Hamilton. Bobby Seale is known as a close associate.

RAM is described as a revolutionary organization which advocates a world-wide black revolution to create a "new world", free from exploitation and oppression of man by man. RAM envisions a seizure of power and, to accomplish this goal, they have devised a three-stage plan. Stage #1 is referred to as "Ideological Warfare" which consists of education and recruitment. Youthful criminals from youth groups are of particular interest to recruiters. Stage #2 is referred to as "Expropriation". Funds derived will be obtained by both legal and illegal methods. Stage #3 is "Direct Action". Implication is that the system of government in the United States will be replaced by violence, if necessary.

RAM's National leader is Robert Franklin Williams. In August, 1961, Williams and his family fled to Cuba, just hours before he was indicted on charges of kidnapping a white couple and holding them for several hours during a racial disturbance. A Federal warrant is outstanding for William's arrest.

As we now face the militant Black Panther Party, there is evidence of a continued similarity through all of the aforementioned organizations. With some variations, Stage #1 of RAM coincides very much with violence, as demonstrated by the Black Panthers. Furthermore, many of the same people have been active in all organizations.

There is deep concern on the part of Law Enforcement officials over the recent activities of the Black Panthers, as well as over the group's publications. Quoted here are some of their demands and beliefs:

"We want freedom. We want power to determine the destiny of our black community."

"We want an end to the robbery by the white man of our black community."

"We want all black men to be exempt from military service."

"We want an immediate end to Police Brutality and Murder of black people."

"We want freedom for all black men and women held in Federal, State, County and City Prisons and Jails."

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

"We want all black people, when brought to trial, to be tried in court by a jury of their peer group, or people from their black communities, as defined by the Constitution of the United States."

"We believe that black people should not be forced to fight in the military service, to defend a racist government that does not protect us. We will not fight and kill other people of color in the world who, like black people, are being victimized by the white racist government of America. We will protect ourselves from the force and violence of the Racist police and the Racist military, by whatever means necessary."

"We believe we can end police brutality in our black community by organizing black self defense groups that are dedicated to defending our black community from racist police oppression and brutality. The second amendment of the Constitution of the United States gives us a right to bear arms. We therefore believe that all black people should arm themselves for self defense."

"We believe that all black people should be released from the many jails and prisons because they have not received a fair and impartial trial."

The local (Oakland) Black Panther party is known in full as, "The Black Panther Party for Self Defense". In their terminology, this means defending one's self with a weapon, be it a pistol, rifle or shotgun. It is clear that members are well informed concerning the laws governing the ownership and carrying of weapons. However, they are seen almost daily with weapons on their persons, particularly in recent days when they have moved about in numbers of from six to twenty-five. This, then, represents a threat to the peace of any community in which they choose to appear.

The first big showing of the Black Panthers was in San Francisco at the airport on February 21st and 22nd, 1967. This was in connection with the Malcolm X Grassroots Memorial, at which time Mrs. Betty Shabazz, widow of Malcolm X, was the featured guest. About twenty Black Panther party members appeared at the San Francisco airport, carrying an assortment of guns. The entire incident was vividly covered by the press.

Oakland has had several contacts with armed Black Panthers, as has Berkeley. Each contact with the police is a potentially explosive situation. They are very antagonistic toward the police and attempt to provoke incidents concerning their carrying or wearing weapons.

Mr. John Nejedly, District Attorney of Contra Costa County, was in attendance at a meeting in Richmond, at the office of the Council of Community Services, on Monday, April 17, 1967. The purpose of the meeting was, as previously indicated in this report, to discuss a recent Coroner's inquest with the parents of the subject of the inquest who had been killed by a Deputy Sheriff. Before the meeting had gotten under way, a number of Black Panthers, said to have been seven, invaded the meeting. All were armed with shotguns, rifles or sidearms. On Thursday of the same week, a large number of Black Panthers appeared before the County Building in the City of Martinez, again fully armed. They attempted to enter the building with their weapons, to meet with the Sheriff. They were told they could not bring the weapons into the building. They reluctantly left their weapons in their vehicles.

It is reported that on Saturday, April 22, 1967, the Black Panthers held a street rally at the corner of Chesley and 4th Street in North Richmond. Well over one hundred persons gathered around. It would appear that this type meeting is for the purpose of gaining support and to recruit new members.

For police agencies to be aware of the activities of the Black Panther party is not enough. With Black Panther leaders, Bobby Seale and Huey Newton, stating that their prime objective is to arm the Negro community to full capacity for the purpose of backing all plays by the Negro community, and to act as a deterrent to all organizations, including police departments, it is evident that new enforceable legislation is urgently needed so that there may be better control over the use of weapons by any group. This is particularly true when the weapons are used as a threat to the peace of any community. Under presently existing laws, the police are powerless to act.

NOTE: The name Bob Hamilton has appeared in this report. The correct spelling of the first name is BOBB

Armed Foray In Assembly Stirs Wrath

By ED SALZMAN
Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Shocked by an invasion by armed members of the Eastbay's "Black Panther Party For Self Defense," the Assembly today appears prepared to enact tough legislation prohibiting anyone from carrying a loaded gun in public.

A dozen Panthers carrying loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns yesterday knocked down a sergeant-at-arms and barged into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session.

About 25 more armed men, most of them from the Eastbay, circulated in the Capitol at the same time to protest a bill by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, outlawing carrying of loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place.

Upon departure from the capitol, 24 of the Panthers aged 17 to 25 were arrested.

About four hours after the invasion, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee met to consider Mulford's bill.

The assemblyman asked that the committee take the measure under submission—out only to give him time to prepare amendments tightening up the bill and making it a felony for anyone to enter the legislative chambers carrying a loaded weapon.

He also reported he must resolve a constitutional question about the right to bear arms.

Some members of the committee said that they were willing to go even further than Mulford and enact comprehensive gun-registration laws.

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Richmond, suggested an urgency clause which would place the bill into effect

'Panther' Invasion Shocks Assembly

Continued from Page 1

immediately after it is signed by the governor.

The invasion of the Assembly began when Sergeant-At-Arms James Rodney was knocked down attempting to prevent the armed band from entering the chamber.

The Panthers were surrounded by cameramen as they entered the chamber. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, D-Hayward speaker pro tempore, was presiding and spotted only the photographers.

"Sergeant-At-Arms," he shouted, "will you remove the cameramen? They have no permission to be in this chamber."

Sergeant-at-arms Tony Beard managed to expel both the photographers and the Panthers. "They broke right through the men guarding the entrance to the chamber," he reported. "We hustled them out as fast as we could."

State police temporarily disarmed the men. The weapons were returned unloaded.

Meanwhile, Mulford told the Assembly that there had been an "historical invasion and I am shocked beyond belief." He said his bill is directed against "this shocking episode.

Panther Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was protesting "the racist Oakland police" and demonstrating for the right to bear arms.

The armed visitors handed out mimeographed sheets signed by Huey P. Newton, identified as the party's "minister of defense."

The leaflet stated that the "racist California Legislature" is considering a bill "aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was also protesting what he called the "racist" shooting April 1 of Denizil Dowell, 22, a Richmond laborer killed by a Contra Costa sheriff's deputy investigating an attempted burglary in North Richmond.

A coroner's jury ruled the death justifiable homicide.

Two of those arrested yesterday were Dowell's brothers, James, 17, and George, 23.

OAKLAND TRIBUNE
May 3, 1967

The armed band left the Capitol just before Gov. Ronald Reagan was scheduled to join a group of Pleasant Hill youngsters for a picnic on the west lawn of the Capitol.

The governor was mobbed by newsmen and spectators. As a result, the luncheon was moved indoors to Reagan's office.

"Americans don't go around carrying guns with the idea of using them to influence other Americans," Reagan declared. "This is a ridiculous way to solve problems anyone who would approve of this type of demonstration must be out of his mind."

By the time the committee met to consider Mulford's bill,

most of the Panthers were under custody of the Sacramento police and there was no need for a heavy police guard in the committee room.

Mulford said the bill was proposed by law enforcement officials as a result of incidents in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

Some of the problems, he emphasized, have been caused by Caucasians "and this has nothing whatsoever to do with the charge that it is pointed at one ethnical group."

Police, Mulford declared, are becoming alarmed at the number of bands of armed citizens "intimidating and coercing people in the streets of our communities."

Supporting the bill were Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly, Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly and Undersheriff Harry Ramsey of Contra Costa County, Deputy Chief Joseph J. Veretto of the Oakland Police Department and Jules Lyons, principal of Walter T. Helms Junior High School in San Pablo.

They described a series of incidents in Clyde, Orinda, North Richmond, and Oakland in which armed bands have become serious problems for police.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The Black Panther Party for Self Defense is an extremely militant, anti-white political organization. Their headquarters in Oakland are at 5624 Grove Street. This is a vacant store where they hold meetings each Saturday at 4:30 p. m. At one meeting they attracted 22 persons, all negro. Many of the persons who attend these meetings are armed with various weapons. To date these subjects have not violated any existing laws concerning the possession of firearms. The concealable weapons have always been carried in plain view, and the subjects have not been in possession of fully automatic rifles or sawed off shotguns. When subjects have been stopped and questioned by the OPD, they have been extremely hostile toward officers and made statements to the effect that the only good white man is a dead white man. Serial numbers taken from subjects' guns have thus far been clear.

On February 21, 1967, 20 armed negroes, who identified themselves as members of the Black Panther Party, appeared at the San Francisco Airport and acted as bodyguards for Betty Shabazz, who is the widow of Malcolm X.

On February 21, 1967, a male negro by the name of Eldridge Cleaver spoke at a Berkeley High School rally which was attended by approximately 300 students, and made the following statement, "We are proud to be black and we don't hide behind our women. One day it will be molotov cocktails; next, hand grenades and bullets. If we can't have our freedom, then white America will die."

The next speaker was Huey Newton, MN/24, who was wearing a holstered pistol on his belt, and made the following statement after patting the pistol on his waist. "We have this, but you can't fight just with guns. The next step is to go into the black community and organize for your needs. If we don't get them, then we can dissolve this Union of America." Newton is identified as a member of the Black Panther Party.

Bobby G. Seale, MN/30, who is a leader of the Oakland Black Panther Party, recently made the statement at a rally at the University of California that he could have 50 armed negroes ready for action on one hour's notice.

On March 9, 1967, at the Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center, a meeting of the "Cowboys" (a negro youth group) was being held when Mr. Martin, the director, observed approximately 30-35 young adults approaching the center. Of this group, approximately 8 or 10 were observed to be armed. The leader of this, Bobby Seale, was told by Mr. Martin that weapons were not allowed in the recreation center. Bobby Seale then ordered the armed members to deposit the weapons in one of their vehicles and posted one member to guard the vehicle and the remaining members entered the meeting.

FIREARMS POLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

13

On March 4, 1967, Bobby Seale, Huey Newton, and Melvin Newton, MN-29, were involved in an accident at 9th and Broadway. Bobby Seale was armed with an automatic pistol in a shoulder holster. These subjects were very antagonistic toward police and attempted to provoke an incident regarding the weapon Seale was wearing.

On November 27, 1966, a vehicle driven by Mark Comfort, MN-34, and containing as passengers Lafayette Robinson, MN-16, and Ernest Allen, MN-17, was stopped in the 8600 block of A Street. Lying in the back seat, in plain view, were the following: 1 .17 cal. Derringer, 1 Berretta .25 cal. automatic, 1 .22 cal. revolver, and 1 .30 cal. carbine.

Bobby Seale and Huey Newton emphasized their prime objective is to arm the negro community to full capacity for the purpose of backing all plays by the negro community and to act as a deterrent to all organizations, including the Oakland Police Department and the San Francisco Police Department.

Confidential

Below are autos known to be used by the Black Panther Party.

AXP 921 - 63 Dodge - Walter or Armelia Newton
881 - 47th St.

BPB 655 - 60 Dodge - John L. Walker
955 - 107th Ave.

BPJ 002 - 55 Buick - H. G. Baikie
5628 Grove St.

AXP 817 - 63 Cadillac - Vernon or Jean Roberts
2430 - 24th Ave.

CSY 837 - 60 Chevrolet - Daniel T. or Lawrence Groom
3105 Adeline, Berkeley

LXZ 752 - 57 Chrysler - Joan or Charles Newton
984 - 57th St.

BJG 908 - 57 Pontiac - Joe Beal
1103 Adeline St.

AWW 142 - 60 Rambler - Mark or Gloria Comfort
6914 Lockwood St.

AZM 489 - 58 Volkswagen Sed - LaVerne Williams
1144 - 12th St.

CHY 119 - 60 Ford - No registration since 1964

Confidential

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

The following persons are known to be members of or are closely associated with the Black Panther Party for Self Defense.

Bobby George Seale MN-30, 5'10", 155 lbs.
OPD # 158659 - Home address 809 - 57th St.

Huey Percy Newton MN-25 (17 Feb 42), 5'10", 165 lbs.,
OPD #159483 - Add. - 881 - 47th St.

Melvin D. Newton MN-29 (17 Dec 37), OPD #S-55764
Add. - 233 Wilson St., Albany

Eldridge Cleaver MN
Writer for Ramparts Magazine

Mark E. Comfort MN-34, 6'1", 200 lbs.,
OPD #83042, Add. - 6914 Lockwood

Lafayette Robinson MN-16, OPD #K-6850
Add. - 1223 - 77th Ave.

Sanford A. Wright MN-26 (24 Sep 46), 5'10", 165 lbs.,
Add. - 3215 California St., Berk.

Donnell Reed MN-21 (25 Oct 45), 5'9", 145 lbs.,
Add. - 2142 E. 21st St., OPD #165346

Bernard Cornelius MN-33 (5 Mar 33), 5'8", 155 lbs.,
Add. - 1265 - 101st Ave.

Marvin E. Jackmon MN-22, 5'6", 160 lbs.,
Add. - 1504 1/2 Union St. OPD #165985

Isaac William Moore MN-21 (21 Apr 45), 6'2", 160 lbs.,
Add. - 1322 Curtis St., Berk. OPD #S-78010

Donald T. Freeman MN-22 (11 Jan 44), 5'8", 175 lbs.,
Add. - 1452 - 70th Ave.

Kenneth M. Freeman MN-28 (11 Oct 38), 5'6", 130 lbs.
Add. - 1630 Filbert, OPD #S-85540

Ernest A. Allen, Jr. MN-24 (9 Oct 42), 5'11",
Brn. Hair, Blue Eyes, Add. - 8623 A St., Oak.

Confidential

28 2848

2150 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
834-3650SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
95814
448-7524COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION
RULES EX OFFICIO

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

July 25, 1967

Mrs. Virginia F. Russell
Head Teacher
Emerson Children's Center
4505 Lawton Avenue
Oakland, California 94609

Dear Mrs. Russell:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Assemblywoman March Fong concerning House Resolution 428 and Assembly Bill 2448, relating to preschool education programs.

The Assembly Committee on Rules is awaiting the recommendation of the Office of Research before setting HR 428 for hearing.

AB 2448 was passed in the Assembly on July 13. I voted for the measure. It is set for hearing in the Senate Education Committee on July 28.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

HR 428

July 25, 1967

Mrs. Virginia F. Russell
Head Teacher
Emerson Children's Center
4505 Lawton Avenue
Oakland, California 94609

Dear Mrs. Russell:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Assemblywoman March Fong concerning House Resolution 428 and Assembly Bill 2448, relating to preschool education programs.

The Assembly Committee on Rules is awaiting the recommendation of the Office of Research before setting HR 428 for hearing.

AB 2448 was passed in the Assembly on July 13. I voted for the measure. It is set for hearing in the Senate Education Committee on July 28.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

JUL 25 1967

HR 428
Fog
7-10
5105

Emerson Children's Center
4505 Lawton Avenue
Oakland, California 94609
July 23, 1967

The Honorable March K. Fong
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mrs. Fong:

It was gratifying to receive your answer to my postcard and to know that you are aware of our dilemma.

I am especially interested in your House Resolution 428. This is a study which has been needed for a long time to clarify the intent and purpose of quality preschool education. With a year at Bank Street College, a BS cum laude, and a Masters degree, both from New York University, plus years of teaching in New York, I have been appalled by the low standards for preschool children in California.

As you undoubtedly know, the aim of AAUW, and the Association for Early Childhood Education, is to see that a credential in Early Childhood Education becomes an accepted fact.

Some of us appeared on Friday, the 21st, to oppose Assembly Bill 2448, but, as you know, it was postponed until next week.

I also hope that Senate Bill will pass because the fee schedule of 1961 is completely out of line with today's inflation. Our mothers contribute thousands of dollars to the economy as against a possible drain of Welfare funds. The Children's Centers are the only hope for many school age children who would otherwise become doorway children.

*Passed
7/13
Senate Ed.
committee
7/28*

Sincerely yours

Virginia F. Russell
(Mrs.) Virginia F. Russell
Head Teacher

November 15, 1987

Honorable Don Mulford
California State Legislature
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:

Since the recent enactment of the Mulford Firearms Control Act by the California Legislature there have been two occasions in which it was necessary to use the Act to avert serious civil disorder in the City of Berkeley.

In both cases the responsible person was carrying a loaded firearm under conditions that would have been lawful prior to the adoption of the Mulford Act by the Legislature. In one instance the arrested person who was carrying the firearm openly in his automobile had a long criminal record and a history of violence. In addition to the firearms violation under Section 12031 of the California Penal Code the subject was also found to have narcotics in his possession.

While these are only two examples, it has occurred to me that you might be interested to know of the use that has been made to date of your legislative efforts to prevent irresponsible and potentially dangerous persons from transporting and using firearms in public streets and other places covered by the statutes.

The new Legislation has been and will continue to be of significant help to law enforcement and public safety.

Best regards,

W. P. BEALL
Chief of Police

CL/201

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

SENATOR JOHN G. SCHMITZ
34TH DISTRICT
5070 STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO
PHONE: 445-5831

Bill File
AB 1591

PRESS RELEASE: July 24, 1967

State Senator John G. Schmitz, R-Tustin (Orange County), has warned of "serious danger threatening every American living in an urban or suburban area if the present wave of nation-wide rioting continues."

Senator Schmitz said:


"For years we have been preaching peace, love and handouts to those who tell us, in Mao Tse-tung's words, that 'political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.' With each new riot we have been urged to give even more in unearned benefits to match the robbery and looting which are fast becoming the primary purpose of these outbreaks. The carnival of destruction now underway in Detroit is strange and bitter fruit of the incessant propaganda during the last twenty years from those who claim to love mankind -- in the collective and abstract -- so much.

"The time has come for justice. The cornerstone of justice is each man's absolute right to defend his home and family against violent assault. The police, much as they have been abused, will do all they can to protect us. But alone they are not enough. When the Governor of Michigan finds it necessary to call upon not only the National Guard but the United States Army to help the Detroit police, it becomes obvious that this rioting has gone beyond mere crime to the first stage of armed revolution.

"Consequently this is the worst possible time for the California legislature to pass any bill limiting the individual's right of self-defense and his right to bear arms. If my home and family is threatened, I would far rather have guns of my own to defend them, than the mere empty assurance that the guns carried by the rioters are not being legally used."

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

The **BLACK PANTHER**



BLACK COMMUNITY NEWS SERVICE

VOLUME 1

APRIL 25, 1967

NUMBER 1

P.O. BOX 8641 OAK, CALIF. EMERYVILLE BRANCH

PUBLISHED BY THE **BLACK PANTHER PARTY FOR SELF DEFENSE**

WHY WAS DENZIL DOWELL KILLED

APRIL FIRST 3:50 a.m.

"I BELIEVE THE POLICE MURDERED MY SON" SAYS THE MOTHER OF DENZIL DOWELL.

Brothers and Sisters of the Richmond community, here is the view of the family's side of the death of Denzil Dowell as compiled by the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, concerned citizens, and the Dowell family. As you know, April 1st, 1967, Denzil Dowell (age 22), was shot and killed by an "officer of the Martinez Sheriff's Department", so read the newspaper.

But there are too many unanswered questions that have been raised by the Dowell family and other neighbors in the North Richmond community. Questions that don't meet the satisfaction of the killing of Denzil. The Richmond Police, the Martinez Sheriff's Department, and the Richmond Independent would have us black people believe some thing contrary to Mrs. Dowell's accusation. That is, her son was "unjustifiably" murdered by a racist cop.

There are too many questionable facts supporting the Dowell family's point of view.

These questionable facts are as follows:

1. Denzil Dowell was unarmed so how can six bullet holes and shot gun blasts be considered "justifiable homicide"? (Con't Page 2)



WE BLACK PEOPLE ARE MEETING SATURDAY 1:30 AT 1717 SECOND STREET LET US SUPPORT THE DOWELL FAIMLY EVERY BLACK BROTHER AND SISTER MUST UNITE FOR REAL POLITICAL ACTION

2. Why did the newspaper and police say only three shots were fired when the coroner's report and surrounding neighbors established the fact that six to ten shots were used and heard?
3. The police and the newspaper stated that the time of the shooting was 4:49 A.M. to 5:01 A.M., yet Denzil Dowell's sister and neighbors in the area testified to hearing shots at 3:50 A.M.
4. Only Richmond police were first seen on the scene; not until later (an hour or so), around 4:50 A.M. were Martinez sheriffs seen on the scene where Denzil Dowell was murdered.
5. The police reported that Denzil Dowell was running and jumped a fence and ran to jump another when he was shot. The Dowell family knows that Denzil had been injured in the hip in a car accident some time ago and after leaving the hospital could not run much at all, let alone jump two fences with a hammer in his hand.
6. The lot that Denzil was supposed to have run across between the two fences is an old car junk yard loaded with grease and oil and why wasn't oil found on his shoes?
7. The coroner reported that Denzil Dowell bled to death. Where was the blood where Denzil Dowell lay? Denzil's sister remembers that night and says she saw very little blood. She said she never saw a pool of blood and yet the coroner said he bled to death after being shot ten times.
8. Denzil Dowell was found by his brother and friend and they noticed that no attempt had been made by police to summon a doctor or to save his life.
9. The family of Denzil Dowell has been denied the right to see or have the clothes that Denzil was murdered in. They want the clothes to see how many bullet holes the clothes have in them. The family was also denied the right to take pictures of his body so they could check for numerous bullet holes.
10. The newspaper came out with a statement of "justifiable homicide" 2 hours before the jury

gave its verdict. The foreman on the jury could not read. A biased jury of 10 white people and two "Negroes" protected the racist cop who murdered Denzil Dowell.

11. The Dowell family also notes a very important fact. The cop who shot Denzil Dowell knew him by name and had stopped Denzil and hollered to him many times, "Denzil Dowell give me your identification." The cop had at other times threatened to kill him.

The Dowell family and concerned citizens have called for a Grand Jury investigation and are demanding that all law enforcement officers change their policy of killing people over property.

On April 18th a group of concerned citizens went to discuss this proposal with Sheriff Young of Martinez. The citizens enumerated the areas of doubt in the case of Denzil Dowell and requested that the officer who admitted doing the shooting be removed from duty pending an investigation. The Sheriff REFUSED to hear our request and we consider his action to be a racist disregard for the reasonable request of black taxpayers and citizens concerned with the survival of black people.

LET US ORGANIZE
 TO DEFEND OURSELVES

"We believe we can end police brutality in our black community by organizing black self-defense groups that are dedicated to defending our black community from racist police oppression and brutality. The second Amendment of the Constitution of the United States gives a right to bear arms. We therefore believe that all black people should arm themselves for self defense." (from the program of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, Point No. 7 of "What We Believe")

WHY MUST BLACK PEOPLE ORGANIZE?

- The murder of Denzil Dowell April 1, 1967 here in North Richmond;
- The murder of two black Brothers a week before last Christmas here in North Richmond;
- The brutal beating of a black woman here in Richmond;

in September, 1966;

--The beating of a 14 year old girl in East Oakland in October 1966.

These are only a few of the murders and brutal beatings by racist cops that have happened and been reported in the newspaper and are known about in the black community.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS THESE RACIST MURDERS ARE HAPPENING EVERY DAY; THEY COULD HAPPEN TO ANY ONE OF US.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS WE MUST UNITE. MANY OTHER MURDERS AND BRUTAL BEATINGS HAVE TAKEN PLACE WITHOUT US DOING MUCH OF ANYTHING BUT LET'S STOP IT NOW!

WITH

SOME

REAL

NITTY GRITTY

POLITICAL ACTION

ARMED BLACK BROTHERS IN RICHMOND COMMUNITY

15 Black Brothers, most of them armed; with Magnum 12 gauge shot guns, M-1 rifles, and side arms, held a street rally at the corner of Third and Chesley in North Richmond last Saturday afternoon about 5 P.M. The nice thing about these Bloods is that they had their arms to defend themselves and their Black Brothers and Sisters while they exercised their Constitutional Rights: Freedom of Speech, and the right to Peacefully Assemble. And while they exercised another Constitutional right; the right to bear arms to defend themselves.

The racist cops could only look on. The Dog Cops made no attempt to break up the meeting like they generally do when Black people get together to sound out their grievances against the white power structure. The point to get firmly into your mind is that both the Black Brothers and the racist cops had "POWER". They had righteous "GUN POWER", but the significant thing is that the Black Brothers had some of this POWER. In the
(con't page 4)

MEETING APRIL 29TH
EVERYBODY
THIS COMMING SATURDAY
SO WE'LL KNOW WHAT TO DO AND
HOW TO DO IT NOW!

1717 SECOND STREET
NORTH RICHMOND

AT 1:30 P.M.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Page 4

THE BLACK PANTHER - April 25, 1967

past, Black People have been at the mercy of cops who feel that their badges are a license to shoot, maim, and out-right murder any Black man, woman, or child who crosses their gun-sights. But there are now strong Black men and women on the scene who are willing to step out front and do what is necessary to bring peace, security, and justice to a people who have been denied all of these for four hundred years.

At this rally, the Brothers were uptight and knew exactly what they were doing at all times. They knew that they were acting strictly within their rights. These Brothers have become aware of something that the white racists have been trying to keep secret from Black people all the time: that a citizen has the right to protect himself. They were ready to insure that the rally went ahead as planned, without any interference from outlaw cops who wanted to suppress the meeting so that other Black People would not get the message.

Black People must realize that the time is short and growing shorter by the day. Check it out. People talk about "Power". There is White Power, Black Power, Yellow Power, Green Power, etc. but all Black People want out of all these different forms of Power is BLACK POWER. Black People want and need the power to stop the white racist power structure from grinding the life out of the Black Race through the daily operation of this system which is designed to exploit and oppress Black People.

The beautiful thing about the Brothers who held the rally is that they are organized, disciplined and politically aware of all the ins and outs of the problems facing Black People throughout the Bay Area in particular. When the cops came rolling up looking, the brothers spreaded out all across the street waiting for some fool cop to try and start something. The brothers were organized.

So, Brothers and Sisters everywhere: righteous BLACK POWER organized is where it's at. The BLACK PANTHER PARTY FOR SELF-DEFENSE really has something going. These brothers are the cream of Black Manhood. They are there for the protection, and defense of our Black Community. The Black Community owes it itself, to the future of our people, to get behind these

Brothers and to let the world know that black people are not stupid fools who are unable to recognize when someone is acting in the best interest of Black People. These Brothers have a political perspective. Most important, they are down here on the GRASS ROOTS LEVEL where the great majority of our people are. The BLACK PANTHER PARTY FOR SELF-DEFENSE moves. The PARTY takes action. Everybody else just sits back and talk. All Black People know what needs to be done, but not all of them are willing to do it. The White man has instilled fear into the very hearts of our people. We must act to remove this fear. The only way to remove this fear is to stand up and look the white man in his blue eyes. Many Black People are able nowadays to look the white man in the eyes--but the line thins out when it comes to looking the white cops in the eye. But the white cop is the instrument sent into our community by the Power Structure to keep Black People quiet and under control. So it is not surprising that the action these days centers around the conduct of these white cops who come from way across town to patrol our communities for 8 hours a day. But Black People have to live in these communities 24 hours a day. So it is time that Black People start moving in a direction that will free our communities from this form of outright brutal oppression. The BLACK PANTHER PARTY FOR SELF DEFENSE has worked out a program that is carefully designed to cope with this situation.

BLACK MEN!!! It is your duty to your women and children, to your mothers and sisters, to investigate the program of the PARTY. There is no other way. We have tried everything else. This is the moment in history when Black People have no choice but to move and move rapidly to gain their freedom, justice, and all the other ingredients of civilized living that have been denied to us. This is where it is at. Check it out, Black Brothers and Sister! This is our Day!!!!



May 4, 1967

This afternoon the Black Panthers held a rally on campus at San Francisco State. One of the speakers (the main speaker) was Leroy Jones, Greenwich Village playwright, white hater, who used very filthy language.

Report that at 12 noon tomorrow, on Sproul Hall Steps at UC Pete Camejo of the Young Socialist Alliance, will sponsor a rally of the Black Panthers and Bobby Seal will be the principal speaker for the Black Panthers. Purpose of this rally is to raise money for armaments and for defense of the people who were arrested in Sacramento. *Refered*

Students for Democratic Society have permission for a rally next Thursday May 11 for raising funds for armaments and defense. On that rally will be

Stu Hamilton, who has been arrested

David Harris, former Student body president Stanford

Rick Harris

Mark Comfort (bp)

Bobby Seal (bp) *S/S - s. d. a - w. b. tonight*

Huey Newton (bp) *also getting Federal funds part time neighborhood organizer 10 hrs a week (Economic op)*

Edredge Cleaver (now on parole - assault to Commit murder) writes or has written for Rampant

JUL 20 1967

July 6, 1967

Dear Sir:

I am writing to you because you are in a position to act on objections to pending legislation. Two subjects I wish to expound upon at this writing are gun controls and the revocation of freedom of self determination of motor bike riders.

I trust that you have not depended too heavily upon letters to the newspapers for your guidance in these matters. They have their own ideas, and print only the ones they want aired. Please read the copies on the reverse side of this page which pertain to the two subjects mentioned, and which have not been published or recognized in any other way.

I feel that to disarm the American citizen so that he cannot protect and defend himself and his family and belongings is a very obvious violation of our Constitutional rights. The criminal we are forced to defend ourselves against will not be governed by any amount of legislation, so the only ones who will suffer because of it are the law abiding citizens. I request that you do everything in your power to put the criminal at a disadvantage instead of the patriotic, law abiding citizens.

In regard to the restrictions being considered for motorbike riders, I feel that insurance lobbyists and the Federal Government are exercising undue pressure for legislation that the elected representatives of our state are capable of determining, based upon opinions expressed by their constituents. It appears to me that most of these restrictions are being proposed by people who haven't the faintest knowledge of motorcycles, or their merits or demerits. A motorbike, like a gun, is dangerous only if in the hands of a dangerous operator. No amount of legislation will cause a dangerous operator to suddenly become a safe operator.

On the other hand, I firmly believe that an individual alone is solely responsible for his own life and safety. No legislation will cause a person to place any more importance on the protection of his own life than he has been accustomed to.

In my own case, I believe that when my time comes, I will go, even if tied down by a seat belt, wearing a helmet and goggles, with my lights on and my horn blowing, drunk or sober. No amount of legislation is going to keep me on this earth any longer than the good Lord wants. Until that time comes, I could be involved in any number of incidents that should have resulted in certain death and still walk away. So please let me control and protect my own life and family in my own responsible way. I'm sure God will continue to control our destiny regardless of these unnecessary government controls over our own lives.

Sincerely,

Howard B. Crownover

Howard B. Crownover
3610 Winona Way
N. Highlands, Calif. 95660

*Card sent
7/11/67
ak*

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

COPY

May 10, 1967

Editor
Sacramento Bee
21st & Q St.
Sacramento, Calif.

Sir:

Communists reputedly set their own stage for incidents they design to subvert our Constitution and our American freedoms. For easier conquest, they have long advocated gun controls, registration of firearms, then confiscation. This will render Americans defenseless against our armed enemy in the streets, and we can be easily subdued by the bandits who recognize no legal restraint. We Americans are permitting them to use us to implement their objectives in our country.

How ridiculous it would be for Americans who must defend themselves against an armed enemy to band together in an invasion of the State Capitol to "oppose gun control laws." Nothing could have been more effective in bringing about the reversal of a Constitutional right for Americans to keep and bear arms for self defense.

We should hope and pray that our legislators will see through this deceptive trick and deny our enemy's solution to a problem they have created for their own benefit. I say it is high time we got tough with the enemy instead of disarming Americans and putting ourselves at their mercy. We are faced with the very reason our forefathers made Constitutional provision for our own self-preservation. Let's not help the enemy destroy us by allowing him to subvert our right to keep and bear arms.

Howard B. Crownover
N. Highlands, Calif.

COPY

Editor
Sacramento Bee
21st & Q St.
Sacramento, Calif.

Sir:

I have been anticipating the recent build-up by the news media for further control of human life in regard to the proposed requirement for the wearing of helmets by motor bike riders.

Because of the advantages in traffic and parking on base, I have conformed to the McClellan AFB requirement to wear a helmet on base only. The helmet offers so many safety hazards as it does advantages, which far outweigh the supposed advantages for normal street riding.

Two of the main hazards is impaired hearing and visibility, which offset two of the main safety advantages of bike riding. Another trying and cumbersome disadvantage is the necessity for carrying the helmet wherever I go on my way to or from work. When a business call is made on the way to or from work, the helmet must be left on the seat or hung on the handlebars of the bike. If it were illegal to ride a bike without a helmet, it would be necessary to carry it wherever I go because of the temptation to thieves if left on the bike. It would not be a popular item with thieves if it were not required by law. Many times I have gone straight home from work just to get rid of the helmet, then back-tracked to make calls or do errands that could otherwise have been done with one trip.

If the helmet should become a requirement statewide, it would remove all the advantages and the enjoyment of riding purely for fun and the feel of fresh air and open space around you. Furthermore, it abrogates the individual right of self-determination in regard to safety or self preservation of one's own body. What may be needed by a daredevil rider is not necessarily needed by, and should not be required for, the safe and sane small bike rider.

I would be much more in favor of a training program to make responsible people of the few irresponsible ones who show off and create a nuisance for others. After all, it is not the bike that is dangerous, but the operator. The same is true of automobiles and guns. If the proposed controls are purely for the preservation of life more than the control of it, then why hasn't something been proposed in regard to cigarettes, liquor, and unfair divorce laws, which cause more deaths in one year than all the motorcycle accidents in our entire history?

Howard B. Crownover
N. Highlands, Calif.

COPY

Sept. 27, 1965

Editor, Sacramento Bee
21st & Q St.
Sacramento, Calif.

Sir:

Your editorials regarding gun controls would have been more logical had the same remarks been made about voting controls.

The "idiot" you refer to will not point a gun at a human and pull the trigger if he has had basic training in Christianity or Americanism; but he would have to be told how to vote. It is much more dangerous that he vote than that he own a gun to protect life and property.

The one without this basic training will always have a gun, or any other effective weapon, to take away life and property, so where is your argument if it is not to make the law abiding citizen defenseless against these criminals and barbarians?

The Great Society might really be great if it would do something to restore the Christianity that has been courted out of our country instead of cultivating Godless atheism.

Howard B. Crownover
N. Highlands, Calif.

COPY

Editor
Sacramento Bee
21st & Q St.
Sacramento, Calif.

Sir:

I shudder every time I read of an attack in the dark, now that I have recently learned that the victim is alone with the responsibility of identifying and prosecuting the assailant. Should the law enforcement agencies not be responsible for the apprehension and prosecution of such criminals? To add insult to injury, a confession by the attacker doesn't help, either, unless the victim can positively identify him. How often would it be possible for a victim to even see his attacker in a dark alley? When a gang attack occurs, how could the victim make a positive identification of so many, even in the daytime, when their work is completed and they disappear before the victim has time to realize what is happening?

I believe this situation should be corrected before so many hoodlums find out how well they are being protected that they will outnumber the innocent law abiding citizens.

Howard B. Crownover
N. Highlands, Calif.

COPY

April 17, 1967

Hon. Ronald Reagan
Governor, State of California
Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

I have felt that you were a firm believer in individual freedom, and abhorred big brother control over our personal lives. Because of this, I wrote you a letter on Feb. 13th objecting to rumors that motorbike riders would be required to wear helmets. I was shocked when I read in the Sacramento Union that you were proposing tighter controls on motorbike riders, including special clothing and the burning of lights at all times, the purpose of which was unexplained.

I have a family of six, four of whom enjoy riding motorbikes. I have stretched the family budget considerably to acquire one for each of us so that we can ride together when the weather permits. We prefer to go where we can get off the road and away from auto traffic, but sometimes ride to and from rather than haul them. I pay more for the license for any one of the bikes than some of my neighbors pay for their family car, which I consider to be pretty much of a penalty for our choice of enjoyment, especially considering the relative size and horsepower of the vehicles, and the amount of use they get.

Any further expense or curtailment in their use will necessitate a change in our family togetherness, which will probably make it impossible to sell them, also. No one will want them with such unnecessary restrictions. No one will want to spend several minutes getting specially dressed just to run down to the store for a loaf of bread, or to make a routine business call requiring only simple transportation and simple clothing, or to risk getting a citation for forgetting to turn on the lights in broad daylight, when lights are not needed.

There are no such "safety" restrictions imposed upon those who enjoy riding horseback, swimming, boating, or golfing. Anything one does can be done dangerously, or it can be done safely. It all depends on the individual, not legislation.

I recommend that we concentrate on making responsible people of the irresponsible, and not deprive everyone of his freedom of self determination because of a few irresponsible ones. It is not the vehicle that is dangerous, but the operator. I am opposed to gun control laws for the same reason.

I am a member of a minority group of taxpayers, and am no doubt in the minority also as a motorbike rider, and may be over-ruled, but I respectfully request that you re-evaluate the implications involved in the revocation of personal freedom by legislation of this type. You could have been the one who said, "Once a freedom is lost, it can never be regained."

Your reconsideration of this proposal will be a vote of confidence in the people who value freedom, believe in patriotism and Constitutional government.

Sincerely,

Howard B. Crownover
Howard B. Crownover
3610 Winona Way
N. Highlands, Calif. 95660

Black panther party for self defense.

Hughes Percy Newton 10/8/64
887 - 47th St. Millk Superior Court
Oak Blanche County, assault w. deadly
Le 2 - 3700 weapon - 10/29/64 sentenced
to 3 years probation + 6 mos
County Jail

Seroy

Eldridge Cleaver
Lamparts
4/1/67
on parole 12/12/66
convicted 3/20/71
1958 felony conviction
assault with deadly weapon
previous conviction
narcotics charge. several
whittaker

Denzil Howell Shot by deputy

Jeff Melvin Brunkhurst 5th AKA

Coroner's Jury - Justifiable

homicide

~~Undershiff - Gary Ramsey~~

Scan
any of
any old
tbl

pc 1-3333

have you seen
to see

from ~~Becker~~ + Newton
Linton

Man w/ a loaded G-6
ch 7.

R. R. A. wants to form
civilian police

put a round thru
weapon at time of
firing of machine

like the word
Angora. Wickelby "no contact"

OPB wagon 2014
"607090 units"

para military act?
General Wagner out?

the gun ~~gun~~
Becker "we did not ~~bring~~
we were invited in"

90.4
"THE LOADED QUESTION"

One of the peculiar problems of our society was pointed up dramatically the other day when an armed group marched into the state capitol.

Carlos Bee, then presiding over the Assembly, ordered the cameramen ousted. But he ignored the gunmen. He explained later that he hadn't seen the guns which provoked the scramble of cameramen.

OPINION

Sometimes we look but we don't see.

In our zeal to be fair in making laws, we occasionally lose sight of the public for whom the laws are made. In the case of any private army that is walking a legal tightrope, public consideration and safety must come first. To act otherwise would encourage tyranny.

A new state law has been proposed that would make it illegal to carry a loaded gun in a public place. Policemen, bank guards and others with permission, would be excepted. This sounds reasonable. Or maybe we already have a law that with a few alterations would fit the situation.

There will be those who argue that the whole gun situation in America is in need of review -- mail order sales -- the entire constitutional right to bear arms. Opinion 7 agrees, but let's have some instant protection then order the review.

It's confusing for the average man when a gun-toting group can march and intimidate in San Francisco without arrest, yet the same act in Sacramento produces an arrest. Same group, same state, same laws.

As another long, hot summer nears, it is imperative as Opinion 7 said earlier, that the legislature act to avert a bloody "High Noon" in California.

KGO-TV regularly presents editorials on topics of vital interest to its viewers. Clearly labeled as opinion, these television editorials are delivered by KGO-TV Vice President and General Manager, David M. Sacks. Your comments concerning the attached editorial will be greatly appreciated.

Charles Cruttenden,
Editorial Director

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

John Najedly

District Attorney
Contra Costa County

Jack Francis

Investigator
Contra Costa County

Jules Lyons

Principal
Walter J. Helms Junior High School
San Pablo

(Parents)

Harry Ramsey

Under Sheriff
Contra Costa County

~~Joseph Veretto~~

~~Deputy Chief of Police
Oakland~~

Carl Anderson, D.A.

Stockton

MEMBERS

CARL A. BRITSCHGI
JOHN L. BURTON
RAY E. JOHNSON
JOHN P. QUIMBY
NEWTON R. RUSSELL
LEO J. RYAN

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

ASSEMBLY OFFICE OF RESEARCH
ROOM 319 445-9098

California Legislature

Assembly Rules Committee

ROOM 3173, STATE CAPITOL

JOE A. GONSALVES
CHAIRMAN

June 5, 1967

*Report on
NR 294*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Joe A. Gonsalves
Chairman, Assembly Rules Committee

Attention: Hazel Lombardo

FROM: Arthur Bolton, Director
Assembly Office of Research

RE: House Resolution 294 by Assemblyman Lanterman

House Resolution 294 calls for a study of funding procedures for California welfare programs. Included in the study would be an investigation of the feasibility of: 1) closed-end appropriations for welfare programs, 2) a single categorical aid structure, and 3) maximum average grants.

The resolution grows out of recommendations by the Legislative Analyst calling for implementation of these three items. The Analyst's report has included these proposals consistently since 1962.

It has been noted by the Analyst that California is one of the few remaining states which does not impose some form of cost control over its welfare appropriations. This factor coupled with growing public concern for rapidly increasing welfare budgets makes this a significant study.

The focal point of this study would be the issue of closed-end appropriations and would involve an investigation of the ability of both the State Department of Welfare and the county welfare agencies to estimate accurately projected caseloads. The State

ARMED BANDS
Santa Barbara part
minutes over

3 hrs ago

Protesters
at
Amuro

Am Nazi Party
→ Clyde C.C. Co
local schools
Police Dept
Court

Resid.

Support
Oak City Commie
Oak Pol Dept
C.C. for out +
D.A.
P.O.A.

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON ULFORD

Date

AB 1591

To

Zeb

producer

Re:

Putterman KGO - A.M.

863 0077

eps gun legislation

6:45 am tomorrow

Branch

between 5:06 ma 6:12 88

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

V. H. WHEELER, Agent

2050 FOURTH STREET

SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

Telephone: GL 3-2616

June 20 1967

*free
no
newly
use*

Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, Calif

Sir;

I have read with considerable shock and amazement the contents of your AB 1591!

The portions pertaining to the Capitol and the Governors environment are probably in order, but the part pertaining to the general use and possession of firearms by free citizens is absolutely abhorable.

There are in existence, laws on the books restricting loaded firearms under certain circumstances and in certain areas. Why the duplication?

However, the most dastardly part of the bill is the sleeper in section 171e.

Under this section, if I want to take my gun out for some target shooting, or for any other purpose, it will be against the law for me to have in my possession at the same time, the loaded ammunition necessary to complete my mission!

What am I supposed to do, dispatch one or the other by carrier pidgeon?

I can not believe an intelligent person being so naive as to think that by restricting the use and possession of firearms by a free people would have an appreciable effect on a crime rate.

If some one decided he was going to shoot you with a gun, you can not seriously be convinced that a law written on a piece of paper would prevent that person from obtaining a weapon one way or another. So I ask you, what have you gained?

NOTHING!



Representing NEW YORK UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY of

THE FIREARMS POLICY INFO/RESOURCES GROUP

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

If I were not aware of your fraternal affiliations, and if I thought you had failed to support that affiliation, I would be inclined to think that perhaps you were the dupe of some subversive organization, who even now, may be shouting with joy because here is another attempt to limit firearms in the possession of the citizens.

Said possession being the one strong opposing factor to the establishment of a dictatorship in this country.

Do not forget, privately owned firearms gave this country to us as it is, and the same firearms will keep it at least some freedom for us, and may some day be the deciding factor in what kind of country we live in. Just go back and read your history books about Bismark, Hitler, Mussolini and the rest of the anarchists.

If you really want to do something about crime, work on what laws are already on the books, make them effective, make the courts responsible, put the fear of God and the law into the offender. You can not stop crime by going soft on the criminal and at the same time placing restrictions on and penalizing the innocent.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "R. DeBevoise".

JUN 26 1967

EQUAL RIGHTS

Los Angeles Times

LIBERTY UNDER THE LAW  TRUE INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM

HARRISON GRAY OTIS, 1881-1917

HARRY CHANDLER, 1917-1944

NORMAN CHANDLER

Chairman & Chief Executive, Times Mirror Company

OTIS CHANDLER

*Publisher*NICK B. WILLIAMS
*Editor*ROBERT D. NELSON
*Vice-President & General Manager*FRANK HAVEN
*Managing Editor*JAMES BELLOWS
*Associate Editor*JAMES BASSETT
Director, Editorial Pages

4—Part II

THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 22, 1967

★

Black Power and Negro Despair

This year the "long, hot summer," with its threatened implication of racial violence, came early to the streets of the nation's cities. In Cincinnati and Dayton, in Tampa and Atlanta and elsewhere, disorders have flared and blood has been shed.

With well-remarked frequency, the passions which have erupted into rioting have been fanned by the black power advocates of SNCC, most notably Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, the organization's chairman. Their message has been simple and uncompromising: obdurate militancy unrelieved by the slightest concession to cooperation.

The Carmichaels and Browns, it is clear, have absolutely no program for constructive accomplishment. They preach instead black racism, rebellion and hatred. They reject any recourse to the usual political or social channels to better the position of the Negro in America. Their aim is to destroy "the system," by whatever means possible and at whatever human or material costs. "We came here," said Rap Brown the other day, "to blow Atlanta up."

It is easy and necessary to condemn the violence which the black power crusaders advocate. It is less easy, but no less necessary, to recognize that their success in rallying young Negroes to violence is inseparable from the climate in which they work, a climate which gives their advocacy

strength, opportunity and, in many cases, motive.

The inescapable truth is that if there were not frustration, anger and despair among young Negroes the incitements of the black power advocates would fall on deaf ears. That they are instead being heard, applauded and followed indicates a series of basic failures to get at the root causes of racial tensions.

To be sure, real improvement directed at giving Negroes a proper stake in American life cannot come overnight. But neither can improvement come when there is no vision, concern or leadership, as too often is the case in the nation's cities.

The situation we face is one in which a minority of Negroes and a minority of whites have joined in an unnatural tacit alliance to frustrate any progress, by encouraging mutual hatred and conflict. This minority has been abetted by apathy and selfishness at the public and the governmental level. Until that apathy is overcome, until the people and the politicians recognize the crisis facing this nation, the haters on both sides will be able to dictate events.

The summer is upon us. The immediate need is to do as much as possible to keep the lid on an explosive situation. But the far greater need is to eradicate the sources responsible for the creation and sustenance of that situation.

Compliments of
Alan Sierot
Assemblyman
59th A.D.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

April 17, 1967

The following list of demands is hereby submitted to the administration of Walter T. Helms Junior School. The parents and students are asking for action on these demands within three days, starting April 17, 1967, or the parents will be forced to withdraw their children from the school.

1. That no student be penalized or disciplined for their participation or present activity around the demands.
2. That Mr. Perrone be removed from the Richmond Unified School District.
 - a. Children are coming home nervous because of police patrolling in the schools.
 - b. Mr. Perrone upsets the children so, they can't function in the classroom and some children are breaking out in a rash.
 - c. Mr. Perrone uses profanity to the children.
3. That no student is to be disciplined unless a student of his choice accompanies him.
4. Hire more minority counselors.
5. Hire equal ratio of Negro cafeteria workers immediately.
6. That parents meet with teachers before they work in the district. This should be a requirement for new teachers.
7. Mrs. Bowers attitude must be changed.
8. The rules for suspensions should apply to long hair as well as shirt tails hanging out. (explain)
9. Hold regular faculty meetings with parents.
10. That the difference between the grading of Negro students and white students must be ended.
11. We also repeat our demand of the Principal at Helms that inter-racial assemblies and other ways for all youth to work together be started.
12. We recommend that Negro history be taught by a bonafied instructor and that it be one of the requirements for counselors entering our district to take this course, as well as those that are already here.

Concerned Parents of the
Richmond Unified School
District
FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

MURKIN ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

ARMED CITIZENS - CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

BLACK PANTHER PARTY FOR SELF-DEFENSE

WALTER HELMS SCHOOL, SAN PABLO

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1967, AT 12 AM, A LARGE GROUP OF 12 TO 15 ADULTS,

MAINLY NEGROES ARRIVED IN FRONT OF THE SCHOOL BY CARS. ONE QUARTER OF THE

GROUP WERE IDENTIFIED AS FROM NORTH RICHMOND AND A FEW MIGHT HAVE BEEN

PARENTS OF PUPILS IN SCHOOL. I WAS CALLED FROM THE CAFETERIA AND BY THE

TIME I GOT TO THE FRONT OF THE SCHOOL SOME OF THE ADULTS HAD GOTTEN ONTO

THE YARD. I ORDERED THE GATES TO BE CLOSED BY THE STUDENT SUPERVISOR AND

PREVENTED THE BALANCE OF THE GROUP FROM ENTERING. THE POLICE ARRIVED AT

THIS TIME AND I TALKED TO THE REMAINING GROUP. I TALKED TO THE LEADER OF

THE GROUP WHO INFORMED ME THEIR LAWYER, BEVERLY AXELROD, WAS WITH THE GROUP

AND HAD GOTTEN ON THE GROUNDS AND WANTED TO TALK TO ME. I WENT FROM THE

YARD TO LOOK FOR THEM BUT COULDN'T FIND THEM. I WAS TOLD LATER THAT THEY

HAD GONE TO THE STUDENTS CAFETERIA, TEACHERS CAFETERIA AND CIRCLED AROUND

THE CORRIDORS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE WING AND TALKED TO PUPILS, TEACHERS AND

CUSTODIANS.

I WENT BACK TO THE FRONT OF THE SCHOOL TO TALK TO THE GROUP AND ANOTHER

LEADER. HE ASKED ME IF I HAD TALKED TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS WHO

WAS TO MEET WITH A SUB-COMMITTEE THAT MORNING. HE SAID IF I COULD CALL THE

SUPERINTENDENT, THAT HE COULD ASSURE HIM THAT THEY HAD MET, HE WOULD GET

THE GROUP TO LEAVE. I INVITED HIM TO MY OFFICE ACCOMPANIED BY 4 OTHER

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

*J. Lyons, Principal
Walter Helms School*

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

HENCHMAN WHO SURROUNDED ME AND KEPT THEIR HANDS IN THEIR JACKETS AND PRETENDING TO HAVE GUNS. THEY ACCOMPANIED ME TO MY OFFICE. I ATTEMPTED TO CONTACT THE SUPERINTENDENT BUT SINCE IT WAS THE LUNCH HOUR, I WAS UNABLE TO DO SO. I DID CONTACT THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT WHO ASSURED ME THAT THE MEETING HAD BEEN HELD. WHEN THE BELL RANG FOR CHANGE OF CLASSES, THEY WENT OUT IN THE MAIN CORRIDOR TO BE SEEN AND CAUSE PANIC AMONG THE PUPILS AND TEACHERS AND REFUSAL ON THE PART OF ANY NEGRO PUPILS TO GO TO CLASS DISPIE MUCH URGING. THEY ASSURED ME ALL THE TIME THEY HAD, IN NO WAY, WANTED TO INTERFERE WITH CLASSES. I REQUESTED THEM TO LEAVE AND THEY REFUSED UNTIL THEY SAW THE COUNSELOR "WHO BEAT UP THE NEGRO BOY."

A BEARDED CAUCASIAN YOUTH CARRYING A TAPE RECORDER AND SURROUNDED BY A LARGE GATHERING OF NEGRO YOUTH, CAME UP AND DEMANDED TO SEE THE NURSE ABOUT A FINGER SHE HAD PUT IN SPLINTS THAT MORNING. THEY WALKED INTO OFFICES AND ASKED QUESTIONS OF THE CLERK OF COUNSELORS.

THE FINALLY GATHERED IN THE HALLS WITH THE GROUP THAT HAD WONDERED AROUND THE SCHOOL AND QUIETLY LEFT.

Trouble At School: 300 Absent

SAN PABLO — More than 300 of the 1,500 students at Helms reported kept out of class by their parents yesterday following the action of a group of adults in entering the school Monday who said they sought a counselor accused of striking a student.

San Pablo Police Chief Walter Pedretti identified the invaders as members of the Black Panthers, described as a militant Negro group.

At a meeting of Richmond Unified School District board in Grant School in Richmond Wednesday night, the counselor in question, Charles Perrone, as defended by his fellow faculty members, his colleagues in the Counselors' Assn. and by School Supt. Denzil H. Widel.

Dr. Widel told the board of an investigation held by himself and the Reverend Dan Aps, of the Greater Richmond Interfaith Project, in which for three hours they heard testimony from principals in the case.

Fall to Floor?

Their report said that they believe the boy fell to the floor accidentally and struck his head, as Perrone and Orvan Kelle, a fellow counselor who was present, said he did. The report said also that it is possible that the boy was dazed from he fall, which cut his lip.

(Turn to Page 2, Col. 7)

Militant Group Invades Helms Junior High School

(Continued from Page 1)

and bruised his face, and did not recall what did happen.

Dr. Widel said that it "was a regrettable accident, regretted by everyone concerned especially those of us who are members of the school staff."

He said that at present, Perrone is too ill to report to work, and that it is likely that he will remain away from his job for some time of orders of his physician.

"Since he is too ill to give any evidence in his own behalf at this time, and basing our conclusion on the evidence given yesterday, we believe we must support him, as it would be unthinkable to indict, judge and punish anyone on this type of evidence."

A group of north Richmond parents have demanded that Perrone be dismissed, but the superintendent's report said that when Perrone is well enough to return to work, after at least several weeks, the decision of whether to return to Helms Junior High will be his.

A letter of support from the Helms faculty, signed by every member of the staff, supported Perrone.

According to an early statement from Perrone, reiterated later by Kellewe, the boy who was injured slipped to the floor while trying to avoid a "swat" administered with the permission of his guardian because he had cut school.

The counselor's association letter gave unanimous support to Perrone and Kellewe, and to Mrs. Bobbie Bowers, another counselor included in the demands by parents.

Dr. Widel emphasized that his investigation was undertaken because of the visit to his office of a group of parents from north Richmond who asked in a "constructive manner" that such investigation be held.

"I wish to inform the board," the superintendent said, "that we will not yield to any group of parents who demand 'fire that employe.' We simply cannot conduct a school district that way."

The superintendent also informed the board of the control plans being made in the event of major disturbances in the schools. The plans are being set up with representatives of law enforcement agencies in the district.

Loyette
4-21-67

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

ARMED CITIZENS - CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

BLACK PANTHER PARTY FOR SELF-DEFENSE

ON APRIL 1st, 1967, A NEGRO NAMED DENZIL DOWELL WAS SHOT DURING AN ATTEMPTED ESCAPE FROM A BURGLARY. HE WAS KILLED BY DEPUTY SHERIFF MELVIN BRUNKHURST IN NORTH RICHMOND, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY. THE HOMICIDE OCCURRED AT 5 AM. IMMEDIATELY THEREAFTER DEPUTY SHERIFF BRUNKHURST WAS CLEARED BY A CORONERS JURY WHO HELD THE HOMICIDE TO BE JUSTIFIABLE.

ON APRIL 17, 1967, MR. NEJEDLY MET WITH THE DOWELL FAMILY CONCERNING THE MURDER OF DENZIL DOWELL AT THE OFFICE OF DAVE WILLIAMS, WHO IS THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZER FOR THE COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY SERVICES IN RICHMOND. MR. NEJEDLY HAD RECEIVED A REQUEST FROM MR. WILLIAMS TO MEET WITH THE DOWELL FAMILY AT THIS TIME. UPON ARRIVING A SHORT 5 TO 10 MINUTE DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE BETWEEN MR. NEJEDLY AND THE DOWELL MOTHER, AT WHICH TIME 8 TO 9 MEMBERS OF THE BLACK PANTHER ORGANIZATION ENTERED FULLY ARMED. SOME WERE CARRYING SHOTGUNS AND THEY WERE ALL ARMED, WITH SOME CARRYING SHOTGUNS AND OTHERS CARRYING SIDE ARMS. THEY ATTEMPTED TO QUESTION MR. NEJEDLY BY ASKING QUESTIONS REGARDING THE DOWELL DEATH AND CHALLENGE THE FACT THAT IT HADN'T BEEN INVESTIGATED PROPERLY AND THAT INJUSTICE WAS OCCURRING. AFTER A BRIEF CONVERSATION OF 5 OR 10 MINUTES, MR. NEJEDLY LEFT. DURING THE CONVERSATION HE ONLY ATTEMPTED TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THAT WOULD BE OF INTEREST TO MRS. DOWELL.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

JUL 11 1967

In a recent editorial, KABC-TV supported legislation which would ban loaded guns from public places. Here to rebut that position is Mr. Gordon Powers, representing the 34th District of the California Republican Assembly and the National Rifle Association . . .

EDITORIAL REBUTTAL #06A67

"LOADED GUNS"

EDITORIAL

"The CRA and National Rifle Association have always stood for human rights, among which is the natural and necessary right of self-defense as recognized by the provision in the Constitution to bear arms.

"It is no more logical to require our citizens to carry unloaded guns, than to inhibit freedom of religion by taking away the act of worship, or to infringe the freedom of the press by making the use of ink illegal.

"We believe that most firearms legislation is of little value in the prevention of crime to justify the restrictions it places on citizens.

"There is no justification for any law which can make a prudent law-abiding citizen an unwitting violator, or which denies the right of self-defense.

"We urge all citizens to write the Governor and their Senators to oppose this Assembly Bill 1591."

KABC-TV regularly presents editorials on topics of vital interest to its viewers. Clearly labeled as opinion, these television editorials are delivered by KABC-TV Vice President and General Manager, Elton H. Rule. Your comments concerning the attached editorial will be greatly appreciated.

V. Harrison Mitchell,
Editorial Director

The above editorial rebuttal was telecast a total of six times, -- on July 8, 9 and 10, 1967.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

June 14, 1967

Mrs. Genevieve Grenberg
1822 - 13th Avenue
E. Oakland, Calif. 94606

Dear Mrs. Grenberg:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

701571

MAY 26 1967

Assemblyman Mulford:

I am enclosing this article for you to read in case you do not see it. It may help you to frame a bill which will take in the secret Black Panther Club.

I hope you can get a bill through that will cover all the angles. You know and I know our state was never like this before.

What we need now most desperately is

bill to punish these
people who tear down
& mistreat our flag.
There seems to be noise
at this time.

Sincerely
Benjamin Franklin
1773-1798
C. W. Bond

From Page 1
we (Negroes) will be wiped out. But we'll take as many whites with us as we can."

VIEWS DIFFER

There is a rift, if not a split between the secret Panthers of San Francisco and the highly public Panthers of Oakland.

The Oakland-based Panthers made the notorious armed foray into the State Legislature earlier this month. Yesterday, the same outfit dispatched two shotgun-carrying members to an Oakland Municipal Court room where three members were being arraigned on weapons charges.

The underground Panthers feel the Oaklanders "blew their cool" in coming in out of the cold to flaunt their weapons in public places.

"Now the cops know the names of everyone of them," the Examiner was told. And that, according to the San Francisco Panthers, defeats the purpose of the movement.

sale of firearms and never knowingly allow a gun of any type to pass into the hands of anyone who may misuse it — confirmed that an AR-15 was in order under the name given to The Examiner.

There is nothing illegal about the sale or possession of such rifles.

In fact, the secret Panthers operate under the name of

"The Afro-American Gun Club," and said that under this title they have applied for membership in the National Rifle Association. It was done "for legal and other reasons."

A spokesman for N.R.A. in Washington, D.C. said that it cannot reveal names of member clubs or applicants for membership.

'You Black People— Get Rifles'

The Black Panther Party For Self-Defense was backed today by the Black Student Union of San Francisco State College in its demand for self-determination for black people.

The BSU held a fund-raising rally at noon yesterday on the campus. About 200 persons attended.

Poet-playwright, Le Roi Jones, visiting professor at State, was the principal speaker.

Jones said, "Black people have to arm themselves—if you want to survive."

"You black people better get yourself a gun, get yourself a rifle."

"If you don't arm yourself, you'll die when the white man says you must die."

Jones shouted, "The white policeman is there to do (the white man's) bidding—not yours."

"The Black Panthers were not present," he explained since they had to be arraigned in Sacramento.

A group of Black Panthers, carrying guns, entered the chamber of the State Assembly in Sacramento Tuesday and later were booked on conspiracy charges.

Several speakers preceded Jones, and expressed the same or similar sentiments the professor did.

Outside of a few hecklers, the crowd at the rally was attentive and quiet.

To The Examiner

The allowing of the Black Panthers, a so-called revolutionary party of discontents, to carry guns as a threat certainly calls for a tightening of laws.

According to your story (April 30), Panther lieutenant Bobby George Seale works as a family counselor for the North Oakland Community Center, the local War on Poverty agency. He is paid \$22 a month. Seale's record included a six months term in military prison for disrespect to an Air Force officer and a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958.

In other words, my tax dollars are helping pay the salary of this man who is working as a family counselor for a government agency I protest.

One would think that the majority of Negro people would be the first to protest because groups like the Panthers are not representative people for any one

SHERMAN LEE
San Francisco



Jack Rosenbaum

Panther 'Fire'

Signs of times: A Black Panther marched into the Hall of Justice yesterday, rifle slung over shoulder, waited in line, paid a traffic fine, and marched out again.

Secret Squad

S.F. Panthers Armed With Deadly AR-15

By JERRY BELCHER
Staff Writer

Copyright, 1967, San Francisco Examiner

Quietly and without dramatics, a well-armed underground squad of Black Panthers has been organized in San Francisco.

The unit is small—"You can say at least 20 guys—15 of us are Muni bus drivers." But it is well armed.

The secret Black Panther outfit is preparing itself for a last stand guerrilla fight in what its members apparently in all sincerity believe will be a white war of extermination against Negroes.

Some are equipped with AR-15 rifles — semi-automatic weapons that are so-called "sporterized" versions of the M-16 rifles now used in Vietnam by American combat troops.

NO UNIFORMS

The San Francisco Panthers never wear uniforms (except Mini driver uniforms when they are working) nor patrol the streets as the Oakland Panthers do.

The underground Panthers formed nearly a year ago — have so far confined their activities largely to secret meetings at which techniques and tactics of guerrilla warfare are studied, and to target practice sessions on public ranges in San Mateo County.

Ironically and ominously the Panthers said, they sometimes are firing on the range at the same time as Minuteman riflemen.

Why was the existence of the underground Panther unit revealed?

"We want people — especially black people — to know that we are around," said the source here. "But we don't want anyone to know who we are."

BUY GUNS HERE

The same source told The Examiner that a number of AR-15 rifles had been purchased at local department stores — and that one such rifle was now on order.

One department store — displaying a sign that reads, "We will constantly exercise our good judgment in the

Black Panthers in S. F.

—From Page 1

we (Negroes) will be wiped out. But we'll take as many whites with us as we can."

VIEWS DIFFER

There is a rift, if not a split, between the secret Panthers of San Francisco and the highly public Panthers of Oakland.

The Oakland-based Panthers made the notorious armed foray into the State Legislature earlier this month. Yesterday, the same outfit dispatched two shotgun-carrying members to an Oakland Municipal Court room where three members were being arraigned on weapons charges.

The underground Panthers feel the Oaklanders "blew their cool" in coming in out of the cold to flaunt their weapons in public places.

Now the cops know the names of everyone of them, the Examiner was told. And that, according to the San Francisco Panthers, defeats the purpose of the movement.

sale of firearms and never knowingly allow a gun of any type to pass into the hands of anyone who may misuse it — confirmed that an AR-15 was on order under the name given to The Examiner.

There is nothing illegal about the sale or possession of such rifles.

In fact, the secret Panthers operate under the name of

"The Afro-American Club," and said that this title they have applied for membership in the National Rifle Association. was done "for legal and other reasons."

A spokesman for N.R.A. in Washington, said that it cannot reveal names of member clubs applicants for members

NO NAME

Oakland, Calif. JUN 30 1967

Sir: Your proposal on gun restrictions may be a very natural reaction to a panic demand, but is it far-sighted and might it result in just the opposite of the effect that you seek? With civil disobedience rampant, every possible gun should be in the hands of those whose stakes are in the preservation of law and order to counter the guns already in the hands of a well-armed and aggressively disobedient minority. Guns will be obtained outside of any laws, and no police force is going to be able, alone, to cope with them; police will need every helper they can get. Such a law, I believe, not only unconstitutional, and politically, its sponsorship might be about as much of a "big no" as a legislator could commit in the present state of affairs in this country!



To	DAN Ford	Message	
Date	6/2	Time	8:45 P.M.
Phone Call Record			42
			Santa Cruz
Mr.	UHA	Message Taken By	Gun Bill
of	(1201)	TELEPHONED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Phone	688-3754	PLEASE PHONE	<input type="checkbox"/>
		CALLED TO SEE YOU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		WILL CALL AGAIN	<input type="checkbox"/>
		WANTS TO SEE YOU	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SEE ME	<input type="checkbox"/>

from the desk of . . .

DON MULFORD

Mr. Uhl wanted the man IN CONTROL of the gun bill. I told him Mr. Mulford was the AUTHOR of the bill, not in control. I asked if he would speak to Mr. Walthall, the Administrative Assistant, and he said NO; he only would talk to the man at the top.

Mr. Uhl was quite excited and went on at great length about his big contributions to Governor Reagan. He talked on about the Governor in some not so nice language.

He then wanted me to send him two copies of the State phone directory. I told him I could not do this, but understood he might be able to purchase them through the Documents Section of the State Printing Plant. He wanted the head man there and I gave him the name and number of Silvius, the State Printer.

He also wanted the man IN CONTROL of the Mental Health bill (AB 1220). I told him Lanterman and Petris were co-authors and gave him their extensions.

Mr. Uhl wants Mr. Mulford to call him today. He will be waiting. I told him Mr. Mulford was in committee, then would be on the Floor. and I did not know if he could call him today. He had a few words to say about that too.

Ernestine

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON FORD

Date 6/1/67

1591

To Mr. Mulford

Re

AB 1591

JUN 2 1967

Mrs. Alston C. Allen
1215 Scott Street
El Cerrito, California

Mrs. Allen telephoned to say she is very much in favor of your firearms legislation. She said that she and her family visited Lake Anza last weekend and there were some incidents involving violent groups of young Negroes which the law enforcement officers were unable to control. One of the Negro youths had a loaded gun on the beach.

She hopes that some effective legislation will be passed before summer.

*Thanks -
Optimistic*

Barbara

June 14, 1967

Mr. Ralph D. Dart
468 - 41st Street
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Dart:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter addressed to Senator Sherman concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MAY 22 1967

468 41st St.
Oakland, California
5/20/67


Dear Senator Sherman,

I have been informed that Mulford's arms bill has passed the Assembly, and I wish to express my opposition to this bill as I understand it.

Reason: During these days of crime and violence on the streets and even within the confines of one's own home, a man has no choice but to be his own first line of defense against the any-time and unknown-time attack of criminals and hoodlums. The hoods already have all the advantage of the element of surprise, and while I am not critical of the police, the deed is usually done by the time they arrive. I live in an integrated neighborhood where I not infrequently have groups of a dozen or more of these juvenile hoods loitering or parading around not ten feet from my front door...Mulford lives up in Piedmont and I doubt that he has any first-hand experience with matters such as this...the man is probably well-intentioned, but I don't mean to let his good intentions get me killed...if he wants to be a hero, let him move out around 98th Ave. where there are plenty chances for heroism...I want to be left in peace in my home, and I intend to defend that home from the attack of anyone who comes charging thru the door or sneaking thru the window. Neither Mulford nor anyone else can disarm the hoods, legislation or no legislation...all this bill can do is to place me at a greater disadvantage than I already am and I don't like that one damn bit.

Please send a copy of the bill to me at the above address.

Sincerely,



Ralph D. Dart

Copy to: Mulford
Reagan

MAY 11 1967

9 May 1967

Mr. Don Mulford
Assemblyman
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

I am very interested in your current bill to outlaw the carrying of fire arms and have picked it as my college term paper subject.

I would be very grateful for any and all literature you might provide me with regarding this subject.

Thank you,

David K. Milligan

David K. Milligan
3836 Baldwin Drive
Santa Clara, California
95051

June 6, 1967

Mr. David K. Milligan
3836 Baldwin Drive
Santa Clara, California 95051

Dear David:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning
Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored.

I am sorry I was unable to reply to your
letter sooner. As you can see from the
enclosed copy of AB 1591, the measure was
amended many times and I hesitated to send
you a copy until it was in final form.

While the enclosed bill probably reached
you too late to be of assistance to you
on your term paper, it may still be of
interest to you. Good luck on the paper!

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

enclosure

May 31, 1967

Mr. William B. Medina
P. O. Box 34
Mountain View, California 94040

Dear Mr. Medina:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your comments on the gun-control bills now before Congress.

I appreciate having the information for my legislative library.

As I am sure you are aware, I have authored a gun-control bill that is now being considered by the California State Legislature. My bill, AB 1591, prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded gun in a public place or on a public street. I feel that this legislation is urgently needed. I also think a thorough study of firearms and all of the ramifications is needed.

I cannot agree with you that it is imperative to form a voluntary group of citizens to help enforce the law. I feel this is the responsibility of the various law enforcement agencies.

I want to make it clear that I too believe in the Second Amendment to the Constitution, but I can see no legitimate reason for bands of armed citizens roaming our streets and countrysides intimidating all who do not agree with them.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

William B. Medina
P.O. Box Number 34
Mountain View, California 94040

MAY 16 1967

May 10, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

I have taken the time to write this letter and have undergone the expense of reproducing it; therefore, will you please pay me the courtesy of reading it in its entirety?

RE: ARMS, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND CRIME

I understand the Dodd S 1 bill and the Celler HR 5384 bill which proposes more controls for the sale, transfer and possession of firearms, is again coming up before the house and the congress. As I recall, there have been several occasions in the past where Senator Dodd and his supporters have attempted to cram this legislation down the public's throat, and it seems as though each time it disappears from public view and hides within the sanctuary of governmental procedure, this type of legislation has a way of rearing its ugly head and again threatening one of America's fundamental rights.

Since you have heard Senator Dodd's arguments for his proposed laws, and since you are in the position of representing me and thousands like me, I then ask that you maintain an open mind and examine the following argument which I will present.

The Second Amendment of the United States Constitution reads:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

You may interpret this as meaning: That the militia (a voluntary citizens army) has since been replaced by an organized Federally supported system of armed forces, and that the common citizen need no longer possess and bear arms for military purposes. This appears to be Senator Dodd's reasoning, and along with this line of thought, would be the conclusion that by

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

(2)

eliminating firearms, we as a nation could reduce crimes of violence.

Now I shall ask your indulgence as we explore another interpretation of the second amendment, one which I feel was foreseen by our nation's founding fathers in their seemingly infinite wisdom: That the militia (the voluntary citizens army of their time and the armed forces of our era) must be well-regulated, and must serve to protect this nation, and keep it secure from foreign invaders.

I believe that "well-regulated" in this instance, is the key word. Well-regulated to the extent that the militia (armed forces) serves its intended purpose, i.e., to protect and keep secure.

What happens when the militia (armed forces) is no longer well-regulated? We need only look back a few years at Nazi Germany to see an excellent example of how a few evil politicians gained control of the armed forces, and with these armies, subjugated nations, conquered peoples, and perpetrated some of the most heinous criminal acts in the history of man.

Why was this allowed to happen? One of the answers lies in the fact that ALL firearms in Germany were under government control, and it was a simple matter for the German army to demand these arms from the German citizens, thus leaving them without the means of defending themselves against their own armies. Proportionally, any nation's armies constitute a relatively small percentage of its population, and the heads of state comprise an insignificant percentage of the citizenry; therefore, if and when an attempt to subjugate a nation is made by that nation's armed forces, with or without the consent of that nation's heads of state, who but the citizens can regulate these armed forces?

How could Americans bring about the regulation of its armed forces as per our constitution's second amendment without arms in the event that our constitution were stripped from us? The answer is, we couldn't!

You may at this stage of my argument think that I am an advocate of armed revolution. Well I am, but only if and when the crimes of a government become unbearable.

Let us never forget that armed revolution has given us a nation which has been the birthplace of economic, religious, scientific, and cultural freedom that has never before been known to mankind. Let us also remember that because our nation was founded on armed revolution, we have served as an inspiration to subjugated people throughout the world.

Armed revolution will never occur in the United States as long as we, as a people maintain control of our government, and as long as our government maintains, protects, and honors our constitution.

I, for one, don't think that the constitution of the United States as it was adopted in 1787, is an outdated, antiquated, document which needs to be revised, rewritten, or discarded, as I have often heard my fellow Americans say. On the contrary, I believe that we as a nation must live that document every hour of everyday of our lives, or die by political strangulation.

Senator Dodd's and Mr. Celler's bills will accomplish nothing more than a contribution toward the accelerated denial of our liberties, and the ultimate removal of our constitution in its entirety by an all-consuming central government.

These bills will not prevent, discourage, or in anyway eliminate crimes of violence, and any supposition to the contrary, is a legislative pipe dream. This statement can be substantiated by the fact that New York (a State who's firearms are restricted) has as many violent crimes per populus as the remainder of the country.

You will, I'm sure, recall that recently, in Illinois, eight student nurses were murdered in cold blood. They weren't shot, but rather they were knived, one by one, while the ninth girl lay hidden in terror under her bed, and while the assailant carefully went about his rotten task in the other room. I will wager, that if a gun had been available to any one of those nine girls, and if she had known how to use it, seven of the dead would be alive today!

Remember also that incident in New York when thirty eight people stood by for half an hour and listened to a girl's cries for help while her assailant repeatedly thrust his knife into her.

Now I ask you Sir, if you were unarmed, and if you knew that by being unarmed you would probably get knived, would you have gone to that girl's aid? You are not isolated in your answer, for it seems that thirty eight other people agree with you.

Again, I would wager that if the citizens of New York were allowed to exercise their constitutional right to bear firearms, that girl could very well be alive today.

Then we must also remember the incident where a girl, again in New York, was in the process of being assaulted when she produced a knife and repelled her assailant, and was subsequently arrested for carrying a concealed weapon, much to the outrage of the entire nation.

New York's Sullivan Act has done nothing but tie the citizen's

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

(4)

hands so that he cannot defend himself when it becomes necessary to do so.

In the above examples, the weapons were knives and not guns, and yet, I don't hear anyone saying that by controlling the interstate flow of knives or by registering them, we could reduce crime.

You may argue that one should call the police for help, and I thoroughly agree, if one can get to a telephone, if one has a dime, if one can remember the police department's number, and most important of all, if one's assailant will wait while one dials.

Thus far I have been nothing but critical and we all know how easy this is, hence I shall offer you a solution to the crime problem which is practical, workable, and economical.

Every policeman was at one time, a citizen with hate, love, anger, fear, integrity, honesty, self-discipline, and every other characteristic which separates man from the animals; and there is absolutely no evidence that the policeman has undergone any change which would make him any less a citizen or a human being. Based on this fact, one could argue that the local cop is emotionally, morally, and temperamentally, the same person now as he was when he first joined the force, with the exception of natural maturity which comes only with age.

Since many male citizens were in the military service and were taught the use of arms, since most citizens are concerned with the rising crime rate and with their family's safety, and since the already understaffed police departments are over burdened with the necessity of being everywhere at once, it would seem imperative to form a voluntary group of citizens who are interested in enforcing the law.

To establish such a group, the local police chief need only appeal to the public via the mass media, and he would receive overwhelming response. Out of the great numbers who would apply, the police department could screen the applicants as carefully as they would their prospective employees.

Unlike the current auxiliary police programs which are in effect, make this citizen volunteer no less a policeman than his salaried counterpart. By that I mean he is to be deputized, he is to be regularly attending a police school or class, he is to be responsible to the police chief for his conduct, and he is to be at all times armed by carrying a concealed weapon.

Again unlike the current auxiliary police programs, the volunteer policeman is neither to be assigned the task of overseeing the crowd at the local ball park, nor is he to be charged with the responsibility of quieting a bunch of noisey kids at the local drive-in, but rather he is to go about his daily tasks or conduct

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
(5)

his normal business activities, and if it becomes necessary, render immediate aid when he sees a crime of violence being committed. Since he is armed, he is in the position of rendering that aid. An unarmed bystander is as helpless to give aid as the person upon whom the crime is being committed.

You may argue that you can't arm every nut in town, and I will say that I'm not advocating arming nuts! I'm advocating arming responsible citizens.

You may ask whom could we consider responsible? It would seem that the police departments have been answering this question for years, but my answer would be to examine your criminal files and your tax rolls.

Again, you may argue that people will be shooting each other whenever they become angry. Let us really examine this by first asking, how often does an armed off-duty policeman shoot someone with whom he is angry? Not often. Furthermore, murder, assault, rape, highway deaths, and man's life expectancy are among the statistically predictable. Before any crime of violence such as murder, robbery, or rape can occur, an assault must first be made upon the victim. Every assault is indeed a crime of violence whether or not the assault terminates the victim's life or simply results in his mutilation. Statistics will bear out that assault by gun is among the lowest percentage figures in the nation. Check your statistical abstract in your public library. In 1966 the following figures were obtained from the statistical clerk's offices of the local police departments.

Campbell, California - Total Assaults 30

By Gun	1	Percentage -	3.3%
By Knife	5	Percentage -	16.7%
By Physical	6	Percentage -	20.0%
By Other Weapons	18	Percentage -	60.0%

San Jose, California - Total Assaults 149

By Gun	32	Percentage -	21.5%
By Knife	68	Percentage -	45.6%
By Physical	18	Percentage -	12.1%
By Other Weapons	31	Percentage -	20.8%

Sunnyvale, California - Total Assaults 206

By Gun	6	Percentage -	2.9%
By Knife	10	Percentage -	4.9%
By Physical	27	Percentage -	13.1%
By Other Weapons	163	Percentage -	79.1%

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
(6)

San Francisco, California - Total Assaults 2057

By Gun	235	Percentage -	11.4%
By Knife	930	Percentage -	45.2%
By Physical	416	Percentage -	20.2%
By Other Weapons	476	Percentage -	23.2%

NATIONAL PERCENTAGE FOR 1965 FROM THE F.B.I REPORT

<u>States</u>	<u>Gun</u>	<u>Knife</u>	<u>Physical</u>	<u>By Other Weapons</u>
NORTH EAST	10.3%	39.8%	26.8%	23.1%
NORTH CENTRAL	16.8%	36.7%	24.6%	21.8%
SOUTHERN	19.8%	35.8%	25.3%	19.1%
WESTERN	18.3%	29.7%	25.7%	26.3%
NATIONAL AVERAGE	16.3%	35.5%	25.6%	22.6%

I would say that these figures speak for themselves!

Now for the sake of argument, let us assume that one of our armed citizens murders someone. It is a little known fact that only one out of every four murders is solved. The reason for this low percentage is the fact that very little or nothing is known about the murderer. But we know all about our killer-citizen. We know where he lives, his line of work, his name, his social security number, his friends, probably his family, his fingerprints, his picture, his drivers license number, his car, his car's license number, even to the extent of knowing his blood type. Where can he run without being apprehended?

Let us also acknowledge the fact that guns constitute an extremely noisy and attention-getting way of doing murder. If one fires a gun, it can be heard for blocks, and no killer wants to take this chance.

Now let us examine the advantages of the outlined citizen-policeman concept. In a hypothetical city of 700,000 population and a working police force of 700 men who are actually in the streets (whether on or off duty), the criminal's probability of being seen and stopped while doing a crime is one in one thousand or 0.1%. If we installed an additional one thousand citizen-policemen, we would have a working force of 1700 men and the criminal's probability of being seen and apprehended would become 0.24%. Assume that instead of one thousand citizen-policemen, we added five thousand (which is a more realistic figure for a city of 700,000) giving us a total of 5700 as a working force. This would make the probability of apprehension 0.81%.

Probabilities and statistics are fine, but what do they really mean? They mean this: That by using a five thousand man volunteer force in addition to the existing seven hundred man force, a seven hundred percent increase in stopped crime is possible. It means an additional seven crimes per thousand could actually be stopped.

The number of stopped crimes, however, would be only a dividend of the citizen-policeman concept, for the primary function of the program, as I have outlined it, is to cause a decrease in the crime rate. This would be accomplished through fear. Fear, on the part of the potential criminal, of being seen and arrested. The program gains strength from the fact that the criminal would know that there exists five thousand armed citizens, all of whom are in plain clothes, and none of whom are predictably in any certain place at any given time. Under these circumstances, the potential criminal would find himself at an extreme disadvantage. Unlike the present criminal, who assumes that he won't be seen or caught and is for the most part correct, the criminal would realize that the citizen-policeman program is in effect, and that he is certainly placing his freedom in jeopardy.

In addition to the above mentioned obvious advantages, our society would glean many additional benefits such as improved police-community relations. This would be accomplished through a better public understanding of our police departments, and would ultimately lead to a more understanding public. Along with an understanding public, would come a revitalization of our rapidly deteriorating respect for laws and man's rights under those laws.

Because of this program, it would no longer be necessary to consider removing another of our fundamental liberties, and this in itself would be an advantage.

The cost of inacting the citizen-policeman program by training, equipping, and insuring the citizen, would be more than offset by the tremendous savings of lives and property which are now being lost to crime.

If this concept were enacted, the ultimate result would be one of increased public safety wherein men, women and children could again walk the streets without the fear of being attacked.

If this concept is not enacted, and if firearms are ultimately removed from the public, you will not have prevented or reduced violent crimes, but rather you have succeeded only in penalizing the citizen, and you will have given the criminal a license to prey upon defenceless people. The only people who obey laws are law-abiding citizens, and if laws prohibiting guns are passed, the only people who will obey these laws are, again law-abiding citizens. The criminal regularly breaks laws. If laws prohibiting guns are passed, the criminal will break them for he is

accustomed to this, and it is simply another law to break. If gun laws are passed, we will I am sure, convert some honest, law-abiding citizens into criminals because some citizens simply won't relinquish their right to bear firearms.

You may argue that if the citizen wishes to bear arms he can obtain a permit. This statement is the sugar coating on a bitter pill. I recall several years ago while I was travelling extensively, I applied for a gun permit, and I was systematically and bureaucratically refused. This systematic, bureaucratic refusal consisted of being verbally shuffled from office to office and from official to official until I finally gave up. Needless to say, I was most annoyed in view of the fact that I am not a convicted felon, I have had a secret security clearance, and I am a responsible, tax-paying citizen.

In view of the foregoing facts and arguments, whom will you arm ---- the criminal or the citizen?

Respectfully,



William B. Medina.

My grateful acknowledgements to:

The Campbell Police Department
The San Jose Police Department
The Sunnyvale Police Department
The San Francisco Police Department
Those police officers and citizens who assisted me in obtaining the information herein contained.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

5/26/67

Clyde:

On 5/22/67 you talked to a Lemar Detro, Director,
Professional Association of Investigators - Advisory Board -

Will you please relate conversation to DM?

AC

licensed
Conversation was brief. Mr. Detro wanted to know if/private investigators
and private uniformed patrols were exempted in AB 1591. He was informed that
they were.

G.W.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON MUL. RD

Date 5/17/67

To

Re:

Phone call

Re AB 1591

Tom Carroll, Consultant, Criminal Procedure Committee

Could not get a copy of amendments to AB 1591 from Knox.

Does Mr. Mulford have an extra copy he could send up to
Mr. Carroll (Room 4132) so he can prepare a digest.

fd

May 8, 1967
Ken Bernardi
3050 Fruitvale Ave. #6
Oakland, Calif.

REC'D MAY 10 1967

Dear Sir,

I am a student attending Merritt College in Oakland. I am planning to do a research paper on California's gun laws for my American government class. I understand you have a bill in the legislature concerning gun laws. I would appreciate it very much if you would send me a copy of this bill.

Sincerely,

Kenneth C. Bernardi

sent 5/15/67
ek

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

5- 9- 67

DON:

Private investigators in California are licensed under provisions of the Business and Professions Code.

Jerry M. Meyer, West Sacramento; he operates the Meyer Security Service, Carl Paular of the Paular Service Bureau, and Bill E. Brown, both of Sacramento say AB 1591 as written and ~~amended~~ amended would all but put them out of business, along with all private ~~px~~ patrols that operate under the Business and Professions Code.

May 9, 1967

Mr. Edward J. Flynn
1327 South Oakknoll
Pasadena, California 91106

Dear Ed:

Sorry I missed you. You must admit I go to
great lengths to impress you.

Hope to see you soon.

All the best,

DON MULFORD

fd

*Send
a/B 1591
when printed
with amended
sent 6/9/67
em*

May 3, 1967

Mr. Merle Gow
P. O. Box 89
Wilton, California

Dear Mr. Gow:

In reply to your telephone conversation
I am enclosing a copy of AB 1591, as you
requested.

I would like to point out that amendments
were offered on this bill in committee
yesterday. I have had one of my secretaries
type in the amendments as they are not in
print at the present time.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

FROM THE DESK OF

Assemblyman Don Mulford:

Thought you might be interested in this letter from a constituent of mine. If you have difficulty reading this copy, I will make the original letter available to you.

MAY 12 1987

ASSEMBLYMAN EARLE P. CRANDALL

File
1591
per
OR

San Jose, Calif

May 4, 1967

To Hon. Earl P. Brandell

State Capitol

Sacramento

Dear Friend Earle

We wish to bring to you our sentiments, and feelings in regards to the recent take over of our State Capitol and Legislative body while in session by a group of armed irresponsible hoodlums.

This kind of action, by this group, or similar groups, cannot, and will not be condoned, or tolerated by myself, or by any and all members of the various groups that I represent.

First off, I want to make it very clear that we do not discriminate against any minority group who has a valid cause to present, verbally, and in a gentlemanly way, and at the right time, and the right place, should be granted every courtesy with a full hearing, and if said party has a sound case a reason, then every effort should be done to see that true justice is granted. This is what our nation was founded on, and has made it the greatest nation in the world today.

On the other hand, we cannot, and will not tolerate certain irresponsible people, trying by force, to push certain legislation of their own upon our duly elected legislative bodies to the

detriment of this body, and to the people as a whole.

In other words, in order to gain what they are after they are walking on our rights, and we don't like it !!

I, and the members of my various groups have been through much to assure posterity that these freedoms which we fought for would always be maintained, and that every man would have an opportunity in this country if he so desired to make a place for himself. I know that I speak this for my Buddies in the various Veterans Hospitals who will never walk our streets in life again, and for my Buddies who gave their all, that Democracy might live, and now be under the white crosses of the various cemeteries here, and overseas.

Earle, our membership went into white heat when they learned of this incident at our State Capitol.

We know that these things are all being lead or inspired by the Communist Party, U.S.A. Same as in our schools and colleges the picketing, the sit downs, marches, Get-out-of-Viet Nam, with drinking, Dope, and Sex. These people are out to wreck us. We have stood this kind of groups - ours just as long as we are going to stand for it.

We are going to ask for a united front on this to get behind our Legislators in creating new Laws to see that any armed group, no matter who it is, will never again be able to force its way into our State Capitol.

again. That new Laws and penalties be written in our books so severe, and with teeth in it, that no one would dare violate it.

I, as Americanism chairman of the United Veterans Council of Santa Clara County, and backed by some 50 various Veteran Organizations plus their Ladies Auxiliaries, do urge you to take prompt, and drastic action, and get this on the books. Lets get California back where it belongs.

We shall be very happy to lend our support in this venture.

We will be watching very closely as to this.

Keep us advised,

Thank you very much

Sincerely

Henry G. Stout

321 So. 16th St

San Jose

Calif 95112

Americanism Chairman
United Veterans Council
of Santa Clara County,

NEW BUSINESS

Councilman Brom: Mr. President, I have on my desk a communication from the City Attorney, dated May 1, in which he attaches letters of commendation to one of his staff, Mr. Shragge. I think that each one of the members of the Council have one of these letters. I think it would be entirely appropriate for the Council to recognize the fact that considerable work is being done by the City Attorney's office in which members of the Council doesn't ordinarily have any means of being aware of just how extensive this work is. For example, in the last year and a half, there were six cases filed against the city of Oakland in which damages were asked for almost two million dollars, to be exact \$1,991,000., some of those cases have been decided in favor of the city some of them, I understand are still waiting decision. But I feel that the Council should be aware of the splendid work that the legal department of the city is doing.

President Reading: Thank you, Mr. Brom. I intended to bring this matter up also and make mention of it. I think you covered it much better than I could cover it. I also would add my commendation to the city attorney's office for the fine work that they are doing.

President Reading: We also have a second matter of new business have received a letter to the City Manager from the Director of Planning on the policy for notifying interested parties of zoning appeal hearings before the City Council. This is in reference to the question that was raised at the Cherry hearing on Tuesday evening as to why the participants in this matter had not been notified and apparently the memo had been lost and this sets up an additional procedure to insure that this would not happen in the future.

Councilman Maggiora: Mr. President, I am a little embarrassed and ashamed in what happened up at Sacramento yesterday. There are a number of minors that are involved who are part of this Black Panther Group. They have an office at 56th and Grove. I feel the least we can do is to urge and endorse this legislation that Assemblyman Mulford is preparing with all the backing it would be possible to give. I feel that possibly we could suggest to the City Manager in the case of these minors, his office could check with the parents of the number of them that were

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 4, 1967

-4-

17, 18. There maybe something that we could do to help out in a constructive way by talking with the parents. I feel that they are being misguided in some ways and I think that certainly we should do something about it at this level as well as what is going on in the legislature. So I could make that in a form of a motion.

President Reading: The motion should be in the form of a resolution to the state legislature urging passage of the

Councilman Maggiora: Urging and endorsing passage

President Reading: All right, do you so move

Councilman Maggiora: I would so move

President Reading: Second

Councilman Osborne: I second it.

President Reading: It has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion.

On the motion.

Upon call of the roll, the motion passed by Ayes: 9.

Councilman Maggiora: I would like to see the manager follow through on the other suggestion.

President Reading: All right, through Al Taylor and his department. Fine.

COMMUNICATIONS

From Board of Education requesting City Council levy 5 cent capital tax for school purposes.

President Reading: I have scheduled a joint meeting between the Council and the School Board to discuss this further. Madam Clerk, do you have the date on that.

Clerk: I don't have the date.

President Reading: Mr. Keithley, do you recall the date of that meeting.

Mr. Keithley: Yes, excuse me, I do have that for you, Mayor.

May 23, Tuesday, 2:30 p.m.

President Reading: All right, fine.

Councilman Rilea: Mr. Mayor, couldn't that be held over till such time we meet with Mr. Keithley and have that all under one session. I understand we are going to have a session for one day, practically

5-1-67



ASSEMBLYMAN MULFO

*It is a pleasure to send the enclosed
material which you requested*

CITY OF RICHMOND
CITY HALL
RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA
232-1212

C. E. BROWN, Chief of Police

Richmond, Calif
29 Apr 67

TO: Chief Brown
Capt. Bacon
Lt. Phelps
Sgt. Garfield
Off. Rawson

Dear Sirs:

On this date, at app. 1:30 PM I drove into the area of 1717 2nd St., Richmond, Cal. This was the area of the so called Black Panther rally. At this time there were app. 100 people in the immediate area just milling about, of this number there were app. 20 juveniles ranging in age from 10 to 16 years. The first sight I noticed was armed guards. At 1717 2nd St an armed guard was stationed on top of the building with a carbine, across the street another guard was stationed on a building with a shotgun. There were two men at both ends of the 1700 block of 2nd St, both armed with side arms and pistol belts. I asked one of the guards as to their number and he replied, there were 16 of the panthers at the rally. I noted that there were about 4 white persons in the group around the speaker, there was also a man that appeared to be chinese wearing a sidearm. I noted four people in the crowd taking pictures and one person with a tape recorder. As the speaker began to speak the crowd grew larger to about 150 to 200 people. This number did not last long but soon returned to about 100 people. A great number of people drove by the area and saw the crowd, parked their cars and went into the area to see what was happening. After about ten minutes these people would return to their cars and drive on. I talked to several of these persons and received replys such as "This is what's happening baby- We should have did this a long time ago-We shall overcome-They found out the truth and are telling the people about it!" In more common terms these statements ment that the Black people were going to take over, it is right for the Black man to arm himself against the white man and the Black Panther party was telling the people the truth about the death of Denzil Dowell.

At this point I moved closer to the speaker to hear his speech. The speaker was un-identified to me, But during my stay in the area he was the only person who took the platform. He spoke on black unity against the white oppressor, namely the white cop who is the enforcer for the white power structure. The speaker stated that the only way to keep the white cop from killing off the Negro community was to arm themselves as a safety measure. This message was met with a mixed reaction from the crowd. The speaker received his greatest cheers from the young Negroes in the crowd, mostly teenagers. The speaker spoke of the great injustices that have been ~~done~~ done to the Negro people for the past One hundred years and of the liberties that has been taken with Negro women by the White man. These statements were also

met with a great response from the crowd. After speaking on these subjects for some length the speaker then went into the crowd and did what appeared to be trying to sign young fellows into the movement. After trying this for about ten minutes the speaker would again take the platform. At this point I was recognized as a Richmond Police Officer and I therefore left the area. I did stay in the area for another half hour and I noted that the crowd did not swell to any greater number.

T. D. Nelson

Pat. 591P
Richmond Police Dept

State of California

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
SACRAMENTO 95814

L APR 26 1967



RONALD REAGAN
GOVERNOR

* April 24, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
State Assemblyman
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Don:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your
letter to Governor Reagan regarding AB 1591
and the attached letter from District
Attorney John A. Nejedly.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Phil".

Philip M. Battaglia
Executive Secretary

~~Larry Carleton~~

~~Bob Dwyer~~

APB 1591 ~~Pauch~~

APB 1591

John Nejedly - Dist.

Jack Francis

Jewell Lyons Pr. of Helms Jr High

U. Ship C.C. Co. Harry Ramsey

~~Dep. Chief Joe Viretta~~

Karl Anderson

Stockton

Some parents who are

incensed - will be at

hearing

Jerry Belcher - copy

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MEMO TO: ASSEMBLYMAN DON MULFORD

April 21, 1967

FROM: MARVIN C. BUCHANAN

RE: BLACK PANTHERS
RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA

On April 19, 1967, Walter Pdretti, Chief, San Pablo Police Department, advised that on April 17, 1967, his department had had some difficulties with a group of negroes who he assumed were either members of the Black Panthers or the Black Muslims.

He stated that this difficulty had been sparked by an incident at the Walter Helms Junior High School at the Park Plaza in San Pablo, California. The incident occurred on Tuesday, April 11, 1967 and it involved the disciplining of a negro boy by the Dean of Men, a Mr. Perrone (or Carrone). The boy had been misbehaving and the school authorities had obtained permission from the boy and his guardian to discipline him. At the time the Dean of Boys attempted to administer the discipline, the boy suddenly decided he did not want to be disciplined and in the ensuing struggle, slipped from the grasp of Mr. Perrone and injured his head.

Chief Pdretti stated that he actually did receive quite a noticeable bruise. The guardian immediately thereafter took the boy to two different doctors and an attorney then ultimately brought him to the Police Department to make a complaint.

He advised that the incident would have died down, except that a few parents with the assistance of an organization, which he believed to be either the Black Panthers or the Black Muslims, had kept the incident alive.

He advised that on April 17, 1967, one of his officers drove by a group of negroes who had gathered at the Walter Helms School and in one automobile he observed an ammunition bandolier, a carbine, military type, and a .380 pistol inside of a car. He stated that there were no weapons in evidence on the person of any of the people in the group and no other weapons of any kind were seen. The officer stopped immediately upon seeing the weapons and inquired about them. A negro named (HNU) Newton stated that the car was his and the weapons also were his. He furthermore pointed out to the officer that he had a constitutional right to carry arms and made several snide remarks to the officer. In the meantime the officer found himself encircled by the group and becoming apprehensive, he called for assistance. The Chief and other supporting officers arrived shortly thereafter and after a short conference, the negroes drifted away. He stated that there were several hecklers who made comments such as, 'we are used to police harassment' and 'we are going to get justice,' etc.

Chief Pdretti stated that a small group of the negroes entered the Walter Helms School along with the principal, a Mr. Lyons. After

cc - 1 - Waltham FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES
cc - 1 - Buchanan

BLACK PANTHERS

-2-

April 21, 1967

they got inside the school, they interviewed some of the children and made voice recordings of the interviews. Lyons then demanded the immediate arrest of the people inside the school. Chief Pdretti pointed out, however, that the group had accompanied him into the school. Lyons stated that they were not in the school by his invitation. Pdretti told him, however, that they were inside with his implied consent because he made no objection and furthermore, other parents were inside of the building along with the protesting negroes and he would not be able to sustain a conviction by singling out only those that Lyon wished removed from the school.

Chief Pdretti stated that there were approximately 30 to 35 men and women in the group of negroes who were protesting. He did not know how many had actually gone inside the school but he believed that there had been about 9 or 10. He estimated there were 8 or 9 women in the group of 30 to 35. He advised that among those in the group who entered the school, he believed was Beverly Axelrod, who is believed to be a member of the American Federation of Teachers and an activist who has been involved in many of the protest movements on UC Campus.

The Chief stated that no photographs of this group or their activities were taken as far as he knew. He stated that Jack Frances, investigator for the Contra Costa Prosecuting Attorney's Office was probably more familiar with the activities of this group than was anyone else in the area.

hnh

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

HALL OF JUSTICE

Richmond, California

April 19, 1967

TO: C. E. BROWN, CHIEF OF POLICE

FROM: R. RAWSON, DETECTIVE 

This past week has brought an outside group into our community known as the "Black Panther Party." Their interest was focused because of the shooting of the burglar, Dowell, by a deputy sheriff and the alleged slugging of a student by a counsellor at Helms Junior High School.

The following narration covers largely only the activities of this week, April 17th through April 18th.

Mr. Nejedly agreed to meet with the family of the deceased after the Dowell inquest should there be any questions still in their minds. Apparently there were so a meeting was set for Monday, April 17th at 10:00 a.m. in the office of Dave Williams, Community Organizer, Council of Community Services.

Mr. Nejedly kept the appointment and found possibly one member of the family - possibly the mother of the deceased but not introduced - plus a representative group of the so-called Black Panthers led by Curtis Lee Baker, also known as "Black Jesus." The Black Panthers were fully armed with shotguns, rifles, cartridge belts of ammunition and side-arms.

After the meeting, the Black Panthers were seen around the Walter Helms Junior High School. Curtis Lee Baker and Bobbie Seale were identified as two of them. Guns were not seen but the ammo belts were in evidence. An unknown number of the Black Panther group entered the school property, engaging some of the youth in conversation and making obvious derogatory remarks about the school.

Marvin Smith had occasion to be at the Council of Community Services' office and saw the group of Black Panthers sitting in the meeting room adjacent to the business office. Officer Smith saw one person with a side-arm but saw no rifles or shotguns. Also present at this gathering was Nobel Coleman, who works with Rudy Webbe of the Dynamic Youth Group. Smith also observed a quantity of literature apparently brought in by the Black Panthers.

Officer Smith, it should be noted, was at the Council of Community Services on another matter and paid little attention to the described meeting. It should also be noted that he did not see Mr. Dave Williams or Mr. Nejedly but was made aware of Mr. Nejedly's presence.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

CHIEF BROWN - page 2

April 19, 1967

Mr. Nat Shaffer called my office, stating that rumors were out that Mr. Dave Williams had Curtis Lee Baker as his house guest and had in fact invited him and his followers to the meeting with Mr. Nejedly. Mr. Shaffer assured me that this was not true. Mr. Williams was as surprised as Mr. Nejedly when they made their bold appearance.

Mr. Shaffer stated that the Welfare Rights Organization had set up the meeting between the Dowell family and Mr. Nejedly. Mr. Williams is the Staff Supervisor for this group.

The issue thought to have motivated the Black Panthers to the Richmond area was the death of the burglar suspect, Dowell, by the hands of a deputy sheriff. However, it would appear that they have a second interest in the incident at Helms Junior High in which a North Richmond student was alleged to have been injured by a school employee.

It is also alleged that Curtis Baker called a meeting for Friday evening at a local park. It is further alleged that the meeting was announced over one of the bay area radio stations, possibly KDIA. There was some confusion as to where the meeting would be - 10th and Virginia or 10th and Lucas, both being public parks. A group did gather at 10th and Lucas and a patrol car drove by. A number of persons were at the park. There was some name calling from the crowd to the officer, one being, "White Devil." It is also alleged that the Black Panthers requested the use of Neighborhood House on N. Jade Street but were refused. Another building leased by Neighborhood House on Alamo Street in Richmond was used for a meeting. Mr. Red Stephenson was contacted regarding the meeting on Alamo Street and he stated he had also heard this but it had not been verified.

At 6:00 p.m., April 18th, Sergeant Laird called me by phone, stating that two men from the Governor's Office were at the station and wished to discuss the current unrest with me. I called Captain Bacon and we both returned to the station. We were met by Mr. Ray Norton of the Governor's office and Mr. John K. Ford of the Lieutenant Governor's office. We filled them in on the local rumble, pointing out our concern for the interest and activities of the Black Panthers in the Richmond area. These men will be in the Bay Area until Friday and agreed to meet with either Captain Bacon or me on Thursday.

Attached hereto are three articles of interest:

1. A four-page explanation as to who the Black Panther Party is and what they believe in. Also, the words of a song they are pushing. All material furnished by them and left in the Council of Community Services.
2. A confidential report furnished by the Oakland Police relative to some Black Panther activities.
3. A list of twelve demands made upon the Richmond Unified School District, Walter T. Helms Junior High School in particular.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON MULFORD

Date APR 19 1967

To

Re:

AB 1591
Bill Andrews

Handwritten signature



PETER J. PITCHESS, SHERIFF

County of Los Angeles
Office of the Sheriff
Hall of Justice
Los Angeles, California 90012

April 19, 1967

Mr. Patrick D. McGee
17304 Sherman Way
Van Nuys, California 91406

Dear Pat:

I know that this is a busy time of the year for you and for that reason I shall be as brief as possible.

As a representative of the people I know you are vitally concerned with the crime situation that presently exists in Los Angeles County. It is a dangerous condition and is increasing daily. Until we are able to root out the causes of crime we are going to have to use direct measures to stop it. This can only be done with a sufficient force of law enforcement officers. ~~My Department is greatly understaffed and I am unable to provide for the safety of our citizens.~~ Repeated pleas have been made to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to provide the incentives to recruit and retain Deputy Sheriffs. These pleas have been all but ignored.

These circumstances compel me to request your assistance in pointing out to the Board of Supervisors the seriousness of the situation. For your convenience I have enclosed a copy of a letter recently sent to them. Any positive action you can take in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,


PETER J. PITCHESS
SHERIFF



PETER J. PITCHESS, SHERIFF

County of Los Angeles
Office of the Sheriff
Hall of Justice
Los Angeles, California 90012

April 17, 1967

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Los Angeles County
222 North Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90012

Gentlemen:

As the governmental body responsible for budgetary allotments to fund the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, your Board must consider both the economics and safety of the residents of areas my Department serves; to ignore or discount either is unthinkable. I have referred repeatedly to the critical nature of the situation:

- In the past two years the total number of Deputies employed by this Department increased only two per cent.
- During the same period Deputies resigning to accept employment with other police agencies offering more attractive salary and fringe benefits increased eighty-six per cent.

These factors have resulted in a proportionately depleted force, which causes a serious morale factor within our Department. The reasons for this dangerous situation have been brought to your attention numerous times -- four times by letter since October, 1965. With rare exception, you have evidenced sparse interest in the concrete resolution of this problem. We are not in a position in law enforcement to picket or strike, as the endangering of public safety is unconscionable. Yet, we note the success of some groups appearing before your Board, who have used precisely these tactics and obtained benefits rightfully theirs, just as the benefits we seek for our employees are only those to which they are rightfully entitled.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Honorable Board of Supervisors - 2 - April 17, 1967

Your Board is on record recognizing and endorsing parity with the Los Angeles Police Department. Yet, their officers -- not ours -- have received longevity and shooting pay for the past ten years. Add to this the far lower retirement payments required of Los Angeles City police officers, their higher retirement benefits, and the situation reaches a point of shameful inequality.

In the face of increasingly arduous working conditions, recruitment and retention of qualified personnel constantly becomes more difficult. The reasons are graphically clear:

- Workload -- with only one per cent per year increase in Deputy manpower, the individual workload has increased drastically.
- Compensation -- with base salaries the same or very nearly the same as Deputies, additional compensation is offered by other police departments in Los Angeles County:

21%, representing 10 Los Angeles County policing agencies, receive longevity pay

48% (23 agencies) give a continuing uniform allowance

58% (28 agencies) offer shooting pay

62% (30 agencies) offer educational incentive pay

62% (30 agencies) pay for all overtime worked -- some at time and a half

Los Angeles County offers none of these incentives.

To make matters worse:

90% (43 agencies) have paid court time

97% (47 agencies) have better sick leave benefits

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Honorable Board of Supervisors - 3 - April 17, 1967

We must face this condition realistically; further discussion and idle talk, without overt action on your part to end the disparities which exist, serve no useful purpose.

On numerous occasions, your Board has praised our Department for progressive and innovative law enforcement programs. Yet, in the wake of the most devastating riot ever to plague our County, I personally appeared before you to request Deputies for police-community relations activities throughout the County. You refused, leaving us without a single person funded to engage in even this critical area of preventive law enforcement. The Los Angeles Police Department recently created an entire bureau, commanded by a Deputy Chief, to fulfill this vital need. Despite your refusal to fund personnel, and support us in this matter, we have still maintained the finest of community relations programs, but only through depleting our strength in other vital areas. Hopefully, our weakened position will not be allowed to pass the point of no return. I am sure it is unnecessary to remind you that in August, 1965, the riot created a situation where it was necessary for us to order the withdrawal of firemen, because we were helpless to protect our fellow safety service officers in their efforts to quell the flames of this holocaust. They, as we, provide services which are absolutely vital to the welfare of this community.

The recent incidents on the Sunset Strip have given prominence to the high number of police we have provided that area over the past several years; what is not apparent on the surface, is the fact that these added Deputies must come from other areas we are also responsible for policing.

To further compound the crisis status, there has been no overt action whatever to increase the salaries and fringe benefits of our Deputies to a level which will attract and retain the personnel we require. Instead, you offer a token increase in personnel strength, knowing full well that we cannot hope to fill these vacancies or increase our force unless you also provide salaries and fringe benefits that place us in a position that is competitive with other law enforcement agencies, and private enterprise. To illustrate the monetary cost of this exodus, the salaries of trainees to fill those vacancies created by resignations alone amounted to nearly one and one-half million dollars, entirely exclusive of the Los Angeles County Department of Personnel and our own administrative training costs during the last two years.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Honorable Board of Supervisors - 4 - April 17, 1967

In some quarters, persons unknowledgeable of the police problems of this County suggest curtailment of service; this is analogous to providing radio patrol cars, without personnel to man them, while criminals rove the streets in record and ever increasing numbers.

Unless the Sheriff's Department is made capable of maintaining and continuing its pursuit of excellence -- through your immediate support -- effective law enforcement in Los Angeles County can become a thing of the past. We are woefully behind scores of other metropolitan areas in our police to population ratio; compare the average 2.3 police personnel per 1,000 citizens in the other fifty-six metropolitan areas of our nation, to the 1.2 ratio -- excluding our jail and civil functions -- of the Sheriff's Department of Los Angeles County.

Our metropolitan area's crime rate is not lagging, however, as it is the second highest in the nation.

The security of residents of the areas we serve directly, as well as that of persons living in every other city of Los Angeles County, is affected by the strength or weakness of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. As you well know, my Department is required by the Constitution of this State to insure that peace and good order are maintained throughout all of Los Angeles County. Yet, at a time when our assistance is needed as never before in history, we are being forced to diminish backup services vitally needed to cope with our County's crime situation.

The course I offer you, as I have repeatedly in the past, must receive positive action, now. Talk will not protect the people we serve. Our Department must have:

1. The remainder of the 1,300 police class personnel, with supporting clerical positions and equipment requested in my letter to you of October 21, 1965, and as yet almost totally unprovided.
2. Parity in salaries, longevity and shooting pay with the Los Angeles Police Department; and in addition, a continuing uniform allowance, increased sick leave benefits, overtime pay at time and one-half for all overtime worked, false arrest insurance, and meritorious service awards requested in my letter to you of April 29, 1966; and educational benefits comparable to those available to other law enforcement agencies.

Honorable Board of Supervisors - 5 - April 17, 1967

3. Recruitment at the fifth step level of the salary ordinance, and shift differential pay requested in my letter to you of July 12, 1966.

Society is at war with the criminal element within our social order. To win requires your supportive action now, as adequate funding of our activities is your responsibility, and yours alone. Crime in Los Angeles County is at a critically high level, and we cannot hope to deal with this forest fire of lawlessness with burlap bag techniques. As Sheriff and chief law enforcement officer of this County, I am responsible to the entire populace, and our severe personnel shortages can neither be condoned nor continued. The public will not stand for it, and your Board cannot afford complacency to the situation.

Sincerely,



PETER J. PITCHESS
SHERIFF

AUTHOR'S COPY

Date: 4/5/67

Request No. 14707

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

as introduced, Mulford ()

Bill No. _____ Author _____ Committee _____

Firearms

General Subject

Adds Sec. 405.5 and 12031, Pen. C.

Prohibits instruction in the use of firearms for the commission of the crime of riot.

Prohibits carrying of a loaded firearm on one's person on a public street or in a public place within any city, except for peace officers, certain guards, members of the armed forces when on duty, and persons who are using target ranges for practice shooting purposes.

Vote - Majority; Appropriation - No; State Expense - No.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON MILFORD

Date 3-27-67

To George Murphy

Re: Private armies

#14707

Research the attached for bill that would control private armies. I am particularly interested in legislation that would control firearms being carried by organizations such as the BLACK PANTHERS without ~~infring~~ infringing on the rights of legitimate hunters to carry arms.

*Prepare ~~bill~~ to cover above
Bill to ~~cover~~ prohibit private armies.*

Don Mulford

Carl Chaplin Walcott

MAR 17 1967

MEMO TO: ASSEMBLYMAN DON MULFORD

March 16, 1967

FROM: MARVIN C. BUCHANAN

RE: BLACK PANTHERS
PROPOSED LEGISLATION

On March 16, 1967, Captain John Arca, Oakland Police Department, telephonically contacted the writer at the Legislative office and advised that there was a group of "Black Panthers" now located in Oakland. He stated that these negroes were violently anti-white and carried loaded shotguns around with them and had 45 automatics strapped on their hips.

He stated that he was very apprehensive concerning this developing situation and was fearful that there would be a "shoot-out" in the not too distant future. He was fearful that innocent bystanders might also be injured.

He was hopeful that some kind of corrective legislation might be initiated but was well aware that this would be fought by the National Rifle Association. He stated that he would prepare some information on the subject and contact the writer or Assemblyman Mulford.

He requested that the writer contact him at the station in order that he might take the writer on a tour to exhibit precisely what is developing.

cc - 1 - Buchanan

hnh

Sergeant H. Dilavor

Lieutenant Lothrop

13 Mar 67

Officer R. Wagner 6141-J

Black Panther Movement (5624 Grove Street)

Sir:

The following is a resume of information I have gathered over the past few weeks concerning the above group. This information was given to me by persons whom I believe to be reliable. For obvious reasons I am withholding their names at this time.

The Black Panthers are a very militant and anti-police group made up of both adult and teenagers whose local headquarters is at 5624 Grove Street. This group is apparently armed with both small and large caliber weapons which range in size from pistols to hand grenades. The small weapons are kept at the above location; however, the location of the other weapons is unknown to my informants at this time. The group also uses at least two autos which they use as "patrol cars". These cars, loaded with Panther members, roam the streets at night looking for locations of police activity and then attempt to incite a crowd to overthrow the police. These members are usually armed with rifles or shot-guns and show these weapons openly to the police and the public. The two "patrol cars" are possibly (1) 1955 Merc., Lic. # RKB 595 and is painted yellow. This auto is now registered to Dorothy Levesque, 1926 - 6th Ave., Oakland. However, DMV has a change of owner pending to Larry Crosby, 5119 Genoa Street, Oak. (2) 1952 Merc., Lic. # DZB 249 and is also yellow with a black top. This auto is registered to Luther Cornish, 1531 Brush Street, Oakland. There is also a change of ownership pending to Ruth Hampton, 3261 Hollis Street, Oakland.

Meetings are held at 5624 Grove Street and also the Lutheran Church at 42nd and Telegraph. The meetings are conducted on an educational level and also self-defense tactics. Fritz Pointer usually handles the education portion and has outside speakers such as Elijah Turner and Don Warden. Warden usually instructs the group as to the legal aspects of their activities. The self-defense tactics are presented by Bobby Seals. Many speakers from the Los Angeles area attended these meetings and are actually recruiting members to participate in a training program in Los Angeles this summer. The contact man in Los Angeles for this program is Don Caringo.

There is at this time a Negro history course (50a) being taught at Merritt College by Mr. Goode, which actually is a course in Black Panther propaganda. FIREARMS POLICY ORG/RESOURCES students are hand picked by someone other than Mr. Goode for this instruction. It is not known at this time exactly who selects these

"special students".

Much of the above information has been supplied by so-called "hard-core" members of the Black Panthers. However, this group is preaching such great hatred for white people that what they are going to do to them this summer, that these students are becoming frightened and are attempting to break away from the group. However, some of these students have been threatened with bodily harm if they do leave the group.

This resume is concluded with a reported quote from Bobbie Seals and Fritz Pointer ----- "Oakland Will Burn This Summer"-----

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Wagner, 6141-J
Juvenile Division

RW:ch

Bgt. R. Hunter

Capt. R. Casaad

10 Mar 67

Officers A. Wright & H. Dohling

Black Panthers - DeFermery Park

Sir:

This detail stopped by the DeFermery Recreation Center, on Adeline street, and talked with the Director, Bill McDavid.

A dance was in progress at this time, and R/O's inquired of Mr. McDavid, if there had been any trouble at this dance. Mr. McDavid stated there had been no trouble at the dance, but he was "worried" about the "Black Panthers" showing up at the center.

McDavid stated that Mr. Martin, from Arroyo Viejo Center, had called him and warned him that the "Black Panthers" were talking about appearing at the DeFermery Center.

McDavid then said that he didn't expect the Panthers to show up at the dance, because the kids at the dance were mostly junior-high school age.

McDavid states he thinks the "Black Panthers" will show up at DeFermery on 16Mar67 (Thur), because this is the night he will be conducting his weekly "Senior Social", with all Senior High boys present.

Bill McDavid states that if he hears anything ~~definite~~ more about the group planning to attend, he will notify the Juvenile Division.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Wright 6206 J

H. Dohling 5157 J

Capt. R. Casadd

Sgt. Dilaver

9 Mar 67

Gilbert P. Souza 5304-1

File

Incident at Arroyo Viejo Center

Sir:

The following information was obtained from Mr. Fred Martin, head director at the Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center, located at 7701 Krause Avenue.

Last night, 8 Mar 67, was the regular meeting night for the group known as the Cowboys, at the Arroyo Viejo Center. Just prior to the meeting, one Eddie Williams, acting president of the Cowboys, informed Mr. Martin that a guest speaker would appear to speak before the group.

At approximately 1915 hours, Mr. Martin noticed a group of approximately 30-35 young adults approaching the Center. The members of this group were dressed in black outfits, and Mr. Martin noticed that 8 or 10 of this group were armed with shot-guns and rifles. Mr. Martin met the group at the entrance to the Center, and at this time, Mr. Martin notified them that weapons were not allowed on the premises. One Bobby Seals MD30, the apparent leader of the group, then ordered the weapons collected from those persons who were armed, and directed one member of the group to put the weapons in a vehicle and remain with the weapons. This was done. Shortly thereafter, Mark Comfort and approximately 8 other persons arrived at the scene.

The group known as the Cowboys then held their regular meeting, with both visiting groups mentioned above in attendance. At the conclusion of the regular business of the Cowboys, Bobby Seals was asked to make his presentation. According to Mr. Martin, also in attendance at the meeting, Bobby Seals attempted to recruit members of the Cowboys into the group represented by Bobby Seals, and known as the Black Panthers. The talk included the aims of the Black Panthers as well as quotations from the U.S. Constitution regarding the bearing of arms. At this time, Mark Comfort offered words in support of the Black Panther group. According to Mr. Martin, the meeting was very orderly, and the group responded to all requests made by Mr. Martin regarding rules pertaining to conduct at the Center.

Deputy Chief E. Brown

Captain J. Area

2 Mar 67

Lt. F. Tornow

Problems at Merritt Jr. College

Sir:

Sgt. Lusk and I contacted Mr. Charles DUFFY at Merritt College at 9 P.M. this date. He enumerated many instances of vandalism, theft, disturbance, etc. However, he was not clear as to what the school position would be as far as taking any remedial action. Our discussion included, thefts from lockers, thefts of purses from the women's restrooms, 242s on students and non students and non students loitering in the hallways. There is also a parking problem at the school. This problem caused by non students pulling in to talk to girls or just loiter and block the driveways so that the faculty cannot get into the parking lot.

The responsible are all young male negroes and many of them belong to the Black Panthers who have an office two doors from the college. On one recent disturbance a Black Panther had a handgun in a holster on his belt and it was concealed by his coat. On 1 Mar 67 in the evening a male white was assaulted in the hallway and had to be taken to the hospital for treatment. Suspects on that offense were three male negroes.

Sgt. Lusk and I explained 602, 415 and 647 P.C. to Mr. Duffy and that these sections could be applied effectively in most of the disturbances but that the arrests would have to be made by school authorities or victims of the various kinds of attacks. The times of the disturbances are varied but usually occur at the hourly breaks between 1000 to 1500 and 2030 to 2200. Most of the 242s occur during the evening hours.

Mr. Duffy is meeting with school officials in the AM to discuss the problems and will attempt to get a definite statement of school policy so he will know what action to take. He will contact Chief Brown in the near future and arrange a meeting with school officials.

There is one unnamed security officer on duty at the school at this time. He has no communication with other school officials and it was suggested that he have a walkie talkie for better communication.

Respectfully submitted,

F. Tornow
Lieutenant of Police
Fourth Platoon Commander.

According to Mr. Martin, Bobby Seale indicated to the assembled group that the Black Panthers were receiving instructions from "back east", and that something "big" was going to occur in the near future. It was also mentioned that the Black Panthers were organizing along the lines of a group known as "The Deacons", an armed negro organization in the south.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Bobby Seale informed the Cowboys that a recruiting meeting would be held Saturday, 11 Mar 67, at 1500 hours, at 5604 Grove Street. This location, according to Seale, was also the area where recruits were instructed in Karate and other methods of self-defense by a member known as Huey Newton MR26.

The meeting concluded at 2155 hours, and Mr. Martin stated that the Black Panther group left the area in an orderly manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilbert P. Nouse 5804-J

From the desk of

Don Mulford

4-24-67

Bill Andrews says
Legislative Council drawing
up a fifth exception to
defining exceptions - that
would eliminate need for
attached amendments.

Opinion whether AB1591
Constitutional still in
the mill.

944 Regal Road
Berkeley, Calif
94708
Apr 23/67

Dear Assemblyman Humphid:

Our country is far, far ahead
of any other in the sale of guns and gun killings, but as long as the
National Rifle Assoc. controls Congress it seems hopeless. I put
through legislation for the good of our people as a whole, N.R.A.
members believe that's illegal. I must get auto drivers bent
down, but it's also O.K. for any young punk to buy a gun. The
men are full of offers. For he would then in the East market - one for
the East. An American made pocket pistol. Fires two quick shots
from its double barrels. Lays flat in the pocket. Ready for instant use,
the permit required. Cost \$1.95, six for \$7.00. That's a perfect
complement for a young hoodlum organizing a neighborhood gang!!

Can our State do more to crack down on selling
while we are waiting year after year for an national Congress
to act? I'd like to see a mandatory prison term for any
unlicensed person caught with a concealed weapon, including
sheath knives, and stop the fiction of the state units
California stopped. Is there any hope?

Sharon, thank for your good service
and the best of wishes

Vernon Long

VERNON LONG (Enclosure)

1967 APR 23 11 36 AM

January 1967 Reader's Digest

Discovery and Renewal	Life	37
Laredo Learns About the War on Poverty	Kenneth O. Gilmore	44
Decision at Sea	First Person Award	50
The Truth Can Stop VD	Parents' Magazine	55
Let's Make Government Work Better!	Dwight D. Eisenhower	61
Why Women Act That Way	Special Request Feature	68
What the News Has Done	Time	70
The Leader	Monthly	75
Humor		80

We Need a Firearms-Control Law—Now!

BY ALAN BARTH

Newspaper	ardy	123
A Man Can't Always	Journal	127
Inside Peru	John Gunther	134
Loud the Twang of the Guitar	Contemporary	143
UNICEF: Tomorrow Must Be Better	Together	151
Electric Heat for Your Home?	Report to Consumers	157
The Three-R War in Vietnam	U.S. Lady	171
Meet the "Monster" That Checks Your Taxes	Kiwanis Magazine	177
Hottest Job on Earth	Die Weltwoche	184
Rewards of Risking It	Christian Herald	191
They Plant Profits in Economic Deserts	Winnipeg Free Press	199
The Unfolding Miracle of X Rays	Today's Health	205

Book Section { Master Spy Gordon W. Prange 209

Have You an Amusing Anecdote? 9—Press Section, 11—We Need a Firearms-Control Law! 17—Humor in Uniform, 25—Quotable Quotes, 29—News From the World of Medicine, 33—Picturesque Speech, 60—Life in These United States, 89—Laughter, 115—Washington Wonderland, 132—Campus Comedy, 165—Word Power, 195

The toll of death by shooting is mounting steadily. Whether the deaths are accidental, calculated or the result of psychopathic rages, the lesson is the same:

We Need a Firearms- Control Law —Now!

BY ALAN BARTH *Editorial writer,
The Washington Post; author of "The
Price of Liberty," "The Loyalty of Free
Men," "Government by Investigation"*

2

GUNS HAVE played a dramatic role in American history. They armed the Minutemen who won American independence; they are intimately associated with the winning of the West and the expansion of our nation's frontier. But for most Americans living in today's crowded cities, the frontier has become part of the national folklore, and the indiscriminate possession of firearms has become a threat to their very lives.

More than 100,000 U.S. civilians were shot during 1966. About 17,000 of these shootings proved fatal. Each year guns figure in some 25,000 aggravated assaults and about 60,000 robberies. They are used to commit more than half of the nearly 10,000 annual murders. Moreover, the trend of casualties is consistently upward.

The United States is one of the few advanced countries to permit an almost wholly unregulated proliferation of firearms. Except for some local restrictions—made ineffectual by mail-order houses and by laxity in neighboring states or counties—firearms are available to anyone who can pay for them, including responsible sportsmen, fools, hopheads, drunks, thugs, children, burglars, homicidal maniacs, angry spouses, and persons who feel like sniping at their fellow citizens from rooftops during a riot.

Shootings can be divided into three categories:

- **Accidents**, when the killing or wounding was unintended. This

kind of mishap is so commonplace that, unless it involves a newsworthy person, it is relegated to inside pages of the newspaper and accorded little space.

A couple of illustrative items can be offered from a single issue of the *Washington Post*. One tells of a 12-year-old boy who was shot and killed by an 11-year-old friend while the two were watching television in the friend's home. The 11-year-old approached the 12-year-old with a .38-caliber pistol, saying, "Look what I found." At that point, according to the story, the pistol went off. The 11-year-old's mother said that the pistol belonged to another of her sons, and that she thought it was unloaded.

The second story that day recounts the death of a 14-year-old girl shot by her stepbrother, who was playing with a rifle which he had found on a wall rack in the home of a neighbor they had visited. The owner of the gun kept it loaded, he said, "for protection."

A word should be said about the use of guns for protection. In the first place, attempts by the average householder to defend his home against armed criminals rarely succeed. Criminals are more accustomed to handling guns than are ordinary householders and less squeamish about killing. And the sight of a householder, gun in hand, is likely to add an unintended murder to a lesser crime. In this kind of dueling, the record runs heavily against householders.

In the second place, pistols kept at home for self-protection will be used more often to shoot friend, by mistake, than foe. Journalism is full of these cases: Mother, hearing footsteps on the stairs, blazes away and learns that she has shot Junior trying to creep home quietly after a late date; or Father, seeing a silhouette on the draperies, takes quick aim—and finds himself a widower.

A pathetic illustration appeared in a recent Associated Press story from Indianapolis: "A high-school girl who arose before dawn to quiet the family dog was shot to death when her father mistook her for a burglar. Larna Kay Wilson, 18, cried, 'Oh, Daddy,' then collapsed and died. Her father, Jack Wilson, 45, was sobbing beside the body when police arrived."

Another familiar type of "accident" stems from the unfortunate propensity of hunters to mistake one another for deer, bear and other forms of wildlife. According to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., shooting accidents occur with special frequency during the October-through-December hunting season. Residents of rural areas in northern New England have come to consider it almost suicidal to venture outside their farm homes during this period.

- The second category of shootings can be called acts of desperation. These range from suicides (some 10,000 a year by guns) to the slaying of a loved one by a rejected suitor, lover or husband to the wanton

slaughter of complete strangers. Such a desperation case shocked the nation last summer when a demented University of Texas student first killed his wife and mother with a gun, then shot 31 fellow human beings from a tower on the university campus, killing 13 before he was himself killed by a policeman's bullet. One of the weapons for this massacre was purchased at a local store just an hour before it was put to its terrible employment.

A further illustration of desperation shooting is found in this newspaper account of tragedy: "William A. Thorpe, a carpenter known to his friends as 'a quiet and kindly man,' went berserk today and killed his mother, his sister, his young son and finally himself with a .25-caliber automatic. Thorpe had been worried over custody of his son since he became estranged from his wife six months ago."

- The third and most common category of shooting includes killings and woundings committed in the course of another crime. Such shootings occur most frequently during robberies and holdups, when the armed holdup man becomes frightened or is indifferent to the taking of human life.

The Great Equalizer. One common denominator runs through all these categories. Guns may not have prompted the killings, but they made the accidents possible, the suicides easier, the resentments more lethal, the crimes more feasible.

Gun enthusiasts argue that the

problem has nothing to do with guns. If the human will to kill is present, they say, and if no gun is handy, a kitchen knife, sash weight, rope or even bare hands will do just as well.

It is unquestionably true that the human will to kill lies at the root of all non-accidental killing. But guns afford peculiarly apt implementation for that will. Appropriately called an "equalizer," a pistol can give a heady sense of power to many who, without it, would never dare defy the law. It is the standard weapon of the criminal. It makes a boy equal to a man, the village idiot equal to the sage, and the thug equal to the police officer.

The Secret Service is capable of protecting Presidents from knives, sash weights, ropes and bare hands, but the assassins of Presidents Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley all used guns. So did the Puerto Ricans who shot at President Truman in Blair House. And so did Lee Harvey Oswald when he decided to end the life of President Kennedy.

Yet today, despite the publicity and the public outrage over the ease with which Oswald obtained his rifle, no questions are asked by the mail-order merchants—or, at any rate, no questions requiring meaningful answers. Some request their customers to sign this statement, recommended by the National Rifle Association: I certify that I am 18 years or more of age; that I have never been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term

exceeding one year; that I am not a mental incompetent, drug addict or adjudged drunkard; and that I am not prohibited from legally acquiring a firearm by state or local laws.

Since no notarization, official certification or witness is required, the statement is worthless.

Aim. It has been demonstrated that cities with gun-control laws have a markedly lower homicide rate than cities without them. James V. Bennett, formerly director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and an ardent advocate of firearms-control legislation, pointed out that in 1962 the homicide rate per 100,000 population in New York City was 5.4. That year the homicide rate in the city of Dallas, which has no gun controls, was 13.4. Firearms fatalities *can* be reduced by firearms control, and the reduction can be dramatic if federal and local controls supplement each other so that local legislation is not nullified by mail-order sales or by the laxity of neighboring jurisdictions.

This is precisely the aim of legislation introduced in the Senate by Connecticut's Sen. Thomas J. Dodd in 1965 and advocated by President Johnson and by law-enforcement authorities all across the land. The bill proposes three major reforms:

1. It would stop the flood of firearms from abroad. More than a million foreign military weapons are dumped in this country annually—because other countries will not let them in—and are made available at

cut-rate prices as a potential arsenal for crime.

2. It would stop the mail-order gun business by providing that guns could be shipped across state lines only by one licensed dealer to another. License fees would be high enough to keep individuals who wished to evade the provision from designating themselves "dealers," as some 99,544 persons did in 1964, in order to buy guns at wholesale prices.

3. It would permit retail, over-the-counter sale of a handgun (pistol) only to a resident of the state where the purchase is made and who is eligible by state and local law to purchase such a weapon. It would operate, in short, to help the states enforce their own gun-control laws by forbidding other states to frustrate them.

The Dodd bill came to naught in the 89th Congress. After extensive hearings and approval by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, the full Judiciary Committee last September scuttled it and proposed a meaningless substitute that would regulate mail-order sale of handguns but not of carbines, rifles or shotguns. This makes about as much sense as a narcotics law restricting the sale of cocaine but ignoring the sale of heroin.

To Lessen the Consequences. Why was the Dodd bill killed? The answer lies, partly at least, in the opposition of the National Rifle Association, which has persistently mobilized its membership—now numbering about three quarters of a

million—to thwart every genuinely effective attempt at firearms control during the past 30-odd years.

In the light of the NRA's adamant, and successful, opposition to the Administration firearms bill, it should be noted that there is nothing in the bill that would curtail present ownership in any way or keep responsible, law-abiding adults from buying firearms—whether for sporting purposes, for target shooting, for self-protection or for the simple pleasure of collecting guns. It would inconvenience the responsible, law-abiding adult to the extent of requiring him to make his purchases in the state of his residence and to wait a few days to let the police check his identity. It would cause serious inconvenience only to felons, juveniles, habitual drunkards, drug addicts and the mentally ill. Can responsible Americans really be unwilling to undergo such minor inconvenience in order to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of the irresponsible?

The NRA has managed to imbue many of its members with the quite mistaken notion that efforts at effective regulation conflict with the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which provides that "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The Supreme Court has made it clear that the second part of this amendment must be read in relation to the first part. The Court ruled, in approving the existing National Firearms Act, that the right to bear arms must have "some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia." The organized militia of the states is today the National Guard, armed and equipped by the federal government. Proposed federal legislation would not interfere with this; and as far as local legislation is concerned, the Second Amendment of course imposes no restraint.

Laws, admittedly, cannot of themselves put an end to crime and folly. But they *can* lessen the tragic consequences of human frailties. What possible sense is there in making it easy for any criminal, any suicidal or homicidal madman, even any child, to obtain guns that can be used at whim to maim and kill?

Let Americans who want to do something to lessen the tragic toll of shootings in this country write to their Congressmen and Senators, to their state legislators and municipal councillors, to their local newspapers. Let them make known that they have had enough of this senseless slaughter and want something done about it—now.

Reprints of this article are available.
Prices, postpaid to one address: 10—50¢;
50—\$2; 100—\$3.50; 500—\$12.50; 1000
—\$18. Address Reprint Editor, The
Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570

REPRINTED FROM THE JANUARY 1967 ISSUE OF THE READER'S DIGEST
©1966 THE READER'S DIGEST ASSOCIATION, INC., PLEASANTVILLE, N.Y. 10570 PRINTED IN U.S.A.

AB 1591

June 16, 1967

Mr. Vernon Long
944 Regal Road
Berkeley, Calif. 94708

Dear Mr. Long:

Thank you very much for your communication regarding gun control legislation. I have purposely refrained from acknowledging it until I could send you a copy of my gun bill, AB 1591, as amended. The bill was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

Incidentally, the National Rifle Association was a great help to me in strengthening this legislation, yet at the same time protecting the Constitutional rights of citizens.

I hope you find the bill interesting reading. Thank you for writing to me.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

June 16, 1967

Mr. John D'Alfonso
4033 El Cajon Boulevard
San Diego, California 92105

Dear Mr. D'Alfonso:

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 5 until my gun bill, AB 1591, was amended in order to protect the constitutional rights of citizens, and approved in the Assembly.

This bill was urgently requested by law enforcement people, for whom I have a great regard, and for whom you hold the same regard. Frankly, I tried to help the police by action and this legislation, I believe, will assist them.

If you review the bill in detail, I believe you will agree that it does serve a very useful purpose. I see no useful purpose in allowing armed bands of citizens with loaded weapons breaking into our police headquarters, our courts, the Legislature, and intimidating school children. All these incidents have occurred in my district.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

John D. Alfonso and Associates . . . COMPLETE INSURANCE SERVICE

Corporate Securities, Inc. . . . MUTUAL FUNDS

4033 EL CAJON BLVD. • SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92105
PHONE 283-2257

MAY 8, 1967

May 5, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
The California Legislature
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford,

I am vitally interested in Crime Prevention, serving as a State Director for the California Exchange Clubs who help sponsor the national observance of Crime Prevention Week. As chairman of the Speakers Bureau of the Stamp Out Crime Crusade I have addressed numerous organizations, local and state, who endorse the Crusade as per the attached list.

Speaking only as a private citizen, I oppose a ban on the carrying of loaded firearms on city streets. It would make it open season on the law abiding. There are countless cases on record where individuals would have been murdered, cruelly beaten, or their families viciously attacked had they been disarmed.

Your bill would never disarm the criminal. Look at New York City where the infamous Sullivan Act disarms the law abiding; not the criminal. The hoodlum would become even bolder were he protected by your legislation disarming his prospective victim.


Granted that everybody should not be permitted to carry concealed weapons. Those who've been given that right after careful screening should not then be denied the right of self defense.

I sincerely hope you will not make ^{it} easier for the criminal to attack with impunity the unwary and the undefended thereby creating additional tragedies and smashed homes for the people of this state who may have very little protection at best under current conditions.

Surely you don't wish to play right into the hands of the hoodlums, sadists, and other vicious breeds who roam the streets today with all kinds of "rights" while very little attention is paid to the rights of the law abiding.


The innocent should not be punished because of the Black Panther incident. Two wrongs don't make a right. Why not pass a law providing very stiff penalties for those using weapons in the commission of a crime?

Sincerely,


John D. Alfonso

cc: Gov. Reagan; Atty. Gen. Lynch; Sen. Schrade, Mills, Burgener; Assymen. Barnes, Bear, Wilson, Deddah, Stull.

FIREARMS POLICY.ORG/RESOURCES



1866 Ft. Stockton Drive
San Diego, California 92103

Phone 296-4282

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

RAY T. BLAIR, JR.
Chairman
Convair Div. of General Dynamics.
ALBERT C. BLATZ
Vice-Chairman
Insurance Agent
VIRGIL WYATT
Executive Secretary
JOHN D'ALPONSO
Insurance Agent
ANDREW H. EKERN
Founder-Insurance Agent
J. THOMAS ERCHUL
Architect
MRS. ADELE FAY
Pacific Telephone Company
WILLIAM HARRISON
Willis Fletcher Company
DR. DONALD MITCHELL
Optometrist
JAMES ROED
Assistant Chief of Police
ELDEN YECK
Corbett, Edelen & Sayage
WILLIAM YOUNG
Ball Insurance Agency

FOUNDING SPONSOR

INDEPENDENT INSURANCE AGENTS
ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO

ASSOCIATE SPONSORS

Blue Goose, San Diego Pond
California Real Estate Association
California Trucking Association,
San Diego Chapter
City of Chula Vista
City of La Mesa
City of San Diego
Collego Center Exchange Club
Coronado Rotary Club
County of San Diego
Del Cerro Junior Women's Club
Del Mar Rotary Club
El Cajon Lions Club.
Escondido Exchange Club
Escondido Rotary Club
Exchange Club of San Diego
Harold P. Field
Garage Owners Association of
San Diego County
Ben Hansen
Harbor Lions Club
Harbor Kiwanis Club
Heartland Altrusa Club
Hillcrest Kiwanis Club
Hillcrest Lions Club
Home Furnishings Association of
San Diego County
Independent Insurance Agents Association
of California
Independent Insurance Agents Association
Chula Vista
Independent Insurance Agents Association
East San Diego County
Kearny Mesa Kiwanis Club
Kearny Mesa Rotary Club
La Jolla Merchants & Professional Association
La Jolla Rotary Club
Lions Club of San Diego
Matlock Service Company
Midway Lions Club
Mission Lions Club
National Association of Bank Women,
San Diego Chapter
National Association of Real Estate Boards
National Insurance Agents Association
North Park Lions Club
Ocean Beach Kiwanis Club
Oceanside Rotary Club
Old Mission Rotary Club
Optimaist Club of San Diego
Pacific Beach Lions Club
Pacific Beach Rotary Club
Peninsula Lions Club
Pilot Club of San Diego
Kenneth R. Rearwin, Investment counselor
San Diego County Optometric Society
San Diego County Traffic Safety Council
San Diego Grocery Sales Club
San Diego Insurance Women
San Diego Police Officers Association
San Diego Realty Board
Commander Richard Schwartz, USN
Silvergate Lions Club
Charles Simpson
Twenty-Thirty Club, No. 62
Uptown Lions Club

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 16, 1967

Mr. K.D. Narron
101 Saunders Drive
Vallejo, California

Dear Mr. Narron:

Thank you very much for your recent card regarding
gun control legislation.

I am enclosing a copy of my bill, AB 1591, as
amended, which was passed by the Assembly on June 8,
1967.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

5/2/67

Dear Sir:

I support your bill regarding the carrying of a loaded fire arm very strongly. The pictures and news reports from Oakland & Sacramento with "Black Panthers" and other groups are very disturbing-Their last Invasion was the Martinez Sheriff;s office. I would go further and say that guns should not be carried except to and from areas where they are used for hunting. One little incident at Martinez would have started a mass killing and riot.

Sincerely,

K.D. Narron
K.D. Narron
101 Saunders Dr.
Vallejo, Calif.

MAY 3 1967

THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS



Hon. Don Mulford
Calif. State Assemblyman
State Legislature
Sacramento, Calif.

June 16, 1967

Reverend W. Evan Golder
West Oakland Christian Parish
United Church of Christ
933 - 12th Street
Oakland, California 94607

Dear Reverend Golder:

Thank you for your communication of May 5.

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your welcome letter until my gun bill, AB 1591, was amended to protect the constitutional rights of citizens, and approved by the Assembly.

I enclose a copy for your review, which I believe takes care of the objection you indicate in your letter.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION



MAY 8, 1967

WEST OAKLAND CHRISTIAN PARISH/933-12TH STREET/OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA/94607

May 5, 1967


Mr. Donald Mulford, Assemblyman
California State Legislature
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford:

I am writing in reference to Assembly Bill No. 1591, your bill to prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms. I am completely in accordance with your intent, except that I feel that Section 2 (a) of 12031 should be amended so that people such as the self-appointed vigilantes of Clyde or the Minutemen would be covered as well.

Perhaps this could be done by removing the restriction which limits the bill to cities only while leaving in the public streets or public places feature of the bill.

Sincerely,


W. Evan Golder, Minister
West Oakland Christian Parish
United Church of Christ

WEG: fmb

June 16, 1967

Mr. C. J. Weber
1087 Via Honda
San Lorenzo, California 94580

Dear Mr. Weber:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning the control of the sale of firearms.

I appreciate your taking the time to give me the benefit of your thinking on this subject. I have included your proposal in my legislative library.

I am enclosing a copy of my gun control bill for your information.

It was good hearing from you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

fd

enclosure

Mr Don Mulford
Senate Office Bldg
Sacramento Calif

Dear Sir

I am a Republican, a
N.R.A. Member, and a Gun Club
Secretary - and would like to
make the following suggestion for
responsible gun ownership.

It would be based on a shooting
license and a person would have
to have one to purchase a firearm

To Obtain a shooting license a
person would have to

- 1) Pass a National Rifle Assn.
Basic Rifle Pistol, or shotgun,
course (He could purchase only
the firearm he was trained to handle
safely - If he passed all 3 he could
purchase all 3 types of guns.)

- 2) after a passing grade the
course instructor would

JUN 8 1967

forward to Sacramento Bureau
of Police identification the Passing
certificate - If the license applicant
had no police record - no mental
sickness record - he would be
issued a shooting license to
shoot a firearm as prescribed by
law (see Hunting Target, etc.)

C. J. Weber
1087 VIA HONDA
SAN LORENZO, CALIF. 94580

P.S. I believe this to be
in line with the N.R.A.
type of gun laws

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 14, 1967

Mr. Bill Post
L.H. Hospital
7th and Dewey Blvd.
San Francisco, Calif. 94116

Dear Mr. Post:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

San Francisco

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MAY 20 1967

MAY 22 1967

Honorable Assembly man

My complaint is too
much Law enforcement
against victims of CRIME
and too LITTLE against
THE REAL CRIMINALS.

At The Borox mining
camp at Botton, Calif.
a white man stole
my 33 Winchester
Rifle and 12 gauge
Winchester repeater
shot Gun. — I know he
then drove his old
wheather beaten
station wagon to
Los Angeles — The
sheriff advised me
to tell the Law in
L.A. because likely the
guy took them to a
pawn shop — I gave
the rifle number to
the Sheriff in L.A.

me went back to Borax mine
camp and by mail me
received a notice to
come to L.A. Sheriff's
office: I went there
and Deputy Sheriff
ask me: Are You
sure This is a white
man? I say positively
sure — He said we
looked him up and his
address is right in
center of negro
district: We want to
know what goes on
there: So we put out
a teletape for
authority to search
that mans house: But
we cant get This
right to search: But
still want to find out
what going on at
that address. —
nothing happened
here except that
a L.A. FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES
white man

had my Rifle and
I could not find it
searching pawn
shops two months.

Then my Dodge Ford was
stolen at Borox mine
camp. I found the
motor in a shop in
Lancaster, Calif.
where one Leonard
Blackwood, sold my
ford in parts. A
Borox company paymaster
gave me Lenords address
in Illinois. me wrote
to his father Mr.
Blackwood. — and he
begged me not to
have Lenord arrested.
Then a lawyer
wrote to me saying
Lenord is now a
Rock Island Rail Road
call boy at only
\$5.00 a week; he owes
Bill Post. FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES call at 1-800-368-5848

for something and is willing to pay at 90 dollars a month and will start paying now if I will accept these terms.

I am an excellent mining electrician and United States Vanadium Co. USV at Bishop, Calif. had on file a notice from USV's medical examiner saying this Bill Post must not be employed by USV: But still USV black listed me out of my job in Nevada; Then in November 1950 I was forcibly brain damaged on orders of USV's Dr. Anderson.

It was morphine
injections. And I was
kidnapped from County
Hospital bed in
Bishop, Calif To
Los Angeles and
here Dr. McKeever
smashed my vertebrae
for big money and
reported for USV
this BILL Post. is able
to work. So by this
I was enslaved by
USV until me
collapsed on the job.

Then Deputy Sheriff
Frank Swallow
dumped me in the
High Sierra. XRAY
made in Bishop proved
Dr. McKeever,
smashed my spine
and USVs Dr. Scott
stole the XRAY film

ALL was backed up
by the Union Communists
and State Compensation
Insurance Fund.

I pay Union dues and
federal Government
tax still there
is no Law enforcement.

Dont deprive Law
abiding citizens
from fire arms

— PLEASE —

VERY TRULY YOURS
BILL POST.

L. H. Hospital
7th and Dewey Blvd.
San Francisco, Calif.
94116

June 16, 1967

Mr. Roger A. Hanes
126 Sears Street
San Francisco, California 94112

Dear Mr. Hanes:

Thank you for your letter concerning my gun-control bill. I am enclosing a copy of the bill as you requested.

As you will see after studying this measure, the bill does not discriminate against the legitimate citizen or the hunter. The intent of the bill is to prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons in a public place or on a public street.

I do not believe there is a place in modern society for armed gangs to parade up and down our city streets intimidating honest citizens.

Thank you for your interest in this legislation.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

cw/ fd
enclosure

From the desk of

Don Mulford

*enclose copy
of AB 1591.*

(amended version)

RAH
1581

JUN 8 1967

June 5, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford:

I am the Legislative Chairman of my local UROC chapter and would like a copy of your firearms bill regarding the carrying of loaded firearms in incorporated areas. Since this is for presentation to our membership I would also appreciate any further information you might have on the matter.

Thank you for your help and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Roger A. Hanes
Roger A. Hanes
126 Sears Street
San Francisco
California 94112

RAH/1h

June 15, 1967

Mr. Lloyd E. Stahl
6400 Rampart Drive
Carmichael, Calif. 95608

Dear Mr. Stahl:

Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your letter of May 12 to the Editor of the Sacramento Bee.

I am sure you are aware that I am very grateful to the National Rifle Association for its help in making my gun control bill, AB 1591, a workable piece of legislation, yet protecting the Constitutional rights of citizens.

I am enclosing a copy of this bill in its amended form, as it was passed by the Assembly.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Lloyd E. Stahl
6400 Rampart Drive
Carmichael, Ca. 95608

Editor
Sacramento Bee
21st. & Q Streets
Sacramento, California

MAY 12 1967

Editor of The Bee-Sir:

I was very disappointed in your editorial cartoon and article of Tuesday May 9, 1967.

As a member of the National Rifle Association I receive the American Rifleman magazine each month, and read it thouroughly.

The May Editorial on page 16 does not suggest that an armed homeowner is the BEST answer to rioting. I feel you have been unfair in not publishing the whole editorial. The editorial does say, "... a ... disarmed... America ... might require the most enormous "standing army" of police ever seen in the free world..." It then explains, with New York City as an example, what could happen.

The statement you make concerning the N.R.A. saying as an afterthought, a sledge or axe handle might be a help to the homeowner in a riot is completely out of context. This statement is erroneous and based on an article which starts on page 30 of the May issue of the American Rifleman. An editors note preceeding the article states the article does not reflect any official N.R.A. policy, However, the N.R.A. does have an official policy of supporting law and order at all levels of government. The N.R.A. in many policy statements has said that it will support responsible legislation in the curbing of crime, especially if a firearm is used in the commission of a crime, but to disarm honest citizens has not proved to be an effective way to curb crime or disarm criminals.

Publishing this letter would be appreciated by the writer and if you could find space to publish the entire Editorial, you have mis-constnaed, would bring a letter of thanks from this writer and from many others.

Yours truly,


L. E. S. Carmichael

cc: Assemblyman , Don Mulford

June 15, 1967

Mr. Edward Lee Soule, Jr.
Soule Steel Company
P. O. Box 3510 Rincon Annex
San Francisco, California 94119

Dear Lee:

Thank you very much for your communication regarding my gun bill, AB 1591. It has now passed the Assembly, as amended. I enclose a copy for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

SOULÉ STEEL COMPANY

1750 ARMY STREET • BOX 3510 RINCON ANNEX • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94119
TELEPHONE • 824-4141

May 5, 1967

MAY 8 1967


The Honorable Don Mulford
State Assemblyman
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Don:

I am greatly encouraged to hear that you are introducing legislation into the State Assembly to prevent the carrying of arms, particularly in loaded condition, as witnessed during the recent invasion of the Chamber at Sacramento by the Black Panthers.

I also agree with you that we should go a lot further than this, and if we allow armed men to indiscriminately roam our streets there is no telling what can happen to the individual citizen, and he will have no way of protecting his life and property and will be subjected to gangster tactics.

Sincerely yours,


Edward Lee Soulé, Jr.
President

LS:eb

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 15, 1967

Mr. Paul F. Perati
6110 Aspinwall Road
Oakland 11, California

Dear Mr. Perati:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your card of May 10 until my bill, AB 1591, was amended to my satisfaction. As you know now, the Assembly has passed it and it is on its way to the Senate.

The bill enjoyed the full support of the National Rifle Association and was without opposition in the committee after we had amended it.

I was particularly careful to make sure that the constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves was included in this measure. I must disagree with you that present laws have given excellent coverage in this field. If this were true, we would not have armed bands of citizens frightening school children, invading courts, invading police departments, invading the halls of the Legislature, with loaded weapons.

Regarding your comment that my record on civil rights and civil liberties is the poorest of any elected Republican Assemblyman since September 9, 1950, I would be interested to know the source of your statistics.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

em

6110 Aspinwall Road
Oakland 11, California
May 10, 1967 16


Assemblyman J. Mulford
member of the California
Assembly
Sacramento, California

Dear Assemblyman Mulford:
Please withdraw your
anti-gun bill as your
position is not well taken.
Present laws have
excellent coverage in
this field.

As a lifelong Republican
may I say, your record
on civil rights and
civil liberties is the
poorest of any elected
Republican Assemblyman
since September 9, 1850.

MAY 12 1967
Yours truly,
Paul F. Perati

P. F. Perati
6110 Aspinwall Rd.
Oakland, California



ALWAYS USE
ZIP CODE



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

Assemblyman Don Mulford
California State Assembly
Sacramento
California

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 14, 1967

Mr. Lyle C. Cloutier
2547 E. 29th Street
Oakland, California 94602

Dear Mr. Cloutier:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, and the Crippled Children Service Program.

AB 1591 was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I agree with you that the Crippled Children Service Program is an important one and worthy of support.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Enclosure

1591 ? - J

MAY 31 1967

OAKLAND, CALIF

MAY 29 1967

Dear Sir:

I BELIEVE YOUR INTENTIONS ARE GOOD ON YOUR GUN CURBING LAW BUT HAVE YOU THOUGHT OF THE RIGHT CITIZENS HAVE TO PROTECT THEMSELVES AND FAMILIES ?

THE PEOPLE YOUR BILL IS AIMED AT JUST PLAIN DON'T GIVE A DAMN FOR ANYTHING. NOTE THE SPEECHES OF TWO OF THE LEADERS OF FORTH COMING RIOTS THIS SUMMER, THESE PEOPLE ARE ANARCHISTS. THEIR ALIGNING RIOTS WITH WAR DEMONSTRATORS AND FOMENTORS OF CIVIC DISOBEDIENCE.

ARE YOU THEM TAKING AWAY THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLE PAYING HIGH TAXES

To Feed and clothe these Protesters
So they can loot at will while
we are working?

I am enclosing also a letter
I received from Assemblyman
Crown in support of his efforts
on behalf of the Crippled Children
Service Program.

You are a member of his
Committee and I hope you
working hard on this as it is
a very worthwhile service.

People should visit the schools to
see the work and rehabilitation that
is achieved.

Sincerely
Lyle C. Chautain

MEMBERS

E. RICHARD BARNES
FRANK P. BELOTTI
CARL A. BRITTEGGI
JOHN L. E. COLLIER
CHARLES J. CONRAD
PAULINE L. DAVIS
LEROY F. GREENE
STEWART HINCKLEY
LESTER McMILLAN
CHARLES W. MEYERS
DON MULFORD
CARLEY V. PORTER
LEO J. RYAN
WINFIELD SHOEMAKER
VICTOR VEYSEY
CHARLES WARREN
GEORGE ZHOVICH
FRANK LANTERMAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

California Legislature

Assembly Committee

on

Ways and Means

STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 2140
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
445-8160

ROBERT W. CROWN
CHAIRMAN

May 1, 1967

LOUIS J. ANGELO
COORDINATOR

EUGENE R. LEYVAL
CONSULTANT

JOHN H. SIMONS
CONSULTANT

GAIL VESSELS
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

MARIA HUSUM
SECRETARY

KEITH AXTELL
LEGISLATIVE INTERN

Mr. Lyle C. Cloutier
2547 E. 29th Street
Oakland, California 94602

Dear Mr. Cloutier:

Thank you very much for your letter of April 14, 1967 urging an adequate appropriation for the Crippled Children Service Program.

I quite agree with you that this program is an important one and that the children it serves are worthy of adequate care.

You may be interested to know that I have introduced H.R. 147 which asks that a legislative committee conduct a study of the C.C.S. program in order to develop improved budgetary estimating procedures. I hope that improvements can be made so as to prevent the necessity for deficiency appropriations, as was necessary this fiscal year.

Thank you very much for your interest and concern. I am most appreciative.

Sincerely,


ROBERT W. CROWN
Assemblyman

RWC:jm

June 16, 1967

Mr. F.D. deGroot
961 Tulare Avenue
Berkeley, Calif. 94707

Dear Mr. deGroot:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 10 until my bill was in final form and amended to my satisfaction. My bill, AB 1591, has passed the Assembly and is on its way to the Senate.

I shall attempt to answer your letter in detail.

First, let me point out that this bill was introduced at the specific request of law enforcement people, specifically the police departments, sheriffs, and district attorneys of Alameda and Contra Costa counties. I hope you will read my bill, which I attach.

We have very carefully worked to protect the constitutional right of people to bear arms, but at the same time I do not believe there is any justification for armed bands on our public streets and entering public buildings, schools, colleges and the University with loaded weapons.

I believe the information you had about charges that could be preferred against the Black Panthers was inaccurate.

The Black Panthers are now being prosecuted in several areas, but primarily for having a loaded weapon near a jail, and for violation of the Fish & Game Act.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mr. F.D. de Groot - 6/16/67 - 2

I believe the people have had ample notice because my bill has been available for public review for several weeks, as you can tell from the date on the face of the bill.

I point out to you that the National Rifle Association has cooperated with me and helped me amend this bill into its present form.

Thank you very much for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

em

AIR MAIL

F. D. de Groot
 961 Tulare Avenue
 Berkeley, Calif. 94707

MAY 11 1967

May 10, 1967

MR. DON MULFORD, ASSEMBLYMEN
 State Capitol
 Sacramento, California 95801

Dear Mr. Mulford: FIRE ARMS CONTROL

I'm very much concerned over reports in the press and radio about your proposal to place controls dealing with fire arms, stemming from the Black Panther invasion of the assembly last week.

It is difficult to give an opinion on your proposal from what I have learned from the press and radio, but if it provides a felony charge for carrying loaded fire arms, though not concealed, on the street or in public as has been reported, I am very much opposed to any such measure. This would appear to reduce the stature of a man carrying a gun to a child carrying a useless toy. It would tend to disarm the honest, law abiding citizen and have little or no effect on the criminal element.

In my opinion, any one approaching a person having a gun and considering it to be empty because of the law, would be a fool. Except when being carried to and fro from ranges, hunting and peaceful pursuits, a gun is not being carried to be used as a club and should be considered loaded, any law to the contrary notwithstanding.

If, as reported in this evening's Oakland Tribune, and as reported being stated by Governor Reagan, "that the 'Black Panther' members who invaded the assembly last week could be charged under present law with assault with a deadly weapon because their loaded weapons constituted 'an implied threat' ", why are they not being so charged and prosecuted??

Be it possible that the BP are not to be prosecuted?? Are we to believe this violation, this act of anarchy is to be swept under the California Congressional rug??

I should like to suggest that no fire arms control law be passed and placed into effect until the people have had ample notice and time to assess and offer their comments. In the meantime, it is my feeling present laws properly enforced provide sufficient safeguards against recurrence of incidents such as the BP invasion of the assembly.

Enclosed, for your information, is my letter to our various senators and representatives on this same subject now being considered on the federal level.

Very sincerely yours,


 F. D. de Groot

Encl.

CC: *Governor Ronald Reagan
 * For your information

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 10, 1967

*F. D. de Groot
961 Tulare Avenue
Berkeley, Calif. 94707*

This letter HR - 5384 to:

Representatives:	James C. Gorman, House Judiciary Committee
	Don Edwards " " "
	Charles E. Wiggins " " "
Senators:	Everett M. Dirksen
	Thomas H. Kuchel
	George Murphy
Representative:	Jeffery Cohelan

MULFORD ACT FILES ^{Acquired by} FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
961 Tulare Avenue
Berkeley, Calif. 94707

May 10, 1967

MR. EMANUEL CELLER, CHAIRMAN HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Celler: H. R. - 5384

I wish to voice my opposition to this bill or any other proposed legislation that would in any way control, restrict or penalize any law abiding citizen in the purchase or possession of fire arms and their uses in peaceful pursuits.

The theory of placing controls on the purchase of fire arms to deter the present crime wave, in my opinion, is not a solution. This bill, I believe, would prove impotent. In practice, it would appear to a greater extent to penalize and disarm the honest and law abiding citizen while having only negligible effect on the criminal element.

Also, why should Congress preempt the rights of the individual states to legislate fire arms controls and want to place the law under the Federal Title for criminal law instead of Title 15 pertaining to interstate and foreign commerce? Should legislation of this nature become necessary, I believe it can be most effectively set up and administered by the individual states.

Further, so long as our courts (justices) espouse and practice their liberal views, unilaterally favoring the criminal's cause because of some slight technicality omitted or violated during apprehension or trial, and setting them free again on society, crime is bound to flourish. Crime feeds on this type of treatment.

Also, if, in our society it would be proper and possible to control the willy nilly and seemingly unwarranted mass migrations from south to north and west thereby controlling the excessive build up and glut in population in metropolitan areas, much could be gained toward reducing our crime rate. It is in the glutted areas, the overcrowding, lack of jobs, recreation, etc., the frustrations of the people wanting the things which it is impossible for them to get under these conditions that make these places the breeding grounds for crime and its proliferation throughout our nation. This, I contend, is the cause for the increase in our crime rate and the problem, and it will not be solved by passing a fire arms control law.

Much more is involved and could be said.

Very sincerely yours,

F. D. de Groot

June 15, 1967

Mrs. J. L. Carpenter, Jr.
President, El Dorado County
Council of Republican Women
P. O. Box 859
Placerville, California 95667

Dear Mrs. Carpenter:

Thank you for your letter concerning AB 1362, pertaining to the creation of the Tahoe Regional Agency.

I have joined Assemblyman Edwin Z'berg in the fight to combat the polluting of Lake Tahoe. Our bill is the result of a study conducted by a joint committee commissioned by the Legislatures of California and Nevada.

The intent of the bill is to protect local autonomy as much as possible while saving the Lake from the ravages of pollution. I am enclosing a copy of the bill, as amended, for your information.

From my investigation of the situation and upon the advice of many constituents who have substantial property holdings at the Lake Tahoe area, I am informed that the sixty-two local agencies have been trying to bring forth some acceptable legislation but are hopelessly bogged down in local arguments. When this occurs, and in view of the rapidly increasing pollution of Lake Tahoe, the State has no choice but to try to find some compromise solution, keeping in mind of course participation of local people.

I think if you will examine this bill you will find that a majority of the people who would serve, would come from the local area, thus assuring local control.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mrs. J. L. Carpenter, Jr.

Page 2

June 15, 1967

It is worth pointing out, however, that because some counties have not been effective in solving the past and present problems connected with pollution, an agency backed with the authority to require basinwide standards is absolutely necessary if the Lake is to be saved.

If California and Nevada fail to meet the challenge of preserving Lake Tahoe, one of the World's great attractions will be lost forever.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek

Enclosure (3)

El Dorado County Council of Republican Women
P. O. Box 858
Placerville, California 95667

May 23, 1967

Honorable Donald Mulford
Assemblyman, 16th District
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:


Re: AB 1362 (Z'berg)
Tahoe Regional Agency
Committee Hearing - May 26, 1967

We strongly urge a "No" vote on AB 1362 since a bill of this type would call for an appointive governing body, eminently powerful, and not responsive to the will of the people.

May we refer you to our letter of March, 1967, in which was quoted a resolution of our Board of Directors, dated February 20, 1967, which reads in part as follows:

"That a regional form of government (as proposed by the Tahoe Regional Agency) violates the principles of a republican form of government by attempting to authorize the formation of a highly appointive body to exercise the power of further appointment, the power of eminent domain brought about by the changing of codes for the condemnation of real or personal property, the power of taxation without direct representation--all of which makes the proposed 'limited purpose regional agency' a super-government not responsible directly to the will of the people of this Republic."

Very truly yours,



Normadene Carpenter (Mrs. J. L., Jr.)
President, El Dorado County Council
of Republican Women

NC:pb

June 15, 1967

Mr. David Buckley
460 Staples Avenue
San Francisco, Calif. 94112

Dear Mr. Buckley:

Thank you very much for your letter of May 8.
I purposely refrained from acknowledging it
until I could send you a copy of my gun bill,
AB 1591, in its amended form. I am enclosing
a copy, which I believe you may find of interest.

I appreciate your good thoughts. Thank you for
writing to me.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MAY 8 1967

ASSEMBLY DON MULFORD
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIF

MAY 8-67

^{MR}
DEAR MULFORD

- MAY I CONGRATULATE YOU
ON THE WEAPONS BILL, I BELIEVE THE
STRONGER THE BETTER. THE LEFT WING,
CIVIL RIGHT DEMONSTRATORS, SHOULD
NOT BE ALLOWED TO TAKE THE LAW
IN THEIR HANDS, FOR SPECIAL INTERESTS.
YOU ARE CREDIT TO THIS STATE, AND
I AM WELL AWARE HOW THE LEFT
TRIED TO DEFEAT YOU IN THE LAST
ELECTION, PARTICULARLY THE U.C.
STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS. PLEASE
KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK YOU ARE
DOING. THANK YOU

DAVE BULLY BUCKLEY
460 STAPLES AVE
SAN FRANCISCO CALIF 94112

June 15, 1967

Mrs. Marie M. Arburees
225 Pamela Drive, Apt. 15
Mountain View, California

Dear Mrs. Arburees:

Thank you very much for your communication of
May 6.

The enclosed copy of my bill, which has passed
the Assembly, may be of interest to you.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure, AB 1591

Apr 16, 1967
Mountain View, Calif

May 6, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Legislature
Sacramento, California

MAY 8 1967

Dear Sir -

I wish to congratulate you for your responses regarding Bill A.B. 1591 on Mr. Rose's program last evening. I highly approve the bill.

I am sick and tired of the "venom spread" by so many of the minority groups against the white race blaming us for everything. I need to make my own mind up on the air and can't help thinking that unless the guise of "free speech" some of the so called leaders of the minority race have gone too far. By so doing they are only hurting their cause and bringing the ire of many citizens upon them.

It seems to me more could be accomplished by dispelling all the hatred and threats.

I'm a native Californian and love my beloved state, but it distresses me to see and hear the things that are going on perpetrated by a few irrational rabble rousers.

Respectfully,
Marie M. Carbone

June 15, 1967

Mr. V.H. Wheeler
2050 Fourth Street
San Rafael, California

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

I enclose a copy of my firearms bill, AB 1591, as amended, for your information.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

V. H. WHEELER
2050 FOURTH STREET
SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

MAY 9 1967

May 8 1967

No comment AT
any time

Mr Charles O'Brien
States Attorney General's Office
Sacramento, Calif

Sir;

I can not but respond in opposition to your statements broadcast on television through channel 7 last Friday night.

You stated a person could fire any kind of weapon in the State of California, etc., without any restrictions, you must be aware that local jurisdictions do have ordinances against discharging firearms within their several city limits.

You also stated the current attempt at restrictive legislation was not discriminatory as to any ethnic group, this may be true, but I do believe it is highly discriminatory against the vast majority of owners of firearms who use their pieces as sporting weapons, hunters, target shooters etc. This is not to condone the possession of destructive weapons, I am speaking of the so-called small-arms category.

There is no argument to the fact that a person with criminal intentions, will acquire a firearm one way or another, hence any legislation against the firearm itself will not achieve the intended purpose of the legislation, but rather it will restrict the law-abiding members of our society, who are obviously, by far, the greater majority.

A great deal more can be accomplished by enforcing existing laws governing the subject, or at least establishing tougher penalties for crimes committed with the use of firearms, but above all else, do not discriminate against the person who derives sportsman's pleasure by the use of firearms in the peace full pursuit of a day in the woods or on the range.

Also, since the perpetrators of crimes of assault and intrusion are becoming more brazen, with a likening disregard for law and order, it becomes more apparent that the protection of life, limb and property is shifting to the attacked person, this is the person who would, in all probability, comply with restrictions. An attacker, knowing this, would feel safer in the commission of an

-2-

intended crime.

People are genuinely concerned about their own safety and the safety of their property, and perhaps justly so, as witness the property destruction in the Watt's situation. People are in a confused state of mind, knowing there are some pretty stringent laws against property damage and especially looting. Yet apparently nothing was done to stop the looting. People would like to know why.

My last concern is that any punitive action now, could be a stepping-stone in the future to complete abolition of the possession of firearms by free citizens. Hitler did this as his first step. And DON'T say it can't happen here!

Thank you.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert".

cc:- John H McCarthy, Senator
Don Mulford

AB 1591

June 15, 1967

Ernest J. Webb, D.D.S.
825 Oak Grove Avenue
Menlo Park, California

Dear Dr. Webb:

I have refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 10 until I could send you a copy of AB 1591 in its amended form. I hope you will find it of interest.

The measure has now passed the Assembly.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

ERNEST J. WEBB, D. D. S.
PRACTICE LIMITED TO ENDODONTICS
825 OAK GROVE AVENUE
MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA

MAY 12 1967

322-7531
10 May 1967


The Hon. Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Sir:

Please send to me at the above address
all available information, pro and con,
on the proposed gun legislation.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,



Ernest J. Webb, D.D.S.

AB 1591

June 13, 1967

Mr. Gordon A. Bader
5661 Cazadero Way
Sacramento, Calif. 95822

Dear Mr. Bader:

Thank you very much for your communication of
May 9 regarding gun controls.

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging
it because I wanted to send you my Bill, AB 1591,
when it was finally amended and passed by the
Assembly. I enclose it for your information.

Thank you for writing to me.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

em

enclosure

MAY 9 1968

Dear Sir:

In view of all the controversy on crime and sale of guns and what to do about it, I, as just an average citizen, would like to offer a few thoughts on a plan to possibly put a control on firearms at the state level and possibly at the federal level, even though it would be a tremendous job.

All through this letter I will be comparing this plan and some of the reasoning to the DMV Motor Vehicle Code because I think there is a definite parallel between use and control of firearms and the motor vehicles.

I can't see where this plan would change the peaceful and lawful use of the firearms but it would put a backbone in a system of controls and laws which would help law enforcement agencies and let Mr. Average Citizen know what the laws are governing the firearm. It would centralize firearm information and liberate a number of law enforcement agencies from setting up their own files, saving time and money.

I advocate setting up a State Division of Small Arms - DSA. This division would be much like the DMV and would control sale and registration of all firearms from pellet guns to the ornamental or collector gun that is illegal until rendered harmless.

I. Duties of the DSA:

- A. Require manufacturers of all firearms to furnish ballistic test where applicable.
 1. Test to accompany firearm to retailer.
 2. Ballistic test with pertinent information sent to DSA on purchase.
 3. Manufacturer keep record of ballistic test.
- B. Require manufacturers to serial number all guns.
- C. Register all firearms:
 1. Fingerprint all applicants.
 2. Issue certificates of registration with "This is not a license to carry firearm" printed on it.
 - a. Contain picture, thumb print, gun information.
 3. Require certificate must be carried at all times when using firearm. One card could be issued for each gun because collectors seldom have full collection with them at one time.
 4. Character check on all purchasers of firearms capable of being concealed.
- D. Sale of guns:
 1. Control as in case of motor vehicle sale or disposition.
 2. Same as C 1 above.
 3. Age limit same as present law.
 4. Private sale restrictions same as retail sale, etc.
- E. Have facilities for fingerprinting and ballistic testing.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

- F. Importing of firearms into State of California:
 - 1. By auto or over land:
 - a. Declare at Border Station and receive certificate to carry - copy sent to DSA.
 - 2. Sent in by retailer by any means, they should sent information (with ballistic test) to DSA.
 - 3. Brought into the State by any other means, the bearer or recipient to declare to DSA.
- G. Illegal firearms made legal:
 - 1. Must register even though they have been rendered harmless as prescribed by present law.
 - 2. Owner to show proof yearly that firearm is still harmless.
 - 3. Sale or transfer of ownership governed by sale regulations as other firearms.
- H. Present arsenal owned by public:
 - 1. Register as described.
 - 2. Ballistic tests taken where applicable.
- I. Cost of program:
 - 1. Initial appropriation by State.
 - 2. Registration fee yearly.
 - 3. License fee where issued yearly.
 - 4. Ballistic test fee.
 - 5. A lot less than the drain of dollars and lives caused by illegal use of firearms.
- J. Issue yearly Summary of Small Arms Code, such as issued by DMV of DMV Code so public will know some of the essentials do's and don'ts.

II. Benefits of this program:

- A. All law enforcement agencies will have a central pool from which to draw firearm information.
- B. Most firearms will be fingerprinted with their ballistic test coupled to owner.
 - 1. This would speed the tracking down of firearms used in crime.
- C. Stop or curtail indiscriminate sale of firearms.
- D. Unlimited benefits.

III. Enforcement of this program:

- A. All law enforcement agencies, State Forestry Rangers, State Game Wardens, Etc.

IV. Constitutionality:

- A. Those who might be in opposition, haven't objected to the DMV Code or statement on Page 3 of Vehicle Code Summary, Section 1, Paragraph 1, saying it is a privilege and not a right to operate a motor vehicle on public highway and street, and they haven't voiced strong opposition to fishing and hunting licenses.


MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

- B. It is interesting to note that the State Legislature had to find out the constitutionality of making it illegal to carry loaded firearms on the street, yet no one contests the same right to drive a motor vehicle on the street - Both Kill !

In conclusion may I say that I believe the DSA would be to the firearm as the DMV is to the motor vehicle and the respective controls are in parallel. Many items in this letter are probably covered by laws or controls, but I will repeat that I think the firearm laws and controls should be centralized so the public will know what is going on with the full realization of the impact of firearms on our society, and give law enforcement agencies another stick to help in this tremendous problem.

Thank you for your time and patience.

Yours truly,



Gordon A. Bader
5661 Cazadero Way
Sacramento, Calif.
95822

1591

June 14, 1967

Mr. John Barale
3721 Elston Avenue
Oakland, Calif. 94602

Dear Mr. Barale:

Thank you for your letter of June 7 concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

3721 Elston Avenue
Oakland, Calif. 94602
June 7, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95801

re: Proposed anti-gun legislation

Dear Sir:

I understand that you are considering legislation to limit the carrying of guns and ammunition by law abiding citizens. May I please register a complaint?

I love guns, hunting, fishing, target practice etc. I appreciate the protection that a gun allows me to give my family and my home in case of forcible entry by a "street*corner gang". In this time of repeated gang attacks of citizens out for a walk, it may become necessary to carry a gun, openly in accordance with the law, of course. May I point out that a gun without ammunition is not much help.

Re the recent and stupid entry of black panthers into the govt chambers, the attached article shows that present laws seem to cover the situation and only need enforcing.

Re guns used in crime. Making it hard for the citizen to own guns does not deter the criminal in any way. What we need are severe laws covering the use of guns in committing a crime. Please, I beg you, go slowly in restricting peoples liberties, especially don't act in haste because of the panther debacle.

Sincerely,


John Barale

'Panthers' Face Court At Capital

SACRAMENTO — Eighteen members of the "Black Panthers" are scheduled for a preliminary hearing July 20 on charges of disturbing a session of the California legislature.

Fifteen of the group appeared in Sacramento Municipal Court yesterday. A bench warrant was issued for Warren Tucker, 19, who failed to appear, but two other missing "Panthers" were excused — Truman Harris, 18, who was reported sick, and Mark Comfort, 33, who is serving a jail sentence at Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center in connection with an Oakland demonstration.

Five youthful members of the gun-carrying group also are scheduled to appear before Juvenile Judge Robert W. Cole.

The "Panthers" are charged with conspiracy to disrupt legislative proceedings, a felony, and disrupting the session, a misdemeanor.

Members of the group appeared on the floor of the legislature May 2 during debate on a gun control law.

June 14, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Selby
19060 Stanton Avenue
Castro Valley, California 94546

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Selby:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1891, which I authored, and fluoridation of drinking water.

AB 1591 was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

AB 1616, relating to fluoridation of domestic water supplies, was heard in the Assembly Public Health Committee on May 16 and failed to pass. This has the effect of defeating the measure at this session of the Legislature. It is my opinion that this measure should be voted upon by the people.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD
FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

em
Enclosure

AB 1591

Stanton Ave,
Castro Valley Calif
94546

April 1967

MAY 19 1967

Assemblyman Alon Mulford,
Dear Sir:

Following the KPIX noon news there was an editorial regarding a bill you're introducing. I believe the bill no. was 1591. But anyway it was regarding carrying weapons. We are very much in accord with the bill you are introducing in this regard. And we definitely hope it passes.

Regarding a less serious matter we were so happy the Calif. song "I Love You, Calif" was kept as the state song. As written before + stated we are native Calif. We think it is too bad, the song isn't sung more often. It occurred to us listening to the news discussion regarding the song that the song is seldom heard anymore. It is a fine reminder to anyone of the beauty of our state & a reminder to keep it that way.

There is another bill we would like to mention. That is the reauthorization of the water. Our area has voted against this bill. But "We the People" doesn't seem to mean much anymore. We defeated this bill in our area. Now in spite of the peoples views we read & hear on the news that it is going to be passed. Regardless of the peoples wishes. Now, it seems the concept of our country is changing to the extent that the majority vote of "we the people" is no avail. This happened in another bill also as you know. And to us it is a dangerous trend. Forced medication, as in this instance, is not the policy of a free people. We sincerely hope this bill is not passed by the legislature over the wishes of the people.

Yours truly
Mr. & Mrs Harold Selby

June 14, 1967

Mrs. Fay Maxwell
855 York Street
Oakland, California 94610

Dear Mrs. Maxwell:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

The Honorable

Don Mulford, Assemblyman
State Capital
Sacramento, Ca. 94801

May, 17, 1967

Dear Sir:

My friends and I (white) strongly resent your trying to disarm us. The negroes have been told by the President and other "liberals" that they do not have to obey laws they do not like and they will not obey this law. If they get arrested, the State of California pays attorneys to defend them and this is our (taxpayer's money).

If any "conserative" white person had marched in the State Capital building the bonds would have been \$100,000 or more. If they had carried loaded guns the State would have found laws to hold them. Governor Reagan said in one of his press conference's that he was not sure there were not laws for this and I am sure if one looks closely they can be found instead of using this as an excuse to disarm us. The next move will be to disarm the Police and we will be at the mercy of "THE MOBS". By this appeasing the "LEFT" element you will find that this will not promote "Peace In Our Time".

I worked hard for your election and belong to "The Republican Piedmont Women's Club". This move on your part to disarm us while you must be aware that the leader of "The Black Panthers" is speaking on the Berkeley campus inciting more violence and he and all his "gang" are being paid by the State to do this is beyond my understanding.

If this "discriminating" bill is passed I surely hope our Governor will veto it or he will loose the support of the very people that voted him in office.

The White and Black-law abiding people in this State are very tired of one law for them and another for "THE MOBS".

I would strongly advise all that may read this letter to read the article, "BLACK POWER-ITS GOALS, METHODS." This article is in "The U. S. News & World Report". May 22, 1967.

Many of us will be watching this vote and will remember it in the next election.

Sincerely,
(Mrs) Fay Maxwell

June 14, 1967

Mrs. R.M. Pickens
754 Rand Avenue
Oakland, California 94610

Dear Mrs. Pickens:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public streets or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MAY 22 1967

754 Rand Avenue
Oakland, California
94610

Doh Mulford, Assemblyman
State Capitol
Sacramento, California - 94801

Dear Sir:

I am an American. I believe in our Constitutional Republic, and government by law. This system has made more progress than any other system of government, ever known.

"--the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" is the second Amendment of the Bill of Rights of that U. S. Constitution.

I oppose and resent the bill now pending, for control of firearms. This legislation, if passed, will be the first step to deprive Law Abiding Citizens of ownership and right to bear arms. These citizens are the ones that voted you into office.

It doesn't seem right to tell one group that they do not have to obey laws they do not like - so they are not obeying them. They will not legally buy guns and register them with the proper authorities. When/ if they are arrested, the State of California, with Tax-Payer's money, pays attorneys to defend them. A bill to control firearms will benefit the Criminal and lawless element of Society. The vast majority of decent, law-abiding citizens, are not the ones that are causing trouble.

The 'passage' of this control bill, no matter how fancy the wording, would leave people, towns, cities, or States at the mercy of the 'lawless mobs'. If you have not already done so, please read and article "Black Power" - its goals and methods, in U. S. News & World Report of May 22, 1967.

Sincerely, for Constitutional Government



(Mrs.) R. M. Pickens

June 14, 1967

Mr. Edward C. Brown
P.O. Box 134
Cromberg, Calif.

Dear Ed:

Thank you very much for your letter expressing support for my gun-control legislation. AB 1591 passed the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I am sorry I was unable to attend the dedication of the reconstructed firehouse in Johnsville last weekend, but the pace in Sacramento has picked up considerably during the past few weeks. Hope the event was a big success.

It was good hearing from you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MAY 19 1967

EDWARD C. BROWN
P. O. BOX 134
CROMBERG, CALIF.

May 16/67

Dear Son,

I am pleased with your continued stand in favor of tougher law enforcement. There is no reason why irresponsible individuals should be permitted to carry loaded weapons. Some of us who live out here in the woods have reason to carry a loaded gun in our car because we never know what hoodlum might be lurking around our home when we return at night from some event in Quincy. But we hold valid permits from the sheriff for this purpose.

The Clampers are having their big event in Johnsonville this year on June 10th for the purpose of dedicating the reconstructed fire house which will not be finished due to the heavy snow conditions!

If you can make it, please bring your horn. We'll have a parade.

Will let you know later about details.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Ed Brown

June 14, 1967

Mr. William B. Hopper, Jr.
1 Poco Paseo
Orinda, California

Dear Mr. Hopper:

Thank you for your recent letter expressing support for Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. The measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

Honorable Congressman Mulford

This letter is my offer of endorsement concerning the proposed bill to curtail the carrying of loaded weapons.

I feel that there have been too many deaths today caused by people carrying loaded guns in public places. The number of people killed by gunshot is increasing and people seem hardly concerned. There is no reason for civilians to carry loaded weapons to protect themselves; there are police to protect people now. I can understand people carrying guns back in 1860 to protect themselves from wild animals or wild Indians. Now times have changed. There are no wild Indians that threaten us; no wild beasts that threaten us. I hunt a lot and know that nobody (except police and authorized personnel) should carry loaded weapons. The only place a person should carry a loaded gun is in a safe place; not in public. I hope the bill is passed so the number of people tooting loaded guns would decrease.

P.S. Do you think as a result of this legislation, if passed, will lead to other legislation that could really infringe upon our rights to carry guns?

Example: a law that says that all guns have to be broken down when they are carried in a car.

June 14, 1967

Mr. M. Montague
2275 Virginia
Berkeley, Calif.

Dear Mr. Montague:

Thank you for your recent communication concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

June 20, 1967

Mr. H. B. Mathes
Legislative Consultant
Sierra Desert Gun Club
P. O. Box 5276
China Lake, California

Dear MR. Mathes:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

Dear Mr. Mulford, ^{2275 Virginia}
^{Berkeley, Calif}
MAY 13 1967
The state is guarded by Militia
who take their guns home
with them. When we have more
justice for all there will be
less need to fear for some.
A completely unarmed people
is at the mercy of tyrants as
Jefferson pointed out. Work
harder for equality, please M. Montague



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

Hon. Don Mulford
State Legislature
Sacramento
Calif

Sierra Desert Gun Club

Affiliated with California Rifle & Pistol Assn.

P. O. BOX 5276

CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA 93556

NRA
Club
7649



DCM
Club
09809

10 May 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
Room 3143
State Capitol
Sacramento
California 95814

Dear Assemblyman Mulford:

It seems that someone is always stirring the "pot"! The latest occurrences involving misuse of firearms such as the foolish Black Panther escapade and several recent deaths involving shootings in Los Angeles probably have renewed the cry in some quarters for further restrictions on firearms ownership. These are matters that should be of concern to all citizens but the old problem of trying to find cures without losing the patient remains to plague us.

We have been looking at legislation that affects firearms at both state and federal level. In regard to your bill (AB 1591) affecting the carrying of a loaded firearm, some thoughts have occurred and we are passing them along for what they are worth.

It seems that the bill does not provide for relief from the prohibition of carrying a loaded firearm for anyone who might employ a loaded gun in the thwarting of a crime or when aiding a law enforcement officer. It would seem to be in the public interest to protect anyone using a loaded firearm in a responsible way as described above from being liable to arrest and conviction for violating the law proposed in your bill. Otherwise those who might engage in upholding law and order might well become victims of the law themselves. This would be irony of the worst sort if their actions were responsible and helpful to law enforcement.

I am including a letter, sent this date, to Governor Reagan congratulating him on his recent statements relating to firearms. Some printed material is also included which you may find of interest.

Yours for sensible firearms laws,

FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
H. B. Mathes

H. B. Mathes

Legislative Consultant

WILL GUN CONTROL CUT CRIME?

Some people never understand why gun owners object to most gun control schemes. Gun owners know full well that it is **they** who will be controlled—not the lawless.

Pressure for new Federal gun laws has mounted as never before. A variety of gun bills have already been introduced in Congress this year. Two identical gun bills have been introduced in behalf of the administration. They are S. 1 sponsored by Senator Dodd (Conn.) and H.R. 5384 by Representative Celler (N.Y.). The Dodd-Celler bills are titled "State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967." They are based on the theory that gun control is a means of crime control. The House bill is given the best chance for passage.

While having some good points, this legislation contains features that promise serious trouble for all responsible gun owners. Most serious is wording found in the "Findings and Declaration" section of the bill which states that the ease with which you can acquire a firearm is a significant factor in the prevalence of crime and violence. If adopted by Congress, this philosophy will be applied to enforcement of the law so that guns will indeed be hard to get—especially for those who try to live within the law. History shows that only the law-abiding can be disarmed. Is this the way to control crime?

If enacted, this legislation would make shipment of any firearm to an individual in another State illegal. There have been abuses of interstate gun sales under the present system which is governed by the Federal Firearms Act but there are other remedies besides outlawing of the privilege. Given the chance, gun owners would probably support a sworn affidavit requirement for out-of-state sales in order to assure the public and the distant dealer that the gun sale is legitimate. It is not likely that members of the shooting sports will agree to the total prohibition of such sales as the Dodd-Celler bills require.

Another trouble spot arises in the section on licensing. As presently worded, an applicant for a Federal firearms importer's, manufacturer's, or dealer's license could have the license refused for any reason. This situation is open to obvious abuse and should be corrected by requiring the issuance of licenses to be mandatory once the applicant has met all requirements.

In final analysis, the Dodd-Celler bills seem to be aimed more at limiting legitimate gun sales and surrounding the shooting sports with a stigma of criminality rather than striking at the roots of crime or discouraging the criminal use of firearms.

ONE WAY TO FIGHT CRIME

Attacks on lone women in their homes increased drastically in the Orlando, Fla. area during 1966. Women were buying guns for home protection but had no knowledge of proper gun handling. One solution, suggested by an Orlando newspaperwoman, was to offer free instruction in handgun safety and marksmanship. Orlando police agreed to supply trained instructors and their pistol range. The response was overwhelming — over 2,000 women and their guns showed up! Absolutely swamped, the course had to be greatly expanded. Instructors noted that many women not only overcame their qualms about firearms but showed considerable skill with them.

In the meantime, the rate of attacks on women dropped nearly to zero! This is one way to fight crime.

THE NEW CRIME PROGRAM: LESS CRIME OR A DISARMED PEOPLE?

On February 6th, President Johnson urged Congress to pass strict gun control legislation (the Dodd-Celler bills) as part of the "War on Crime." He referred to New York's Sullivan law as a model for other states to follow.

This announcement will not enthruse gun owners. The Sullivan law has been used for years to deny handguns to responsible citizens no matter how legitimate their purpose.

During a period when pistol permits were drastically reduced, New York's crime rate rose to a level comparable to that of Los Angeles. Los Angeles has few gun control laws and one-third the police protection of New York! The evidence suggests that gun control does not equal crime control.

IS THERE REALLY A GUN MENACE?

Misuse and mishaps involving guns get daily headline treatment in the news but literally millions of gun owners and billions of safely fired shots go entirely unnoticed. This type of treatment generates the feeling that guns are only used to kill people.

Several highly publicized tragedies with firearms coupled with continued pressure from a few in Congress and from the press would have the world believe that the death rate from guns in this country has never been higher. Actually the death rate from guns has dropped one-half in the past 35 years. The drop occurred during a period when the number of guns and gun owners increased considerably.

On this basis, it appears there is less need for new firearms legislation now than 30 years ago.

YOUR STAKE IN THE LAW

You are urged to communicate your ideas on the gun law issue to your legislators in Congress. Their names and addresses can be gotten from your post office. A short, courteous letter giving reasons for your beliefs and wishes will be read. It may bring out a point he had not considered.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

NATIONAL SHOOTING
SPORTS FOUNDATION
1075 Post Road
Riverside, Conn. 06878

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION
1600 Rhode Island Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Your local gun club—



MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

SIERRA DESERT GUN CLUB
P.O. Box 5276
China Lake, Calif. 93554

General Meeting
20 March 1967

RESOLUTION ON FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Whereas persistent attempts are being made to equate crime rates with private acquisition and possession of firearms; and

Whereas this philosophy, if adopted by Congress, will open the door to laws which will disarm the law-abiding citizen, leaving him sure and easy prey to the violent, lawless and irresponsible element in our society; and

Whereas attempts to discourage criminal use of firearms by invoking measures which place severe and stringent regulations on the legal sale and possession of firearms are indirect, ineffective, and fail to disarm the lawless, but, instead, offer ever increasing harassment to those who abide by the law in acquiring firearms for legitimate purposes; and

Whereas the failure of such measures to eliminate criminal use of firearms results in ever more stringent attempts to control possession and sale of firearms with the law-abiding citizen being ultimately disarmed while the criminal element continues unrestrained and uncontrolled; and

Whereas violent crime rates in strict gun control jurisdictions are not consistently lower than in areas with little or no gun control laws; and

Whereas it is demonstrable that a citizenry possessing arms and skilled in their safe and proper use offers a marked deterrent to criminal attack; and

Whereas lack of safe and convenient places for the public to engage in hunting and target shooting is an increasingly severe problem to all citizens and especially to city residents; and is used as another excuse to disarm the people; and

Whereas present defects in the Federal Firearms Laws are easily remedied and do not offer sufficient cause or justification for enactment of many currently proposed firearms control bills which would place harshly restrictive burdens on the people; Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Sierra Desert Gun Club, Inc., at a general Meeting, That all legislative proposals which prohibit or impose unnecessary restrictions upon interstate firearms transactions between responsible individuals or between such individuals and an importer, manufacturer, or dealer should be opposed and rejected; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Federal Firearms Act be kept in Title 15, U. S. Code but that it be amended to remedy defects, long known to exist, as follows:

- 1) Impose a minimum age requirement on federal firearms license holders;
- 2) Require a sworn affidavit to accompany each firearms order which goes to an individual or licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer that assures the seller that the person ordering the firearm(s) is of proper age, is not falsifying his identity, and is legally entitled to receive the firearm(s);
- 3) Provide that it is unlawful for any person of licensee to knowingly transport or ship a firearm into another state in violation of law of the state and locality to which it is being shipped; and be it further

Sierra Desert Gun Club
Resolution on Firearms Legislation

Page 2

RESOLVED that criminal use of firearms be discouraged directly by enacting legislation at all levels of government that impose additional, consecutive prison terms for conviction of crimes committed with firearms; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Congress encourage all citizens of good repute to have and to know the safe and proper use of firearms as a means of defending themselves and their neighbors against criminal attack; to know their responsibilities under the laws of man and God in thwarting criminal action, and to better understand the role of law enforcement officers in maintaining law and order; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Congress seek means to increase the number of safe places for recreational and competitive shooting; as well as means to increase the capacity of existing facilities with special emphasis on providing such facilities in and about the heavily populated metropolitan areas; and be it further

RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be sent to the appropriate legislators in Sacramento, California and in the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald L. Inman
Secretary

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

GOOD GUN BILLS NEED SUPPORT

To: All Persons Interested in Preserving Private
Possession of Firearms and the Shooting Sports:

From: H. B. Mathes
Legislative Consultant
Sierra Desert Gun Club
P.O. Box 5276
China Lake, Calif.

Legislators often complain that those opposing restrictive gun laws seldom offer constructive alternatives. Since the pressure is mounting for some kind of gun legislation, it behooves us to find and support legislation relating to firearms that will be of benefit to the nation yet that will not disarm the people. I have listed some gun bills that are now in Congress which seem to be good, reasonable, and necessary proposals. They are listed under the Committee to which they are referred. If you like any of these proposals, write the Committee Chairman and let him know you favor the bill. (Be sure to mention the bill number and its sponsor's name.) Most bills die in committee each session. If a committee chairman likes a bill, it has a chance to get out of committee and become law. Here is the information... I have included some remarks in brackets where I have some thoughts on the matter.

HOUSE WAYS & MEANS COMMITTEE
Chairman, Wilbur D. Mills

- H.R. 867 (Robert M. Michel) This bill would require a sworn statement for the transportation, shipment, or receipt of handguns in interstate or foreign commerce. (This is needed to thwart youngsters from getting firearms unlawfully. It should cover all firearms, I think, but it is a start in the right direction of enabling the existing provisions of the Federal Firearms Act to be enforced.)
- H.R. 999 (John M. Murphy) This bill would place "destructive devices" under the tax and registration provisions of the National Firearms Act.
- H.R. 2839 (Robert L. F. Sikes) To prohibit a licensed manufacturer or dealer from shipping any firearm to any person in any state in violation of that state's law. (This is needed to thwart the few careless or unscrupulous mail order dealers that have continuously shipped firearms into states in violation of that state's law.)
- H.R. 7667 (John D. Dingell) Would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a manufacturer's excise tax on the component parts of ammunition. (While this will increase the cost of handloading components 10%, it is a desperately needed bill. The revenues from the tax will go to the construction of shooting ranges and for hunting areas. This bill is one way to preserve the shooting sports by guaranteeing that there will be places to shoot in the future. The way housing projects are sprouting up, the shooting sports will be dead in another 20 years or less, as there will be even fewer places to safely shoot. This bill offers a way around the lack of safe places to shoot by making Federal money available to the areas that need it most.)

HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE & FISHERIES COMMITTEE
Chairman, Edward A. Garmatz


- H.R. 7681 (John D. Dingell) This bill would make half of the revenues from the excise tax on manufacture of pistols and revolvers available to the States for target ranges and firearms safety training programs. (Here is an excellent proposal as it does not create a new tax, but puts an existing one to proper use. It would make about 1-million dollars available every year to support the shooting sports.)


These are all I can offer at the moment. More good bills are being introduced but, as yet, I do not have any information on them. When more information on good gun bills becomes available, I will pass it on.

There are many groups and interests which originate firearms legislation. In each regular session of any legislature, proposals to control the ownership and use of firearms are introduced. Frequently, through ignorance, a number of these bills seriously infringe upon the right of law-abiding citizens to own and to use firearms for legitimate purposes. When such bills are introduced, interested shooter-sportsmen must intervene, through their elected representatives, in order that the legislature may have full information. To help you evaluate any proposed firearms bill, here is a discussion on the subject.

Published as a service to its members by the
National Rifle Association of America
1600 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

THE GUN LAW PROBLEM





WHO PROPOSES FIREARMS LEGISLATION?

Law-enforcement officials, state's attorneys and others are constantly seeking, through legislation, greater assistance in the arrest and conviction of law-breakers. Some of these officials, with good cause, seek more severe penalties for those who commit crimes of violence while armed. Other officials, with visions of Utopia, strive for a law which, they believe, will prevent a criminal from having a firearm. The fish and game departments of the several states advocate legislation giving additional authority to enforcement personnel so that they can deal with the deliberate game-law violator. Public and private groups propose legislative solutions to the problems of gun accidents, vandalism, and the misuse of firearms in residential communities. In large part, the motives of all these groups are good. Unfortunately, the bills in many cases range from poor to bad.

IS THERE A CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARD?

Some shooter-sportsmen have a tendency to rely entirely on the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution for protection against all gun legislation. This Amendment says: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary

to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." Despite the seeming clarity of the language, jurists have argued since the founding of the Republic over the exact meaning of those words. The arguments have dwelt upon two points—(1) the extent to which the right guaranteed in the Constitution is individual or collective; (2) the limitation, if any, the guarantee imposes upon the powers of the States.


For our purpose, the arguments are entirely academic. The simple fact is that the Second Amendment has not prevented firearms regulation on either the national or state levels.

The constitutions of three-fourths of the states contain a guarantee of the right "to keep and bear arms" similar to that found in the United States Constitution. Nevertheless, the courts have repeatedly held that many laws regulating the purchase, carrying or use of concealable firearms are constitutional. If we are to effectively evaluate proposed firearms legislation, we must realize that, in spite of federal and state constitutional guarantees, firearms control statutes can be and have been enacted which, *in their operation*, tend to deprive the law-abiding shooter of his guns or effectively ban his sport through excessive regulation.

The usual ground on which firearms laws have been upheld by the courts is the familiar one of the states' "police power." What this term means in this context is that *reasonable* limitations on the right of individuals to own and use firearms may be made in the interest of public security and the proper administration of criminal justice. The notorious New York "Sullivan Law," which requires a police permit to own a handgun for *any* reason, *even in one's home*, has consistently been held to be constitutional, even though the *operation* of the law is frequently far from reasonable.

**FEDERAL
FIREARMS REGULATION**

In the so-called "gangster era" of the '30's, the mobsters focused nation-wide attention on the problem of armed crime. Congress, feeling that the matter could not be properly handled by individual state controls alone, took advantage of two federal powers—taxation and interstate commerce—to enact two firearms control laws. These laws provide legal "tools" that can be used against armed criminals. Unfortunately, these statutes are not too well known by state law-enforcement officers who often feel that new laws are needed, hence so many unnecessary laws are introduced each year.



The first federal law, the National Firearms Act of 1934, is a tax statute, enforced by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Internal Revenue Service. This Act imposes, among other things, a \$200 tax on the making or transfer of any fully automatic weapon, shotgun with a barrel less than 18 inches in length, rifle with a barrel less than 16 inches, certain other concealable weapons except a pistol or revolver, and any muffler or silencer.

The second law, the Federal Firearms Act of 1938, controls the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of firearms of all types and handgun ammunition. It, too, is enforced by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Internal Revenue Service.


Relatively few fully appreciate the federal charges that could be brought against criminals if the Act of 1938 were vigorously applied. Consider the principal provisions of this law:

- a All manufacturers, importers and dealers in firearms, handgun ammunition and components must obtain a federal license.
- b All licensed manufacturers, importers and dealers must maintain complete records of shipments and sales of *all* firearms.
- c No person may lawfully buy, sell, pawn or transport interstate *any* stolen firearm or handgun ammunition.
- d No person who is under indictment or who has been convicted of a crime of violence in *any* court in the United States, its territories or possessions may lawfully transport *any* firearm or handgun ammunition, or ship or receive such firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce.
- e The restrictions described in (d) apply with equal force to "fugitives from justice," which term includes persons who have fled to avoid prosecution for a crime of violence and those who have fled "to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding."
- f No person may lawfully receive, possess or dispose of *any* firearm or ammunition stolen while moving in or which is a part of interstate or foreign commerce.
- g No person may lawfully receive, possess or dispose of *any* firearm from which the serial number has been removed, altered or obliterated.

Directed at the criminal, both the National and Federal Firearms Acts provide a maximum fine of \$2,000 or imprisonment up to five years, or both, for conviction of violation of any of their provisions. These statutes have proved to be valuable aids when intelligently enforced.

The National Rifle Association played its part in the consideration and passage of these laws. That part was largely a restraining and counseling role but important to the future.

In addition to the foregoing laws, a federal statute enacted in 1927 prohibits the shipment of concealable firearms through the mails except to certain classes of persons and under certain conditions. Conviction of violation carries a maximum fine of \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.



**STATE
FIREARMS CONTROLS**

The development of state firearms controls is relatively modern history. Only a few generations ago, a personal weapon, for good reason, was an ordinary article of dress. As the absolute need for personal sidearms diminished, the problem of the criminal use of firearms demanded increasing legislative attention.

The traditional approach to the problem presented by armed crime has been a negative one which flatly prohibits, except for authorized persons, the carry-

ing or "wearing" of a concealable weapon. To this day, seventeen states depend on a prohibitory statute and have no licensing provision. All other states have varying degrees of positive license provisions in their laws regulating the carrying of handguns. Few states go so far as to license the purchasing of handguns.

In the beginning each state wrote its own laws as it saw fit, with the consequence that no two states had similar statutes. This pattern resulted not only in a hopeless diversity but also, in most instances, in a law which suffered from glaring defects of one kind or another.

In 1923, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws initiated a study of the hodge-podge of state laws "for the purpose of considering and reporting upon a Uniform Act to Regulate the Sale and Possession of Firearms." Their efforts produced the Uniform Firearms Act, approved by the National Conference of Commissioners and the American Bar Association in 1930. This Act was a modern, forward-looking, original statute which was subsequently adopted in more or less substantial form during the '30's by six states and the District of Columbia.

While engaged in its comprehensive consideration of the firearms control field, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws had this to say about existing state firearms laws:

The most obvious objection to existing pistol legislation is its diversity. Here, as in many other fields, uniformity is desirable.

Still more objectionable is the wrong emphasis in most pistol legislation. It is aimed at regulating pistols in the hands of law-abiding citizens rather than at punishing severely criminals who use pistols. Of course, no legislation can prevent gangsters and other dangerous criminals from securing and using

pistols, but legislation can make it to the interest of criminals not to use pistols and can send to prison for long periods those caught doing so.

The Uniform Firearms Act did contain heavy penalties for armed crime that were calculated to provide a real deterrent to the criminal. When vigorously applied by the adopting jurisdictions, this uniform law has been an effective control measure. It suffered from some weaknesses which have been a source of harassment to sportsmen in jurisdictions where the law has been given adverse interpretation.

The work and advice of the National Conference of Commissioners was years ahead of its time and went unheeded by most of the states.

In 1937, an Interstate Commission on Crime also interested itself in the matter of firearms regulation, and, accordingly, commissioned a Harvard Law School professor to draft a model pistol act. This draft was approved by the Crime Commission in 1938. Now, there existed the undesirable situation of two competing uniform acts covering substantially the same field. Hence, both the Interstate Commission on Crime and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws appointed a joint committee to reconcile the two "model" laws. This joint effort brought about the so-called "Uniform Pistol Act."

The principal, objectionable features of the Uniform Pistol Act were (1) the provision for a "target shooter's license"; (2) the requirement that the barrel of any target pistol be at least six inches long. Sportsmen strongly opposed these provisions as being unnecessary and restrictive, and the Act never gained acceptance by any state. Finally, in 1949, the National Conference of Commissioners recognized that the Act was unsatisfactory and, consequently, killed the "Uniform Pistol Act" by withdrawing approval.



**TRENDS IN
FIREARMS
LEGISLATION**

Some of the factors involved in firearms legislation are old and well known. The simplest and most common is the almost universal demand, "There ought to be a law!", whenever a spectacular crime or tragedy makes the headlines. On the other hand, some factors are the product of our changing times and can neither be ignored nor wished away.

A comparatively new element, for example, in the gun control picture is legislation originating with game conservation interests and designed to protect wildlife, promote hunting safety or assist in the conviction of game-law violators. Most of this legislation has been proposed and supported by well-meaning sportsmen. Many of these bills have been worthwhile; many other proposals, unfortunately, have been poorly drawn or ambiguous, and directly contrary to the best interest of the sportsmen whom they are intended to serve. A classic example is the enactment by a western state some years ago of a bill subjecting to arrest any hunter who, while in possession of a firearm, drives down the road at night with car lights on or lights a lantern or flashlight in camp! Well intended? Surely, and most probably it will never be enforced against a sportsman who, *in the opinion of the arresting officer*, does not deserve to be arrested.

As increasing millions take to the hunting field (currently, over fifteen million annually), hunting pressure increases. In some areas, game becomes less plentiful and gives added urgency to controls that will insure proper hunting methods. Heavy hunting pressure also brings an increase in hunting accidents. The causes of hunting accidents

are varied (see annual *NRA Uniform Hunter Casualty Report* available on request from the National Rifle Association). Without question, pure carelessness heads the list. Some persons think that legislation, perhaps, can help make hunters aware of their responsibility to exercise ordinary care.

Despite repeated failure of attempts to disarm the criminal by statute, fresh attempts are made each year to "strengthen" these laws in the hope that they will work. Despite the painful history of such firearms legislation in every country where it has been tried, there are those who still believe, or pretend to believe, that some form of national or state firearms registration law in the United States will divorce the gun from the criminal or will aid law enforcement.

RELATIONSHIP OF FIREARMS CONTROLS TO CRIME

Frequently, the avowed purpose of stringent firearms regulation is the reduction of crime. Expert opinion and compelling evidence seem to indicate that the amount or kind of crime in a community is not substantially affected by the relative ease with which a person can obtain a firearm.


In his authoritative study, *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*, of every homicide (588) occurring in the Philadelphia area from 1948 through 1952, Dr. Marvin E. Wolfgang, Professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, says: "... It is probably safe to contend that many homicides occur only because there is sufficient motivation or provocation, and that the type of method used to kill is merely an accident of availability; ...". The author further states: "... It is the contention of this observer that few homicides due to shooting could be avoided merely if the firearm were not immediately present, and that the offender would select some other weapon to

achieve the same destructive goal. Probably only in those cases where a felon kills a police officer, or vice versa, would homicide be avoided in the absence of a firearm."

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has, for years, published in its annual reports, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States*, a list of those factors which, in its opinion, affect the crime rate in any community. These factors are:

- Population of the city and metropolitan area adjacent thereto.
- The composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex and race.
- The economic status and activities of the population.
- Climate.
- Educational, recreational and religious facilities.
- The number of police employees per unit of population.
- The standards governing appointments to the police force.
- The policies of the prosecuting officials and the courts.
- The attitude of the public toward law-enforcement problems.
- The degree of efficiency of the local law-enforcement agency.

Certainly, nothing could be more logical and more obviously true. The FBI list contains no mention of the impact of firearms regulation on crime. Clearly, no firearm by itself ever committed a crime; and equally clear is the fact that the person who uses a weapon is the responsible element. If the criminal or potential law-breaker does not have or cannot easily acquire a firearm, then he will use some other implement—and there is ample evidence for this statement—to accomplish his purpose.



NRA POLICY

Among the objectives of the National Rifle Association of America are the following: To promote public safety, law and order, and the national defense; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms, and in the technique of design, production and group instruction; to increase the knowledge of small arms and promote efficiency in the use of such arms on the part of members of law enforcement agencies, of the Armed Forces, and of citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; and generally to encourage the lawful ownership and use of small arms by citizens of good repute.

A. The National Rifle Association believes that firearms legislation is of insufficient value in the prevention of crime to justify the inevitable restrictions which such legislation places upon law abiding citizens. In those cases where legislative bodies, nevertheless, determine that some firearms control legislation is necessary, the position of the NRA is as follows:

1. The NRA is opposed to control measures which levy discriminatory or punitive taxes or fees on the purchase, ownership or use of rifles, shotguns, pistols and revolvers.

2. The NRA is opposed to proposals to license the possession or purchase of a rifle, shotgun, pistol or revolver. The inevitable result of such licensing regulation is to vest the arbitrary power to say who may and who may not own a gun in the hands of an appointed or elected official. It is the illegal use and not the ownership of a firearm which should be the subject of legislative control.

3. The NRA is opposed to the theory that a target shooter, hunter or collector, in order to transport a handgun for lawful purposes, should be required to meet the conditions for a permit to carry a weapon concealed on his person.

4. The NRA is opposed to the registration on any level of government of the ownership of rifles, shotguns, pistols or revolvers for any purpose whatever. Regardless of professed intent, there can be only one outcome of registration, and that is to make possible the seizure of such weapons by political authorities, or by persons seeking to overthrow the Government by force. Registration will not keep guns out of the hands of undesirable persons, and few people seriously claim that it will.

5. The NRA is opposed to legislation which denies, or interferes with, individual rights of our citizens or is designed purely for the convenience of law enforcement officers or for the purpose of circumventing due process of law in order to obtain convictions more easily. The desire to see our laws adequately enforced is not justification for any law which can make a prudent, law-abiding citizen an unwitting violator, or which denies the right of self-defense.

B. The National Rifle Association of America does not advocate, propose or suggest any restrictive gun legislation at any level of government. When, nevertheless, firearms legislation is enacted, it should never exceed any of the following four provisions:

1. Legislation designed to prohibit the possession of firearms by persons who have been finally convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, drug addicts and persons while adjudicated an habitual drunkard.

2. Legislation providing severe ad-

ditional penalties for the use of a dangerous weapon in the commission of a crime.

3. Legislation making the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent and the use of firearms in public by juveniles subject to adequate supervision.

4. Legislation regulating the carrying of concealed handguns should be reasonable and the requirements for such carrying should be clearly set forth in the law. The conditions having been met, the issuance of a "license to carry" should be mandatory and should license the act of carrying, not the handgun itself.

WHAT CAN ONE PERSON DO?

When some form of firearms control measure is under consideration in the legislature, the chances are good that you will read about it in the local newspaper, in *THE AMERICAN RIFLEMAN*, or if it is urgent enough, you as an NRA member will receive a special Legislative Bulletin by first-class mail.

When an important bill does come to your attention, your personal influence is considerable. By no means should it be underestimated. Each member of a legislature is a private citizen who has been elected to a trying and time-consuming job. A legislator is interested, as you would be, in doing the best possible job for his state. On legislation that is proposed for his consideration, he welcomes not only the opinions of the citizens who elected him to office, but also the advice of anyone whose knowledge and experience on a particular subject are greater than his own. (This is equally true in county and municipal councils.) Your elected representative will always welcome a thoughtful letter from you, giving opinions and reasons for or against any piece of legislation on which he may be required to vote. Signed petitions, while they undoubtedly have their effect, cannot in the mind of a conscientious legislator re-

place the effect of a friendly, logical expression of opinion from a constituent.

When the NRA reports a bill to its members in a particular state, the essentials of the bill are given. Space ordinarily does not permit quoting the entire text. However, your elected representative can usually obtain for you a copy of any bill in which you are interested.

A check list for shooters interested in taking an active part in the fight for good, reasonable firearms legislation would have these guides.

- 1 Get all the information on the bill that is available.
- 2 Give the information to other shooters, sportsmen's clubs, veterans' organizations, and other civic groups interested in sound legislation.
- 3 Study the proposed legislation in the light of existing law and the history of firearms control—and ask yourself these questions:
 - Is it enforceable?
 - What is its purpose, and will it actually achieve that purpose?
 - Can it be used by an unscrupulous person or party to extend or perpetuate its own power?
 - Is it really necessary, or does it merely contribute to a network of technical restrictions which can trip you or other conscientious sportsmen into being an unintentional violator?
 - Is it an attempt to accomplish by prohibition what can be done only by education and training?
- 4 Participate in your democratic government. Let your elected representative know what you think about the proposal. Your opinion alone—given briefly, intelligently and clearly—may do the trick.

THE BEST DEFENSE IS A GOOD OFFENSE

Unfortunately, many of the shooting public, actively interested in safeguarding the right to bear arms, receive the impression that their fight is a never-ending defense. They are often called upon to oppose some sort of crackpot legislation. Frequently, the same stupid proposal has to be defeated year after year.

The offense, the positive effort, carried on through public education, safety training, and the publishing of factual information year after year—while it

makes no headlines and frequently passes unnoticed—is as important in preventing poor firearms legislation as is the purely defensive fight which must be repeated time after time.

A positive effort can be carried out in a number of ways to educate public officials and the public about proper uses of firearms. Letters to the editor of a local paper are an effective way to get the message of the gun-owning sportsman across to the members of the community. Active participation in hearings before town and county councils on firearms regulation, talks before local businessmen's clubs, church and school groups and contacts with state and local legislators are all means by which one determined individual can effectively carry on the "good offense." Shooting clubs and other sportsmen's groups stand to gain much through publicizing locally their activities and programs—firearms safety education, senior and junior marksmanship training, matches, etc. By spreading the word about these activities and programs and by encouraging the public to participate in them, shooters and clubs give concrete evidence of their accomplishments and the importance of their place in the community.

Regardless of whether we shooter-sportsmen are, at the moment, fighting a particularly bad piece of proposed firearms legislation or whether we are engaged in a long-range offensive to kill unwise legislation at its source, the important thing is that each of us, as individuals, must accept the burden. The ultimate responsibility for bad laws cannot rest on those who make the laws if the shooter-sportsman, the individual voting American, is indifferent or if he is silent before the threat of disarmament by careless persons with other interests. It must be the job of the thinking citizen to understand something of the problems that create gun laws, and to give his elected law-makers his active, vocal support in separating good gun legislation from the bad.



LS-1 50M 3/62

Sierra Desert Gun Club

Affiliated with California Rifle & Pistol Assn.
P. O. BOX 5276
CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA 93556



NRA
Club
7649

DCM
Club
09809

Sorry, I forgot to include this before posting my letter to you.

MAY 15 1967

10 May 1967

Governor Ronald Reagan
State Capitol
Sacramento
California 95814

Dear Governor Reagan:

Some of your statements concerning firearms, crime, and need for further gun laws were shown on Channel 11 last evening (Alex Dreier News, 10 PM, KTTV Los Angeles). Your comments showed a knowledge of the subject too seldom displayed by public officials. In general, we agree with you. We also appreciate the fact that California gun laws are among the best in the nation.

I wonder, however, if enough thought has been given to the bill that would prohibit the carrying of a loaded firearm in public. As I understand it, this bill (A.B. 1591, Mulford) would not make allowance for citizens who would use a loaded firearm in thwarting a crime or who would use one in coming to the aid of a law enforcement officer. It seems a tragedy to put someone trying to help law and order be maintained under threat of law, assuming that he is acting in a responsible and prudent manner.

In regard to interstate firearms control, members of this club are apprehensive over needlessly stringent prohibitions on mail order firearms. We oppose the current Administration bill in Congress (H.R. 5384, Emanuel Celler) as it prohibits mail order gun sales to every individual in the nation. Although we oppose the Celler bill, we do support changes in existing Federal laws affecting firearms. Better regulation of mail order guns is needed. Some printed material is enclosed which further explains our view and it may be of interest to you. Incidentally, the Celler bill appears to offer an opening for Federal control of State firearms laws. If so, it is a matter that every state should seriously consider. I understand over a dozen states have sent memorials to their men in Congress opposing the Celler bill.

It is too bad that the gun is often blamed for the consequences of human actions that end in violence. I believe that law-abiding citizens should not be discouraged from possessing firearms. The recent actions of the Black Panthers did great damage to the concept of private firearms ownership. The Panthers evidently

need some lessons in common manners, firearms safety, and psychology.

Keep up the good work. We are behind you in regard to responsible firearms legislation.

Yours truly,



H. B. Mathes
Legislative Consultant

P.S. If possible, I would appreciate receiving the full text of your remarks at the May 9th press conference. Exerpts will be included in the "Legislative Corner" portion of our monthly bulletin which I prepare.

H. B. M.

Copy to Assemblyman Mulford

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. John Bedecarre'
2195 Greenbrier Street
Concord, California

Dear Mr. Bedecarre':

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

1591
22

Concord, California

3 May 1967

Mr. Don Mulford
Sacramento, California

MAY 10 1967

Dear Assemblyman Mulford:

If we fail to crack down HARD on this idiotic Black Panther outfit, we deserve any follow-up activities. Sheriff Young here in Contra Costa County backs off from the group when they showed up at our county jail.

I'm a civil rights advocate (NAACP, etc.) but this is beyond all limits of toleration.

Now is the time to nip this in the bud, not tomorrow. Unless the intelligence of these birds is a lot lower than I give them credit for this is an appeal to anarchy and a bid to entrench themselves with the extreme radical fringe of the civil rights movement.

The cherished rights (right to bear arms) of the Bill of Rights are subject to the restrictions necessary for the general welfare (shouting fire in a theater, etc.) AND even more important is the concept for insisting upon responsibility to ~~accompany~~ accompany rights.

20th century American is no place for armed men following lawless pursuits.

Let's see that ALL present laws are STRICTLY enforced and let's go forward with any needed new laws as the situation requires.

There is no need to resort to armed lawlessness in America. I support all reasonable efforts to maintain law and order under our democratic safeguards (We learned only today that a former Concord resident, father of 9, I believe, was knifed to death in Los Angeles this past week-end, apparently in a totally unprovoked episode in his own home).

Sincerely yours,


John Bedecarre'

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

JOHN BEDECARRE
2195 Greenbrier St.
Concord, Calif. 94520



VISIT MT. DIABLO
PUBLIC SCHOOLS



Mr. Don Mulford
California State Assembly
Sacramento, California

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. John E. Steele
1115 Marcia Avenue
Yuba City, California

Dear Mr. Steele:

As you requested, I am enclosing a copy of Assembly
Bill 1591

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

CH
mbc
enc.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Rudy Fahlbusch, D.C.
1766 Grand Avenue
San Diego, California 92109

Dear Doctor Fahlbusch:

Thank you very much for your letter of May 2.
I agree with you.

The Assembly also agrees with you and approved
my legislation by a vote of 70-5. I enclose a
copy of the bill for your information.

Thank you very much for your interest.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MAY 5, 1967

AN OPEN LETTER TO:

THE BICAMERAL LEGISLATIVE BODY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SACRAMENTO, CALIF.
95814

MAY 10 1967

RE: Armed Invasion of Assembly
May 2, 1967

HONORABLE MEMBER:

Californians were appalled and shocked over the recent 'inane circus' by a band of thugs that had the affront to carry weapons into the very 'Fountain-Head of Constitutional Government!'

Freedom is now too often being confused with personal license and personal rights are being confused with personal lack of responsibility; and such confusion must be corrected before it is too late if we are to protect our basic freedoms for which our forefathers fought and died. Along with adequate attention to the responsibilities of citizenship, respect for law and order, good government, and a sincere search for the truth, must come proper law enforcement or seeds of anarchy will sprout into full flower.

Members of the Legislature who view the May 2, 1967 fiasco in a light-hearted manner are not using proper and reasonable judgement. It is conjectural that a serious explosive situation existed in which the Governor and the entire Bicameral Body was in grave jeopardy. One individual with a trigger finger could have sparked a maelstrom. We should be thankful that the episode ended as it did, however, now is the time to effect a prevention-so a future cure will not have to be attempted.

The architects of our beautiful Constitution did envision the right of citizens to 'Bear Arms' to help protect the individuals life and limb. The privilege was not meant to be an open invitation to groups to assault our governmental officers..... The former must not be ostracized because of the latter.

Psychologically, if stern preventative steps are not undertaken, at this time, the invaders will view their intrusion as a victory and future assaults will follow-just as surely as Night follows Day.

Sincerely yours,

Rudy Fahlbusch, D.C.

Rudy Fahlbusch, D.C. FIREARMS POLICY COALITION, Sacramento, Calif. 92109
RF/ss

June 19, 1967

Mr. V. H. Wheeler, Agent
The Hartford Insurance Group
2050 Fourth Street
San Rafael, California

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 4 until my gun bill, AB 1591, was finally amended and approved by the Assembly. Enclosed is a copy for your information.

I cannot understand your statement, "It is difficult to understand why a person of your obvious stature would attempt to invoke such an impractical proposition." I can only presume, Mr. Wheeler, that you are not thoroughly familiar with the legislative process. This bill was brought to my attention, with an urgent request from the law enforcement authorities in my district which I represent, Oakland, Piedmont and Berkeley, supported by law enforcement of California, including district attorneys, sheriffs and chiefs of police. Incidents involved armed bands of individuals, moving into police headquarters, into courts, intimidating school children, invading the Assembly chambers of the Capitol and other incidents, all involving the use of loaded weapons.

After you have read the bill and compared your questions with the bill I have reason to believe you will be satisfied that it is not only constitutional and does support the constitutional right to bear arms but is designed specifically to protect the public against armed bands on public streets and public places with loaded weapons.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mr. V. H. Wheeler

Page 2

June 19, 1967

I am sorry you do not agree with any restrictions regarding firearms. The law enforcement people who have to carry out the work in the State to protect us do not agree with you.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek

cc: Honorable John McCarthy
Member of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 3082

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

V. H. WHEELER, Agent

2050 FOURTH STREET
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA
Telephone: GL 3-2616

May 4 1967

MAY 8 1967

Mr Don Mulford
Capitol Building
Sacramento, Calif

Dear Mr Mulford;

The news items regarding your introduction of a bill to outlaw loaded firearms within city limits bothers me.

It is difficult to understand why a person of your obvious stature would attempt to invoke such an unpractical proposition.

For example;

What about areas where a firing range is inside a city's limits?

What about the areas where a city's limits extend into an undeveloped country-side?

Are you going to invoke a house-to-house police inspection of and for loaded firearms?

Suppose I wanted to go gunning for somebody or something, no law would stop me, no one would ever know I was armed prior to the use of the firearm.

You can not stop the illegal use of firearms by legislating against them, if you want to slow down such uses, work on the proposition of the penalties resulting from the use of firearms in an illegal act.

I am violently opposed to ANY restrictions pertaining to firearms as a sporting piece and therefore implore you to be reasonable and logical in the matter.

Sincerely



cc:-Sen John McCarthy



Representing NEW YORK UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY of

THE FIREARMS POLICY ORG/RESOURCES GROUP
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

2150 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
836-3050

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
95814
448-7884

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION
RULES EX OFFICIO

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

June 15, 1967

Mr. V. H. Wheeler, Agent
The Hartford Insurance Group
2050 Fourth Street
San Rafael, California

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 4 until my gun bill, AB 1591 was finally amended and approved by the Assembly. Enclosed is a copy for your information.

~~can't~~
I can understand your statement, "It is difficult to understand why a person of your obvious stature would attempt to invoke such an impractical proposition." I can only presume, Mr. Wheeler, that you are not thoroughly familiar with the legislative process. This bill was brought to my attention, with an urgent request from the law enforcement authorities in my district which I represent, Oakland, Piedmont and Berkeley, supported by law enforcement of California, including district attorneys, sheriffs and chiefs of police. Incidents involved ~~including~~ armed bands of individuals, moving into police headquarters, into courts, intimidating school children, invading the Assembly chambers of the Capitol and other incidents, all involving the use of loaded weapons.

After you have read the bill and compared your questions with the bill I have reason to believe you will be satisfied that it is not only constitutional and does support the constitutional right to bear arms but is designed specifically to protect the public against armed bands on public streets and public places with loaded weapons.

JUN 14 1967

you want to buy a gun? Well, go right ahead. Nobody will ask you how old you are, if you are a mental defective, if you have a criminal record, or if you know how to use firearms properly. If you can pay for a gun you can have one — a rifle, a bazooka, a pistol, an anti-tank blaster, any kind of gun your little heart desires.

If you can't get to a gun store or a pawn shop, fill out a coupon and get a gun through the mail. Lee Oswald did it and nothing has changed since then. You can do it, too.

If all this sounds unsettling, let me assure you it is. I am writing to you because you and you alone can put an end to this appalling situation. We need a federal law to prohibit the shipment of guns across state lines. We need state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

According to the Gallup Poll taken in January for NBC, approximately 75 per cent of the American people want tougher gun laws. We have no paid lobbyists, no organization to espouse our cause, no one to speak for us, so we must speak for ourselves. We ask your help, Mr. Lawmaker, in the name of the 17,000 Americans who died last year from gunshot wounds. — Sincerely,

YOUR CONSTITUENT

DEAR LAWMAKER: Do

Copyright 1967
Publishers' Newspaper Syndicate

*This expresses my sentiments
So I will not add anything
except to say I hope some
thing can be done to correct
this serious problem. Sincerely,
(Mrs.) Edna C. Reid*

June 19, 1967

Mrs. W. M. Reid
491 Stow Avenue
Oakland, California 94606

Dear Mrs. Reid:

Thank you for sending me the Ann Landers column concerning the sale of weapons.

I am enclosing a copy of my Gun Control Bill, AB 1591, for your information. Although this bill will not regulate the sale of guns, it will make it unlawful for unauthorized persons to carry a loaded weapon on a public street or in a public place.

I appreciate your taking the time to write to me. I share your concern for this serious problem.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mbc
mbc
enc.

June 19, 1967

Mrs. Genevieve Grenberg
1822 13th Avenue
East Oakland, California 94606

Dear Mrs. Grenberg:

Thank you for your recent letter informing me of the printed notices in the windows of two Oakland buildings. I appreciate having this information.

I thought you might be interested in my Gun Control Bill, AB 1591. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

CDH
mbe
enc.

JUN 15 1967

I was telling one of the clerks at the Safeway market to go over and read this notice and he told me that on the corner of 12th Ave and W 17th St the Black Panthers were living in the newest apt there and holding meetings but the police had been there as it was reported. I do not know whether they were told to get out or not. This clerk told me that this group cut the back of the closet door out so they could connect the two apartments. If there is a group living in the apartment on 12th Ave. there must be others elsewhere, too.

That is why I voted for #14 because these people abuse the privilege of living among decent people. After they are gone, the place is a wreck.

Another apt. on 12th Ave and E 18th St has the windows boarded up because violence has been committed there and next to it. A person does not want to put a lot of money in property and have it destroyed because these kinds of folks think they can live rent free, or anything else that comes into their heads. The Rumford Bill is a joke as it is one sided. Property owners has rights, too.

Thanks for the efforts in behalf of the orphan children as I didn't want to see them separated or have to go into an orphan asylum and not be taken care of.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Gumberg

There is a picture of a ferocious looking Negro holding a gun across a chest.

June 14, 1967
Flag Day

Assemblyman Don Mulford
Dear Sir:

Being that you are the Assemblyman of this district, I am telling you of an incident, that is if you have not already heard it.

When I went to the mail box last Friday I decided to walk around the block and on a window of a vacant store near the mail box at 14th Avenue and E 18th Street was a notice which shocked me and alarmed me at the same time.

It read: Support and join people's armed defense reactionary violence of the ruling classes with revolutionary violence of the people. People's armed defense groups are being organized by the Communist Party. Write to 9120 So. Compton Ave. Los Angeles, California or 2821 St. Avenue, New York, N. Y. Marxist-Lenin, Berkeley. I couldn't see the Berkeley address as someone had scratched it out.

This store has been vacant for a number of years and I do not understand why it has not been rented.

421-0093 is the owner's phone number which is printed in large print in the window. I guess the owner is not aware that this group is using his store window as a bill-board. It is near the corner of E 18th and 14th Ave next to

June 19, 1967

Mr. James E. Fields
131 Covington Street
Oakland, Calif. 94605

Dear Mr. Fields:

Thank you for your letter of June 5 concerning my gun control legislation, AB 1591. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

REC'D JUN 7 1967
131 Covington St.
Oakland, Calif. 94605Honorable Don Mulford
2150 Franklin St.
Oakland, Calif.

June 5, 1967

JUN 8 1967

My Dear Mr. Mulford:

For days now, I have been studying your bill, A. B. 1591 and find it difficult to understand how you could allow your self to introduce a type of legislation that punishes the honest citizen for the crimes and stupidity of the few kooks and idiots, who --- like the poor, will always be with us.

With laws governing the use and possession of firearms in this country already in excess of 30,000 we do NOT need more. We DO however, need ENFORCEMENT of those already workable, acceptable laws now on the books.

This is especially true of those laws that are aimed directly at the Criminal and the CRIMINAL MISUSE of firearms. Penalties should be severe, swift and ----- if our judges and courts continue being soft on criminals ----- mandatory!

Your bill WILL NOT disarm the criminal. The very best you could hope for, if it becomes law will be that the HONEST CITIZEN will, for the most part either obey it or ---- ignore it, and by so doing be in violation of the law. The average Honest Citizen, and this includes myself, will not permit himself to be disarmed by a law purported to control criminals and kooks who will not respect the law anyway.

I supported Senate Bills # 85, 86, & 87 as any responsible citizen of this State should have, and The Chabot Gun Club, Inc. of which I am President did likewise by going on record in support of these bills, and offering the full support of it's membership of some 800 persons in the passage of legislation of similar nature which will increase the penalties for the criminal misuse of firearms.

Do not for a moment think that you was the only person who was indignant at the idiotic action of the 'Black Panthers'. Every decent citizen of this State felt the same way and displays of temper and passion were NOT confined to the Assembly but were general all over the country, but passions MUST be kept within DUE BOUNDS if we are to be able to reason correctly and make decisions that will IMPROVE our conditions.

I have yet to question any person who does not firmly believe that the armed demonstration by the 'Black Panthers' that you, and others present witnessed at the State Capitol, was a planned and 'set-up' deal, engineered and encouraged by those who would like nothing better than to see this country of ours completely disarmed and helpless.

Sufficient violations of the existing laws are already applicable to these trouble makers and I firmly suggest that prosecution and just sentence should follow without further delay.

I offer my support for legislation designed to prevent the criminal misuse of firearms, as well as the support of the large organization I represent, but A. B. 1591, regardless of your intent, does NOT fall into this category.

Very truly yours,

FIREARMS POLICY ORG/RESOURCES


James E. Fields

June 19, 1967

Mrs. Eleanor C. Colbourn
3017 College Avenue, Apartment #1
Berkeley, California 94705

Dear Mr. Colbourn:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your communication until I could send to you a copy of my bill, AB 1591 as amended, which was approved by the Assembly.

I believe after you have read it you will see that it is a strong measure, yet it protects the constitutional right of citizens to arm and protect themselves.

Thank you very much for writing to me.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

Assemblyman Ron Mulford
State Assembly
Sacramento, Calif.

MAY 8 1967

Dear Mr. Mulford -

The action of the Colored
gunmen against the Assembly
showed the true colors of a certain
class of colored people who
believe that everything they
want should be given them at
once -

I hope the laws of group (except
military) carrying guns will
be tightened - Both white and
colored organizations should be
included or there will be shooting
on the streets -

People coming to this state
should be here five years

21
before they are allowed to have relief - This would keep out many who come here because of our ^{liberal} relief laws - and should help -

Professional agitators should not be allowed across the state borders & alone be allowed to use the University of California to speak in -

These colored people are the reason why white people are afraid to live in the same neighborhood with them -

I read last year where Mr Carmichael ^{SA?} was born in the West Indies - (U.S. News & World Report) - Has he ever become an American Citizen? This really should be looked into. There

3 known of cases where aliens who were never naturalized actually got into strategic positions in the U.S. Navy simply because the Navy had not checked with the F.B.I. This could have been disastrous if the Navy had never gone to the F.B.I. A simple appearance before an Army Draft Board can mean nothing unless the Army checked with the F.B.I.

I hope the law you have before the Assembly is passed and if anything it should be made stronger.

Sincerely

Mrs Eleanor C. Colburn
3017 College Ave Apt I
Berkeley
Calif - 94705

Don Mulford, Assemblyman
Edwin S. Capps

Edwin S. Capps Vs. Ann Landers

By EDWIN S. CAPP
SACRAMENTO—(CNS)—Having been a long-time champion of motherhood and a toiler in the vineyards against sin and corruption, it is with some misgivings we proceed to take on such a national institution as Ann Landers.

But her trend, of late, has been to move into the area of anti-firearm laws and her shopworn arguments against owning and possessing guns have been dropped for years by the more sophisticated outlaws of gun ownership.

This brings us to the situation in California and the nation's capital this year as far as firearms legislation is concerned. The California legislature has a good record of reasonableness on firearms and is expected to maintain it this year.

Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch has sponsored several bills, authored by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddel, R-Riverside, chairman of the assembly committee on criminal procedures. Generally, they would: 1) outlaw sale of cannons, bazookas and the like; 2) make possession of machine gun parts illegal; 3) require purchasers of concealable weapons out of state to notify their local police or sheriff. The latter would require them to do the same as is done for persons buying handguns in California now.

The provision on out-of-state gun purchase may be difficult of enforcement and may result in some unwitting violators who wouldn't be aware of the law if it passes. There are some technicalities on the possession of nicalities on the possession of hopefully will be worked out in the legislation.

This is because many parts of the fully automatic M14 are interchangeable with the semi-automatic and legal M1.

One dark spot in the California picture is SB1382 by Senator Ralph C. Dills, D-Gardena. This bill would outlaw the sale of gas or air operated weapons. Dills said the bill is aimed at preventing sale of B-B guns, as well as the CO2 guns.

He said he has had numerous complaints in his district of youngsters shooting out windshields and windows.

A fourth part of the Lynch-Biddle program would require CO2 guns to be considered as concealable weapons, making them subject to the same restrictions.

Then Senator Anthony C. Beilenson, D-Beverly Hills, author of some unsuccessful bills in 1965, is trying again with a couple which have to go on the wrong side of the ledger in our book.

Beilenson's SB1449, similar to his 1965 bill, would provide a permit to carry a concealed weapon would have to be issued by the police or sheriff in the city or county of the applicant's residence. This may sound all right but several populous counties have flat policies of issuing no permits.

His other bill, SB1220 would declare the legislature has not preempted the field of firearms legislation permitting cities or counties to set up their own ordinances. Not only could this subject residents of certain areas to some unwarranted restrictions, it would make it difficult for anyone traveling to a hunting or shooting trip, as he might run afoul of some local ordinance.

In Washington, the National Rifle Association has recommended: 1) a requirement that sellers of concealable weapons in inter-state commerce notify the local authorities of the purchase and that purchasers sign sworn statements as to their eligibility to own a weapon; 2) that the President be asked to stop imports of most foreign firearms; 3) severe restrictions on sale of destructive devices—bazookas, grenades, etc.; and 4) stricter enforcement of existing gun-control laws.

Unruh Sees

June 19, 1967

Mr. William C. Dietrich
100 Ardmore Road
Kensington, California 94707

Dear Mr. Dietrich:

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging your very welcome letter regarding my gun bill, AB 1591, until it was amended and approved by the Assembly.

I am unaware, incidentally, of any legislation here that will restrict B-B and CO₂ guns.

I hope that after you have read this legislation you will agree with me that it does not restrict the constitutional right of citizens to protect themselves, yet it does treat the problem of armed bands of citizens carrying loaded weapons in public places.

The Oakland Police Department sent me an urgent request for this legislation and I am optimistic that this bill will be of some assistance in the protection of innocent citizens of the State.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

WILLIAM F. DIETRICH
100 Alameda Rd.
Kensington, Calif. 94707

Don Mulford, Assemblyman
State Capitol
Sacramento
California

MAY 8, 1967

Dear Assemblyman Mulford:

Your bill to restrict large size
fire arms of military nature is
commendable.

Enclosed is an article about firearms
bills. I am in agreement with the
idea expressed as a dark spot in the
proposed bill about outlawing B-B and
CO₂ guns. Please don't do it.
My boys (ages 21 and 19 now) had a lot
of fun with this type gun on my ranch in
Solano Co. It kept them from working & use
more powerful guns before sufficiently trained
to do so. If we take all spontaneous pleasures
render suitable conditions away from children,
we will have more LSD trouble.

Also we are drafting these some men now
to go half way around the world to fill
people hell the world in two faced
morals.

Sincerely
William F. Dietrich

June 21, 1967

Mr. Lloyd E. Mutinsky, C.S.R.
1601 Chabot Terrace
San Leandro, California

Dear Mr. Mutinsky:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

OB 591

1601 Chabot Terrace,
San Leandro, Calif. 94577
April 20, 1967

1
2
3
4 Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
5 Sacramento, Calif. 95801

APR 21 1967

6 Dear Assemblyman Mulford:

7 Please vote FOR the following bills in their present form: A.B. 1382
8 making it a crime to assault a member of the University of California Police,
and A.B. 1199, requiring consent of parents for a minor to purchase a firearm.

9 Please vote AGAINST the following bills in their present form: S.B. 439
10 restricting the amount of powder a shooter may store in his home, and vir-
11 tually requiring permission to discharge a firearm (explosive) from a fire-
12 chief or marshal, an unrealistic and absurd bill. A.B. 1021, prohibiting
13 firearms on school grounds. This bill would be acceptable if it were amended
14 to include persons who possess a concealed weapons permit issued by the State
15 of California. A.B. 911, requiring toy guns, etc., be labeled as detrimental
16 to children, another ridiculous, unrealistic bill. S.B. 142, allowing retired
17 federal government employees who carried guns during their employment to
18 continue doing so. They should be required to obtain a concealed weapons
19 permit like everyone else. A.B. 1323, classifying machineguns and parts as
20 a public nuisance, another absurd bill that runs contrary to the federal
21 National Firearms Act which already makes possession of such firearms subject
22 to a tax of \$200. It would be unconstitutional, usurping the National Firearms
23 Act. A.B. 1324, requiring registration of out-of-state purchased weapons.
24 This bill would be about as enforceable as Prohibition. I could go to Reno,
25 Las Vegas, or any other state, buy a gun, and never tell the State about it.
26 A.B. 1325, classifies parts of guns in the category of a machinegun. This
bill is in direct contradiction with the National Firearms Act. It would be
an illegal and unenforceable bill. A.B. 1326, requires a permit to sell guns
by dealers, etc., another bill that would prevent nothing and create nothing
but red tape for dealers. A.B. 1591, prohibits carrying a weapon on a street.
This bill makes no provision for persons who possess a concealed weapons
permit issued by the State of California. It would make a criminal out of
someone who took a gun from his house and walked across the street with it to
show it to a neighbor, an unrealistic, unenforceable and unconstitutional bill.

Sincerely,

Lloyd E. Mutinsky

LLOYD E. MUTINSKY, C.S.R.
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

June 21, 1967

Mr. L. A. Hathaway
916 Masonic
Albany, California

Dear Mr. Hathaway:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

AB 15-91

Mr. L.A. Hathaway
916 Masonic
Albany, California 94705

Dear Mr. Hathaway:

In response to your request made to my Oakland
office, I enclose a copy of Assembly Bill 1591,
relating to firearms.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON MC DRD

Date 4/6/67

To Aileen

Re

APR 7 1967

Mr. L. A. Hathaway
916 Masonic
Albany, California 94706

Please send copy of AB 1591

not in print

B.A.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 4, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
Assemblymen, 16th Dist.
State Capitol
Sacramento, Calif.

MAY 8, 1967

Dear Sir:

I am not a member of any rifle club or group but I oppose regulations which would keep honest citizens from carrying loaded weapons in public. I also oppose legislation that would require newly purchased out-of-state weapons capable of being concealed on one's person to be registered with a police or sheriff's office. This is a right of privacy that would be unconstitutional to take away. Just how do you expect honest private citizens to protect themselves anyway? Learn karate? Criminals and gangs will not be the slightest bit affected by new regulations as they will risk it and carry weapons anyway. Only honest people will be disarmed and unable to protect themselves.

I would like to know how you feel about this and I would like a copy of this bill or bills. I am not against regulations requiring registration of heavy weapons such as rockets, anti-tank guns and machine guns.

Respectfully yours,

Al Hume

Al Hume and family.

1029A Capuchino Ave

Burlingame Calif

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

Mr. Merle D. Gow
Wilton, California

Dear Mr. Gow:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 9 until the Legislature had spoken in the Assembly on my gun bill, AB 1591.

I enclose a copy of the bill, as amended several times as you can see. I believe if you will study it carefully you will see that we have protected very carefully the constitutional rights of citizens to bear arms.

The thrust of my legislation is to restrict the activities of those individuals acting in concert who carry loaded weapons on our public streets and in public places. We amended the bill to also include schools, colleges and universities.

Frankly I can think of no useful purpose in carrying loaded weapons in these areas.

Thank you very much for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MAY 10 1967

Wilton, California
May 9, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

I hope you will forgive me for my persistency in discussing this particular subject, but it seems imperative that we have some real definitive legislation along these lines, but it is also incumbent upon us to see that such legislation not only serves its intended purpose, but that it does not adversely affect any of those whom it is intended to serve.

I deplore the hysteria presently in vogue, which holds that all firearms and owners of firearms are mala in se, but at the same time, I deplore the dearth of legislation to effectively control the wrongful use of weapons of all kinds. I am quite sure that you share my concern along these lines.

Entirely too much emphasis is being placed on firearms per se, and not enough on other types of weapons, and not nearly enough on the real culprits, the people who make unlawful use of weapons--who use weapons in the furtherance of their criminal acts.

Speaking from the viewpoint of one who spent a large part of his life in law enforcement, but who has also been a lifelong sportsman and shooter I would like to make a few pertinent observations and suggestions which might contribute significantly toward the reduction of crime, particularly crimes of violence.

1. A man who undertakes the commission of any unlawful act, and arms himself with a weapon of any kind, has by such arming, compounded his crime and increased the probabilities of violence resulting in great bodily harm or death. Conviction under such circumstances should be not less than twice as severe as it would be if the crime were committed by one who was unarmed. Where great bodily harm or death resulted from such a crime, the penalty should be infinitely greater.
2. Any person who, after being once convicted for a crime of violence, commits a second offense of a similar nature, should receive a mandatory minimum sentence at least twice as great as he received for his first such offense; a third such offense should carry a mandatory minimum sentence at least three times as great as the original, or in lieu of that approach, should receive a mandatory sentence without chance of parole, amounting to the maximum penalty provided by law, for his offense.

3. Any person who participates peacefully in any public protest demonstration, which is in itself peaceful and within the limits of lawful authority, is exercising his constitutional rights under the first amendment. Any person who arms himself with a weapon of any kind, and participates in any such demonstration, has placed himself outside the protection guaranteed for peaceful assembly, since weapons are simply not compatible with peaceful assembly.

Weapons, like hard liquor, frequently imbue a person with false courage and a distorted sense of values. In the tense atmosphere frequently associated with such public gatherings, and the oft-times ill-considered oratory and inflammatory slogans, it is quite easy for one to have his passions incited to acts of violence. If, while under the influence of such incited passions, a person is further emboldened by having in his hands, a club, knife, gun, or any other weapon, the results are frequently violent and bloody.

4. There are actually very few, if any, everyday situations in which the average law-abiding citizen could not, or should not be entrusted with a firearm. Since those with criminal records, those subject to mental aberrations or mental instability, and those under the age of responsibility, cannot be classed as average citizens, we except them from the above observation. It would be quite unjust to consider either the actual or constructive disarming of millions of responsible citizens, simply because a very small segment of our society is less than average.

We would be aghast if legislation were enacted outlawing baseball bats on the grounds that 25 or 30 homicides are committed annually by such weapons, or because a few thousand windows are broken every year by future Babe Ruths. Hundred of people are murdered every year by such things as hammers and butcher knives, yet it would be inane to consider outlawing such weapons. Autos take a staggering total of lives every year but who would suggest curtailing ownership of autos. The AMA says over 300,000 deaths per year can be attributed to cigarettes, but there does not appear to be any mad rush of legislation to banish the nicotine time bomb.

5. Laws are a necessary part of our society, but no law should ever be enacted which does not serve a specific useful purpose, and no law should ever be enacted which is so drawn as to act like a seine--catching great numbers of good fish in the hope of netting an occasional eel.

The three proposals which follow, are submitted for your consideration in the belief that they would fill a definite need, without unduly harassing the innocent.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

(1) Except in defense of life or property, or in actual pursuit of one who has committed or attempted to commit a felony, or unless otherwise legally authorized to do so, any person who carries a loaded firearm on his person while upon a public street or public place within any incorporated city of this state, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

(2) Any person who carries a weapon of any kind upon his person while participating in any public protest meeting or demonstration, or in any riot anywhere in this state, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

(3) Any person who carries a loaded firearm of any kind on his person while participating in any public protest meeting or demonstration, or in any riot, anywhere within this state, shall be guilty of a felony.

I feel very strongly, that we must take the bull by the horns before the situation gets any worse, which from all indications, it probably will before the summer is over.

Respectfully yours,

Merle D. Gow

June 20, 1967

Mr. Jim Dutra
Route 2, Box 384
Stockton, California 95207

Dear Jim:

I purposely refrained from acknowledging your very welcome letter until my gun bill, AB 1591, was finally amended and passed by the Assembly.

I enclose a copy of it for you.

Best wishes.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

May 4, 1967

Dear Sir,

MAY 8 1967

Although I am from another district, I am very interested in your bill that is before the legislature. This is the bill that would outlaw the possession of a loaded weapon within a city. I realize that, as it has been said in the news, you have not finished the entire bill. However, if it is possible, when it is done, could you send me a copy and any other information, pro and con, that is available to you. I will be able to use this information greatly in preparing a case for next school year's debate contests. I am on the Lodi Union High School debate squad and the topic, which is, "That the federal government should regulate the possession and use of firearms," fits in perfectly.

with your bill.
Thank you for any assistance

Yours truly
Jim Dutra
P.O. Box 384
Stockton, Calif. 95207

Encl: Self addressed envelope

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. E. L. Cosgrove
8150 Peerless Avenue
Orangevale, California

Dear Mr. Cosgrove:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

900 15
Orangevale, Calif.
May 3, 1967

MAY 4 1967

Assemblyman
Don Mulford,
California State Assembly,
Sacramento, California. 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:

I wrote yesterday to United States Congressman John E. Moss about our need for more stringent federal laws regarding firearms. Now I would like to tell you I was very gratified to read that you have introduced to the assembly a bill which would forbid anyone, except police officers, carrying a loaded weapon within an incorporated area.

We also need

Stronger state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

Anyone can get a gun at a gun store, pawn shop, or through the mail. Lee Oswald did it and nothing has changed since then. And, look what happened yesterday in your own back^{er}yard.

And, if you do buy a gun, nobody is going to ask you your age, if you are mentally defective, or if you know how to use firearms properly. If you can pay for a gun, you can have one, a rifle, a bazooka, a pistol, an anti-tank blaster, just any type of gun your little heart desires.

According to the Gallup Poll taken in January for NBC, approximately 75 percent of the American people want tougher gun laws. All we ask, Mr. Mulford, is your help, in the name of the 17,000 Americans who died last year from gunshot wounds.

Very sincerely,

Larry Gosgrove

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. A. W. Nash
711 North Euclid Street
Fullerton, California

Dear Mr. Nash:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM: bmk
Enclosure

FB
159W

JUN 12 1967

A. W. NASH

711 North Euclid Street

Fullerton, Calif.

June 9, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
Assemblyman
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford:

Our local newspapers carried the story of the negroes invading the Assembly chambers in protest to Assemblyman Mulford's proposed legislation "outlawing the possession of a loaded weapon within a city - and amended to unincorporated areas". The negroes' actions were of course reprehensible and deserve no further comment.

What does seem important, though, is the proposed bill. Our local newspaper is frequently woefully inaccurate, so I can only comment based on the above quoted purpose of the bill. I have no figures on the numbers of criminals in the country but suspect percentagewise they are relatively few. That implies that most of us are decent law abiding citizens. And the big worry to most of us is that all the furor today about gun legislation is simply going to disarm the honest people and leave the criminals armed. And of course it's obviously impossible for us to begin to support enough policemen that they can be everywhere all the time.

My work in electrical equipment field engineering takes me into many areas, city and rural. Some of these places scare me silly! I admit it. Mrs. Nash and I have three daughters and a son, ages 22 down to 16. The idea of disarming all honest citizens and leaving the others armed worries me.

The bill is spoken of as being referred to the Criminal Procedures Committee. Are the honest people to become criminals too? Far fetched, you say? No, I don't carry weapons, but I feel I should be allowed to. I certainly do have loaded weapons at home, and have taught my wife and children to use them. The newspapers are full everyday of murders, rape, robbery, break-ins of home. Of course policemen can't be in every home to protect these women and children - or me either, either physically or legally.

Please think through proposed legislation carefully with the well being of the honest people uppermost in mind. From all I've read in the past few years on the weapons problem, it seems that what we need most is rigid enforcement of present laws, not just more and more laws. Punish the present law breakers with the present laws. Don't try to solve the crime problem simply by passing laws that will really effect only those who are law abiding to start with.

Sincerely,



A. W. Nash

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. Wesley C. Keir
Blackstone Apts., Apt. 508
81 Ninth Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Keir:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bak
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

San Francisco 5-3-67

MAY 4 1967

HON DON MULFORD, DEAR SIR

PERMIT ME TO SAY THIS:

THE WHOLE TROUBLE WITH THESE HOODLUMS LIES DIRECTLY WITH OUR LAWMAKERS, OUR COURTS, AND LAW ENFORCING AGENCIES. WHY NOT PASS SOME STIFF LAWS AND SEVERE PUNISHMENTS FOR THE CRIMINALS AND LAW BREAKER WHO LAUGH AT OUR COURTS, OUR LAWS AND AT THE HELPLESS POLICE. AND WHY NOT ENFORCE THE LAWS? A MAN IS BEATEN UP, ASSAULTED AND ROBBED IN BROAD DAYLIGHT WITH IMPUNITY AND IF A COP LAYS ONE FINGER ON THESE SAVAGE BLACK DEGENERATES ALL YOU HEAR IS POLICE BRUTALITY! WHY NOT HAVE SOME CIVIL RIGHTS AND PROTECTION FOR THE LAW ABIDING CITIZENS THAT PAY TAXES AND SUPPORT ALL OUR ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL STRUCTURE? AND WHO PAYS FOR THE WELFARE DEPT. MONEY THAT'S DISHED OUT TO THESE SAVAGES AND LAWBREAKERS. WHEN THE WHITE MAN FIRST CAME TO CALIFORNIA IN 1848 IT WAS: ROOT WHOG "OR DIE! AND I'VE WORKED HERE IN SACRAMENTO IN 1910 FOR DOLLAR DAY 12 HOURS. NOW THE CRIMINAL ELEMENT BY THE MILLION MOVED IN TO CALIFORNIA FROM THE SLUMS OF THE BIG CITIES IN THE EAST OR FROM THE COTTON BELT IN THE SOUTH. AND THEY DEMAND EVERYTHING HANDED TO THEM ON THE SILVER PLATTER. BIG MONEY AND VERY LITTLE WORK SO THEY CAN PLAY THE BIG SHOTS AND NOW THEY CLAIM THAT THE MR. CHARLIE (WHITE MAN) OWES IT TO THEM. THAT'S THE WHOLE THING IN A NUTSHELL. WE DESPERATELY NEED TOUGHER LAWS AND PUNISHMENT FOR THE CRIMINALS AND BETTER POLICE PROTECTION FOR THE ORDINARY LAW ABIDING CITIZENS.

SINCERELY YOURS,

WESLEY C. KEIR

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

June 20, 1967

Mr. Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr.
P. O. Box 850
Salinas, California

Dear Mr. D'Arrigo:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

5-13
Wesley C. Keir
Blackstone Apts, Apt. 508
81 - 9th Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94103

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MAY 12 1967

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, JR.

P. O. Box 850

SALINAS, CALIFORNIA

May 11, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford:

I read the newspaper accounts of the revisions of your Firearms Control Bill.

For the most part, I agree with the intent of your bill even as amended. However, I am disturbed about one of the revisions that would require a permit to keep a loaded gun in the home or place of business. I see no connection between this and the armed bands. What this provision in fact does is invite burglaries and robberies. Unless the gun is loaded, there is not much point in keeping one in the home for defense. It is unlikely a burglar or holdup man would allow you time to load the gun. In the event you have time to load it, how does that square with your revision prohibiting the keeping of a loaded gun in the home or place of business?

It will not prevent the illegal use of weapons by the criminal element, but the law abiding citizen will be at his mercy and if he should load a gun and either wound or capture the man using a loaded weapon, he could be prosecuted under your prohibition without permit to keeping a loaded weapon. I believe this restriction should be eliminated since the protection of one's family, home and property would in effect be subject to permission.

The same would apply to your revision prohibiting loaded weapons within 100 feet of a residence, building or place of business. This

latter revision should in all probability be revised by clarification, etc.. I think I understand your reasoning and purpose, but as the newspapers have it, your amendment would throw the baby out with the bath water. It may be the papers don't have it right and that is not unusual these days. If this is aimed at armed bands, groups, etc., or hold-up men, then I am in accord provided there is language in the bill clarifying the intent.

With reference to the Black Panther raid, I cannot visualize those people as interested in preserving the Second Amendment. I think the exact opposite was their intent. Any one who is fighting to preserve the Second Amendment is too astute to pull off a deal like that, and I believe the intent was to stir up a campaign for L. B. J.'s gun control bill.

Sincerely yours,



Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr.

SD, JR:lg

Editorial

Who Guards America's Homes?

I see nothing here to warrant the editorials & news articles all are reading. Taking the one paragraph it would be stretching it some to say the NRA urges armed vigilance in its entirety. It is impossible.

IN these unsettled times when some courts seem to pamper criminals, when too many Americans revel in all sorts of law-breaking from speeding to head-smashing, and when law enforcement officers are popular only on television, the best police on earth, alone, cannot stem the kind of mob violence that has swept many American cities.

Mob action on a scale unprecedented in the modern United States has ravaged community after community in recent years. Chicago, Cleveland, Omaha, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Rochester, N. Y., Birmingham, Ala., Newport, R. I., Daytona Beach, Fla., and many others have felt the lash of mass fury and rioting.

What happens when community disorder gets out of hand and local police call for help in the crisis? State police usually are available only in limited numbers for a relatively short time. The brunt of the crisis is likely to fall on the National Guard.

Last July, some 6,700 National Guardsmen of 3 States were summoned to quell riots and preserve order. Guardsmen went on duty in Omaha July 4-5, Chicago July 15-19, and Cleveland July 19-31.

The previous August, homefront policing by the National Guard reached an all-time high with the Watts rioting in Los Angeles. Some 8,674 citizen soldiers spent a week on active duty there.

Within a month of the Watts crisis, 2,200 National Guardsmen were called out at Springfield, Mass., and 600 at Natchez, Miss., in civil rights disturbances.

While hating on the homefront increased in frequency and intensity in the past several years, it is nothing new. Since World War II, the National Guard has been summoned in strength at least 50 times.

During educational integration crises in the South, 13,000 U. S. Army Regulars were ordered to special duty. U. S. Marines helped to quell one 'teen-age' riot in New England.

But the main reliance of local authorities in sudden blazes of civic disorder has been the National Guard. Fortunately, it has been available for homefront duty.

Which brings us to a question: What if the National Guard were overseas in a major war, as it has been repeatedly in this century?

Who then supports the police? Who then guards the doors of American homes from senseless savagery and pillaging?

Under any full war mobilization, the National Guard and our Armed Forces reservists would find themselves away on active duty. Some cities maintain home guard and auxiliary police organizations but others do not. In at least one Midwestern community, a home guard dating from World War II recently was abandoned

With homefront safeguards spotty and uncertain, the armed citizen represents a potential community stabilizer. His support of law and order, whether as a civilian member of the posse comitatus or as one of the unorganized militia, defined as the "whole body of able-bodied male citizens," could prove essential. Realistic appraisals attest that there is a widespread practice and belief in keeping firearms for home protection.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (19 commissioners, only one a law officer; 63 staffers, 175 consultants) reported recently that "slightly more than one-third (of all Americans) say they keep firearms in the house for protection against criminals."

Keeping firearms at home for protection is going to be increasingly difficult under proposed new laws. In New York under the Sullivan Law, which the President wishes to see copied in all other States, police have cut down steadily on the number of protection arms. They have denied permits with little or no real reason time and again. New York State, by increasing the annual handgun license fee from nothing at first to \$20 at present, tends to tax pistol ownership out of existence.

Experience suggests that an extension of the Sullivan Law with its arbitrary administrative attitudes is a sure way to disarm law-abiding citizens.

From undisputed facts in New York City and elsewhere, it appears that a program like the one that would be initiated under the Dodd-Celler Bills would seriously reduce possession and availability of firearms for home protection.

Most of the current crop of firearms "control" bills, in fact, are the kind that discourage home ownership of protection guns. There is little indication that their sponsors have given any thought to the fate of citizens who may be trapped and beleaguered by howling mobs that brush aside police.

To guard a disarmed America under such conditions might require the most enormous "standing army" of police ever seen in the free world. New York City has increased its police force from 15,000 to 24,000—about the size of 2 U. S. Army divisions—in the past 22 years although its population remains the same. It now spends more than \$1,000,000 a day on policing, yet its crime rate rockets. There, it is very nearly left entirely up to the cops to shoot it out with the robbers.

If the U. S. civilian population were generally disarmed—we speak now, naturally, of the law-abiding ones who would comply with anti-gun laws—how many would be left to support the nation need? And at what cost? Do the supporters of the Dodd-Celler Bills have a figure?

NRA POSITION ON GUN LEGISLATION

Positive program announced at NRA Annual Meetings in Washington

The National Rifle Association will support a positive program of firearms legislation in the current session of Congress akin in many ways to measures that it favored as far back as 1963.

That policy was announced at the close of the 96th NRA Annual Meetings in Washington, D. C., Mar. 31-Apr. 6, during which the program was discussed and approved.

The NRA policy makers' action confirmed the organization's opposition to the drastic controls proposed in the pending Dodd-Celler Bills (S. J. H.R. 518-D), which would impose on rifles and shotguns the same restrictions they would place on handguns and would group sporting arms with military guns and bazookas.

In its present form, the NRA program advocates 4 gun control principles, most of which the organization has supported in some form in recent years. As announced by NRA President Harold W. Glassen, these would:

1. Amend the National Firearms Act by banning so-called "destructive devices" such as antitank guns, bazookas, and rockets.

2. Strengthen state firearm regulation by providing Federal cooperation at the interstate level.

3. Increase penalties for crimes in which firearms are used.

4. Ban all handgun sales to minors and require sworn statements of eligibility to buy and own pistols from buyers seeking handguns by mail order.

The first 3 provisions embrace the 3-part program that the NRA endorsed during the 1966 session of Congress.

The fourth provision represents approval of measures such as Senator Roman Hruska (Neb.) introduced at the last session (S. 3767) to regulate mail traffic. The similar proposal he presented in the original Dodd Bill that the NRA endorsed in 1963. But Senator Dodd's drastic alterations of that Bill forced the NRA to oppose it.

Soon after the NRA decision, Rep. Cecil R. King (17th Dist., Calif.), NRA Director and Life Member, introduced a House bill (H.R. 8645) to implement 2 parts of the NRA program. King's bill would make it a Federal offense to ship firearms interstate into States whose laws forbid such shipments. It also would regulate interstate sales of handguns to screen out minors and criminals.

Specifically, the King bill would set fees and conditions under which manufacturers and dealers may sell and ship firearms; would make it a crime for them to ship in violation of any State law, or for any resident of a State to receive firearms in violation of his State's laws; and would further safeguard handgun transactions by requiring the buyer in interstate commerce to submit a sworn statement that he is not a minor or criminal, together with the name and address of his chief local law enforcement officer. The seller is required to transmit this information to the law officer and to withhold shipment of the firearm for at least 7 days after receiving notice that the statement has reached the law officer—thus allowing a week for a local checkup on the would-be buyer.

NRA President Glassen pointed out that the legislative proposals effectively refuted charges of NRA critics that the organization, largest sportsmen's association in the nation, blindly opposed all new gun laws.

"That never has been true and the stand taken at the NRA Meetings should demonstrate for once and for all that it is manifestly untrue," Glassen commented.

The NRA throughout its long and distinguished history has always actively opposed or sincerely supported legislative measures which afforded a practical, constitutional means of insuring the legitimate ownership and use of firearms to some 50,000,000 American gun owners while denying guns, as nearly as any laws can, to the 100,000 or so criminals who misuse them.

The current program of the NRA has been long in the making. It has not been sudden, or abruptly influenced, or arrived at casually. In evolving this program, respectful consideration has been given to the views of key members of the membership. The result represents the mature and similar efforts of dedicated leaders both in the NRA and among those in the Congress who are in accord with legitimate firearms ownership and use.

The current program of the NRA has been long in the making. It has not been sudden, or abruptly influenced, or arrived at casually. In evolving this program, respectful consideration has been given to the views of key members of the membership. The result represents the mature and similar efforts of dedicated leaders both in the NRA and among those in the Congress who are in accord with legitimate firearms ownership and use.

with the rights of law-abiding Americans to possess and enjoy firearms. It should in fact serve to insure that right against unwarranted and unworkable

legislation which has been introduced in both the Congress and in certain State legislatures.

"At the State level, it is notable that the legislatures of several major States, including Illinois, Ohio and Connecticut, have rejected unduly restrictive firearms legislation. It is sincerely to be hoped that others will recognize the wisdom and propriety of such a position."

The NRA program was developed principally by the NRA firearms legislation committee headed by John M. Schooley, of Denver, Colo., a past national president and veteran law officer, and consisting also of Woodson D. Scott, New York, vice chairman; Ben Avery, Phoenix, Ariz.; Alvin Badeaux, Thibodaux, La.; Eugene D. Bennett, San Francisco, C. R. Guermuth, Washington, D. C.; Leon C. Jackson, Dallas, Tex.; Bruce G. Johnston, West Des Moines, Iowa; Robert J. Kukla, Chicago; Joe H. McCracken, III, Dallas; Robert M. Modisette, Jr., Pasadena, Calif.; Judge Bartlett Rummel, Tacoma, Wash.; Stuart H. Russell, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Garth F. Steltenpohl, Salem, Oreg.; and Jack J. Basil, secretary. The committee met last December and again this March and early April. Its recommendations were approved by the NRA Executive Committee and Board of Directors at the Meetings.—A.H.

Pending House bills that relate to policies enacted in the 1967 NRA legislative program are as follows:

To control "destructive devices": H.R. 7457, by Rep. Cecil King (12th Dist., Calif.); H.R. 7467, by Rep. John Dingell (16th Dist., Mich.); H.R. 7174, by Rep. Frank Horton (36th Dist., N.Y.).

To give Federal support to local firearms enforcement: H.R. 2839, by Rep. Robert Sikes (1st Dist., Fla.); H.R. 7450 and H.R. 7466, by Rep. Dingell; also H.R. 867, by Rep. Robert Michel (18th Dist., Ill.) and H.R. 7173, by Rep. Horton, which refer to mail-order gun sales.

To increase penalties for use of firearms to commit H.R. 340 and H.R. 6137, by Rep. Bob Casey (2nd Dist., Texas); H.R. 312, by Rep. Ed Edmondson (2nd Dist., Okla.); H.R. 7454, by Rep. Wendell Wyatt (1st Dist., Oreg.); H.R. 6067, by Rep. John Zwach (6th Dist., Minn.); and H.R. 7869 by Rep. Olin Teague (6th Dist., Texas).

To regulate interstate sales of handguns: H.R. 867, by Rep. Michel; H.R. 7173, by Rep. Horton.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 10, 1967

To The Editor
San Jose News
211 W. Santa Clara
San Jose, California

Dear Sir:

Dead center on the front page of the San Jose News appeared "Arm Self, Rifle Group Urges". At least it wasn't as bad as that of the New York Times and the San Francisco Chronicle. The latter two were bold faced lies in that they accused the NRA of urging the formation of armed groups or vigilantes. I am a member of the NRA. I also have a copy of the May issue to which your article refers. Never in my years of membership have I ever seen or read an NRA statement urging the formation of such groups. They in fact support and sponsor legislation that would prohibit such groups.

The editorial in the May edition, when taken in its ENTIRE context has a different connotation. It cites a potential void in police protection should the National Guard, which is the organized militia, be called to active duty. A careful study of the history of the Second Amendment and of the debates before its inclusion in the Constitution, makes it clear that the armed civilian is a part of the unorganized militia. He is the one who is deputized at times of emergency.

It is to this the NRA editorial refers and not to bands such as the Minute Men, the Black Panthers, Vigilantes, or any other such groups by whatever name.

The articles in the New York Times and San Francisco Chronicle are dishonest reporting. Your heading is only slightly better. No where does

-2-

the NRA editorial urge the formation of groups of armed men or advise the populace to arm themselves. It points out that under certain conditions there could be a definite need for the armed citizen (unorganized militia) operating under the law. What you and the other papers have done is to take a little segment from the editorial and applied your version.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr.

SD, JR:lg

cc: National Rifle Assn.
Washington, D. C.

THE TRUTH ABOUT GUNS

A public service presentation of
THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION.



WHAT NRA IS

The National Rifle Association of America, founded in 1871, is an independent non-profit organization supported by membership fees. Its purposes are to educate public-spirited citizens in the safe and efficient use of small arms for pleasure and protection; to foster firearms accuracy and safety in law-enforcement agencies, in the Armed Services, and among citizens subject to military duty; and to further the public welfare and national defense.

HARLON B. CARTER, *NRA President*
HAROLD W. GLASSEN, *NRA Vice President*
FRANKLIN L. ORTH, *Executive Vice President*
LOUIS F. LUCAS, *Executive Director*
& *Treasurer*
FRANK C. DANIEL, *Secretary*
MORTON C. MUMMA, *Chairman,*
NRA Public Relations Committee

Copyright National Rifle Association of America 1967

Provided the original intent is not changed, copyright is waived on the use, in whole or part, of material in these pages.

Is There A "Gun Problem?"

No. There is a *crime* problem. It is worldwide and involves all forms of violence. "Crime is indeed universal and is not a social phenomenon peculiar only to the United States," says the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for Dec., 1966. It indicates that within this decade, violent or armed crimes increased 60% in France, 41% in Sweden, 35% in the U. S., 20% in South Australia, and sharply in England, Scotland, Wales.

In the course of crime, 9 women in Boston and 6 in Cincinnati were strangled in the past several years with silk stockings. Eight nurses were killed in Chicago last July—principally with a knife. America's biggest single mass murder, in 1955, took 44 lives—with a bomb planted in an airplane.¹

The U. S. crime problem is entangled with abruptly changing moral values, family breakdowns, poverty and ignorance, big city slums, alcoholism and automobiles, narcotics and much else. Any real solution must view the problem as a whole.

¹ Second largest, 34 killed by a bomb in a plane in 1960.

②

Well, What Should Be Done About The *Crime* Problem?

Prompt, unswerving enforcement of existing laws would do much to solve it. Effective punishment has diminished until criminals laugh at the law—all law including gun laws.¹

There are an estimated 20,000 State and local laws already in effect that can be invoked in their respective localities to control misuse of firearms. The National Rifle Association and others, including spokesmen for law enforcers, favor stiffer penalties for violence involving misuse of firearms.

The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for December, 1966, after citing that firearms are used in crime in the U. S. more often than in England, says: "This difference . . . can be attributed, in part, to an English law providing for an extra penalty in addition to the penalty for the substantive offense for an offender convicted of using a firearm in the commission of crime."

This is substantially what the NRA has strongly and repeatedly urged.

¹ Charles J. Whitman, the Austin killer, violated an existing Federal law by having a sawed-off shotgun. New laws proposed last year would not have stopped him or some others like him.

③

Does Availability of Guns Create Crime?

NOT necessarily. The FBI Uniform Crime Report¹ says "the factors which cause crime are many and vary from place to place. . . ." The statement lists as "some of the conditions" which affect the amount and type of crime the following:

Density and size of the community population and the metropolitan area of which it is a part.

Composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex and race.

Economic status and mores of the population.

Relative stability of population, including commuters, seasonal, and other transient types.

Climate, including seasonal weather conditions.

Educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.

Effective strength of the police force.
Standards governing appointments to the police force.

Policies of the prosecuting officials and the courts.

Attitude of the public toward law enforcement problems.

The administrative and investigative efficiency of the local law enforcement agency.

¹ FBI Uniform Crime Report released July 28, 1966, Page VIII.

④

How About Federal Firearms Laws?

The National and Federal Firearms Acts,¹ both passed with NRA support, provide a distinct measure of control wherever invoked.

Contrary to assertions that the NRA seeks to "block all legislation," it has repeatedly backed conscientious measures for the public welfare. It is on record as favoring federal legislation to curb shipment of firearms into states where their delivery violates state law, to ban "destructive devices" such as antitank guns and bazookas, and to impose mandatory prison terms for those who commit specified criminal acts involving the misuse of firearms. But anti-gun spokesmen² have declared that even the so-called Dodd Bill represented only "*a beginning.*" They do *not* reveal their real goal. Many conscientious people think the ultimate goal is virtually the elimination of the private ownership of firearms in America.

¹ The National Firearms Act (1934) outlaws machineguns and sawed-off shotguns and rifles except by special license. The Federal Firearms Act (1938, amended later) regulates interstate commerce in firearms. The Federal Aviation Act (1958) restricts the carrying of firearms on airliners. U. S. Post Office regulations ban the mail shipment of pistols to the general public.

² U. S. Senator Edward Kennedy (Mass.) quoted in Senate Report 1866, 89th Congress, Oct. 19, 1966, Page 97.

⑤

Why Does NRA Object To Registration And Licensing By Police?

To require police departments to grant or deny applications for firearms ownership imposes on them, we think, an unfair burden of deciding who is a law-abiding citizen and who is not. Except in foreign police states, this is a function of the courts.

Registration and licensing measures that deny firearms permits to certain categories of people place the police in position of being blamed if they issue a permit to anyone, other than in those categories, who suddenly misuses a firearm. To guard against this blame, police in several areas of the United States where registration is now in force sometimes refuse to issue any permits. An impossible situation results.

As to the ineffectiveness of firearms registration in curbing crime, law enforcement records indicate that most criminals steal both the cars and the firearms that they use. Car registration seldom or never seems to deter them. Nor does firearms registration where it has been attempted.

6

7

What About Constitutional Rights?

Under the U.S. Constitution and many State Constitutions, there is much basis for *individual law-abiding citizens* to own and bear arms.

The Second Amendment (U.S.) states *in full*: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

Anti-gun spokesmen claim "militia" means only the National Guard and like organizations.¹ They could hardly be more wrong. The nation has 2 kinds of militia, organized and *unorganized*. The latter consists of virtually *all able-bodied males*. See:

¹Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Volume II, 1961

mi-li-ti-a *mī-lī-shə* n. -i [L. military service, warfare, fr. *militis*, *miles* soldier + *-ia* -y] 1 obs. a; military practice or system. b; military service. c; ARMAMENT. 2 obs. a particular military force. 3; HOME RESERVE. 4; the whole body of able-bodied male citizens declared by law as being subject to call to military service.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary, 1903

mi-li-ti-a (*mī-lī-shə*) n. 1. A body of citizens enrolled and drilled in military organizations other than the regular military forces, and called out only in emergencies. 2. U.S. Able-bodied male citizens between eighteen and forty-five years of age not members of the regular military forces, and legally subject to call for military duty. Abbr. *mil.* [*< L.*, military service *< miles*, *militis* soldier.]

A Dictionary of American English, Volume III, 1942. (5th Impression 1965)

* Militia.

1. a. An organization, primarily for local defense, consisting, usually, of men who meet periodically for military drill and exercise. [1660-] +b. The whole body of adult male citizens capable of bearing arms.

Any assertion that the unorganized militia or able-bodied American man-

hood lacks the right to bear arms because it is not "well-regulated" is equally in error. It *is regulated* by (a) Selective Service and (b) current manpower needs of the Armed Forces. Seldom has the right to own and learn to use arms been more essential to young Americans than *now*. In "regulating" the unorganized militia, the Government recognizes this by sponsoring, with NRA, DCM civilian firearms training.

Further, all rights not exercised by the U.S. Government under the Second Amendment revert to the States and "the people" under the Tenth Amendment. Fully 2/3rds of State Constitutions authorize their citizens to have firearms "for the defense of home, person or property," or the like. Some others do so by statute.

¹ Senators Dodd, Bayh, Edward Kennedy, Tydings, Fong, Javits, Smathers, and E. V. Long signed a statement (Page 68, Report 1966, 89th Congress) asserting that "no body of citizens other than the organized State militia, or other military organization provided for by law, may be said to have a constitutional right to bear arms."

8

Is There Really A "Firearms Menace?"

Of the nearly 2 million Americans who die each year:

One in 3 passes away of heart disease.

One in 6 is taken by cancer.

One in 38 dies a motor vehicle fatality.

Only 1 in 195 meets his end from a shot fired accidentally or willfully and unjustifiably.

Only 1 in 2,329 of all fatalities is caused by a criminal shooting during a holdup or other crime.¹

Odds against the average American being maliciously or accidentally killed by a firearm run more than 26,000 to 1.²

Nearly half of all Americans killed in accidents during a typical year are motor vehicle victims. Falls, fires and drownings account for the next largest groups, in order. Only 2% of all accidental deaths involve firearms.

¹ Computed from FBI Uniform Crime Reports and National Safety Council reports.

² Computed from above and Bureau of Vital Statistics data. The murder-manslaughter rate increased (1965) less than that of every other major crime.

9

Aren't Far More People Killed With Guns Now?

Only on *television*. Actually, instead of widespread slaughter, the rate of homicides from firearms has *decreased by half* from 1930 to 1965.¹ Although the population is now much larger, gun fatalities are fewer.

Back in 1930, the rate was 5.7 firearms homicides per 100,000 population. In 1965, the last year on record, it was 2.9.

In 1930, when the nation had 123,077,000 people, 6,995 were killed by firearms and explosives.

In 1965, with 193,800,000 people, 5,634 died from shots or blasts.

The rate of firearms homicides would be even lower except that a few sensational cases swell the total.

There is *less* basis for new firearms laws now, despite a slight upturn in rate during the 1960's, than in most years past.

The only big increase of any kind has been in hysterical anti-gun propaganda.

¹ Statistical Abstract of the U. S., 1966; also compilations by the NRA Legislative Service, Jack J. Basil.

10

How Have Anti-Gun Authors Juggled Figures?

A book author ran up the annual total of "shooting deaths" to 17,000 by a means somewhat like counting car exhaust suicides as motor vehicle fatalities: He added 9,500 firearms suicides to the accidental and willful shootings.

In the distortion that ensued, four monthly magazines misused the 17,000 figure as follows:

One¹ asserted editorially that "18,000 murders are committed by criminals" with guns. (*Felony* murders that year totalled 772, FBI Uniform Crime Reports.)

Two² said 17,000 Americans were *accidentally* shot. (The National Safety Council figure for fatal firearms accidents is 2,200.)

Yet another magazine³ asserted 17,000 "*were killed*," as if deliberately shot down by others. (Actually 11,700 died in suicides or accidents, all of the former and some of the latter by their own hand.)

¹ Harold H. Roswell in *National Police Gazette*, Nov. 1966.

² Stanley S. Jacobs in *Together* (Methodist) and *Presbyterian Life*, Dec. 1966.

³ Alan Barth in *The Reader's Digest*, Jan. 1967.

11

An Editorial Asking Fairness To Firearms Owners

(THE AMERICAN RIFLEMAN, December 1966)

IN an era of fresh air in American human relations, when we are briskly ventilating away old prejudices, hurtful customs, and belittling ethnic slang, it is a curious reversal of form to see one of the largest elements of our population deliberately misrepresented and slurred. We refer to the 30 or 40 million Americans—one-sixth or one-seventh of all of us—who exercise their constitutional right to own and bear firearms.

For the past several years, these law-abiding people have been constantly held up and shamed as being somehow warped, anti-social, and out of step with our times—this at a time when 350,000 Americans are battling in Vietnam largely with firearms. In particular, some big-city dwellers, their legislators, and their news media have sought, like small children who must classify everyone on television as a "goody" or "baddy," to brand legitimate ownership of firearms as evil or undesirable.

The fact that several notably shocking crimes in recent years have involved guns can hardly justify a methodical emotional assault on the good names of millions of Americans. Yet there continues a calculated campaign to smear lawful gun ownership with a sinister suggestion of illegality.

One nationally syndicated cartoonist has persistently featured the National Rifle Association hand-in-hand with criminal elements. Such misrepresentations were published three times in less than a month as part of an editorial campaign.

Even distorted facts are now being misquoted by firearms critics, com-

12

pounding the overall misrepresentation. A book of glib half-truths fixed the annual firearms toll at 17,000 by including 9,500 suicides with 5,600 homicides and 2,000 accidental firearms fatalities; a compilation about as fair as if all car-exhaust suicides were added to our toll of 49,000 highway deaths. Fact-twisting fell to a new low when one magazine, apparently garbling the 17,000 figure, asserted that "18,000 murders are committed by criminals who purchased their weapons by merely buying them in stores the way they would a piece of candy." The magazine publisher had the fernerity to tag onto this misstatement, "If you agree with this editorial, send it to your Congressman."

A nationally-known survey of opinion meanwhile reported a high public demand for a Federal firearms measure—whipped up in part, no doubt, by the tidal wave of phony publicity—but neglected to say that the demand was 5% less than in a previous survey 18 months earlier.

Abetted by all the hypnotic propagandizing and brainwashing, the State of New Jersey and the City of Philadelphia, Pa., have enacted the most drastic gun control laws in the nation. These laws are now being touted as "models" to be copied elsewhere. Support for such moves has been drummed up by a "smear by association" technique of suggesting that a gun equals crime, and therefore gun ownership equals criminality or crime potential. Some of the same lofty elements who objected loudest to "guilt by association" in questions of national patriotism now lend themselves to this smear

13

by association regardless of the damage it does to individual rights.

As a result, the firearms control laws in the State of New Jersey and City of Philadelphia invade individual privacy far beyond any other form of licensing or registration. Hundreds of thousands of law-abiding citizens, in order to enjoy sports with firearms, must be fingerprinted and photographically "mugged," and must give signed, witnessed statements of their personal habits and sometimes medical certificates attesting to their sanity. Purchasers and owners of rifles and shotguns, as well as pistols, are asked to do this. The New Jersey law applies even to air rifles. No other licensing is so stringent. Although cars kill 49,000 persons a year, some of them by hit-run, applicants for driver's licenses are not required to be fingerprinted. Although most State laws disfranchise insane persons, applicants for voting certificates are not required to produce verification of their sanity. Only in firearms control are such requests made.

Law-abiding citizens who would exercise their constitutional rights under the Second Amendment sometimes are literally grouped with criminals. One applicant for a permit found himself at a police fingerprinting bureau in a waiting line between a prostitute and a manacled knifing suspect.

At a time when our courts insist upon an almost sacred respect for the rights and sensitivities of felons and crime suspects, it is strange that multitudes of law-abiding citizens should be vilified and stripped of their traditional American right to self-respect. ■

14

One Little Test, Please.

When You Look At A Gun, What Do You See?

1. A "lethal weapon?"
2. A form of protection?
3. An item for sport or pastime?

Most Americans think of guns as sports items like fishing rods or tennis rackets; some as a last resort for personal defense. Yet the anti-gun commentators and writers refer even to specialized skeet guns and single-shot smallbore target rifles as "lethal" or "murderous" *weapons*, as if their only purpose was to kill.

(Actually, any inanimate object can be used as a weapon by an infuriated person. Golf clubs have become "lethal weapons" in certain killings. So have cars. A New York State court ruled that a heavy paint-brush, hurled by an angry house painter, constituted a weapon.)

15

How Does The National Rifle Association Help?

Far from being "just a bunch of shooters for fun," the NRA through its nearly 95,000 conscientious unpaid instructors has taught safety and accuracy in recent years to:

Almost one-tenth (36,637) of U. S. law enforcement officers, so they will shoot only when they must and hit only where they aim.

More than 21,000 wives, mothers and others under the NRA Home Firearm Safety Program designed to avert accidents at home.

Some 3,142,526 hunters in U. S. and Canada under the NRA Hunter Safety Program.

In helping millions of Americans to use firearms cautiously for pleasure and protection, the NRA has contributed materially to reducing the U. S. fatality rate from firearms accidents 15% in 1955-65.¹

¹ National Safety Council Report.

16

Why Are So Many Americans Interested In The NRA?

Shooting in its various forms is the world's second largest sport, next only to track.

The National Rifle Association, with its 805,000 active members, is the largest organization of sportsmen in the United States and probably in the world.

Aside from the military, protection and historical importance of firearms, shooting is one of the largest participation sports in the United States.

17

How Is National Defense Strengthened By NRA?

Actually, firearms and ammunition distributed through the Army's Director of Civilian Marksmanship represent a prime investment in national defense. By this means, the NRA as a free service gives thousands of young Americans pre-military marksmanship training at home. This saves time and money. It also saves lives and aids in winning wars. In citing the superiority of Army and Marine Corps riflemen, General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U. S. Army, has stated: "There is a reason for this, and the work of *The National Rifle Association* is no small part of it."

The program administered by the DCM and NRA makes firearms instruction available annually to more than 400,000 Americans—equivalent to all our manpower in Viet-Nam or a fourth of all Americans in the Armed Services. Its cost is only a trifle in our multi-billion-dollar defense program.

18

"NRA Rifle Training As A Lifesaver"

(THE AMERICAN RIFLEMAN, November 1966)

WHAT does a 50-foot NRA range for .22 rifles in Oklahoma have to do with the combat effectiveness and survival of a Marine in Viet-Nam? In the young life of R. S. Hildreth, almost everything.

Hildreth at 17 qualified as an NRA junior sharpshooter. He fired his score at Tulsa on a 50-foot NRA range.

Hildreth at 19 qualified as a hero. He fired against a Viet Cong machinegun at 175 feet.

With only his rifle, he "literally fought a duel" with the machinegun crew. When his accurate marksmanship wiped them out, other Viet Cong manned the weapon. Hildreth coolly picked them off in turn.

The Silver Star Medal was awarded him for his "resolute fighting spirit, bold initiative and unwavering dedication to duty . . . in the face of overwhelming odds." What the citation clearly implied, without saying, was: "He had faith in his rifle and himself."

Never in this century has American marksmanship been more important and vital than in the crazy jungle conflict in Viet-Nam. And never has the urgency for homefront rifle training been clearer.

As brought out in the Arthur D. Little Company research report to the Department of the Army, "We found that the more marksmanship instruction trainees received prior to service, the higher their record scores" in military shooting.

Under the programs administered through the Director of Civilian Marksmanship and NRA, nearly 6,000 civilian clubs participate in making

19

firearms instruction available to more than 400,000 Americans annually. The participants fire annually 62,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition issued by the DCM.

The 1966 national convention of the American Legion, composed of men who know war, commended the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the NRA "for their work in organizing adult and junior clubs, furnishing trained instructors, and conducting marksmanship tournaments throughout the country."

The veterans' organization noted that "actual experience has proven that men entering military service with previous rifle training are more capable in combat, thus improving their chances for survival. . . ."

Those words should make people like J. A. Perrin, Jr., of Loveland, Ohio, an NRA Life Member, feel pretty good. Joe, Jr., saw to it that Joe, 3rd, learned to shoot well enough to win the junior Expert Rifleman Medal at the age of 9. Although Joe, 3rd, had not fired a shot in the 10 years since then, he easily qualified as Expert with a service rifle as a Marine "boot" at Parris Island.

Wherever Joe, 3rd, serves next, he stands a better chance of coming home alive and hearty because of what his dad calls "good old NRA training."

That is what the National Rifle Association is about.

It is not all that NRA does, but if it were, it would be enough. ■

NRA Heroes In Vietnam



1st Lt. Anthony P. Tokarz,
USMC, NRA Member.



1st Lt. Walter J. Marm, Jr.,
USA, NRA Smallbore Expert.



1st/Sgt. Clovis C. Coffman,
Jr., USMC, NRA Member.



S/Sgt. Roger Swindler, USA,
NRA Competitor.



President Johnson presents Sgt. Charles B. Morris, USA,
an NRA Member, with the Distinguished Service Cross.

NRA HONOR ROLL

Medal of Honor

1st Lt. Walter J. Marm, Jr., USA, NRA
Smallbore Expert

Distinguished Service Cross

Sgt. Charles B. Morris, USA, NRA Member

Navy Cross

1st Sgt. Clovis C. Coffman, Jr., USMC,
NRA Member

Silver Star

1st Lt. John A. Albrecht, USMC, NRA
Member

Capt. William B. Feille, USMC, NRA
Member

LCpl. R. S. Hildreth, USMC, NRA Junior
Sharpshooter

Sgt. Felix Lopez, USMC, NRA High Power
Rifle Competitor

1st Lt. A. P. Tokarz, USMC, NRA Member

Bronze Star with V for Valor

1st Lt. David C. Neese, USA, NRA Junior
Distinguished Expert Rifleman

S/Sgt. Roger Swindler, USA, NRA Rifle
Competitor

SP4 Eugene Van Voltinburg, USA, NRA
Member

"The Truth About Guns"

Produced by

The NRA Office of Publications

Ashley Halsey, Jr., Director

John A. Harper, Jr., Ass't Director


In Conjunction with

The NRA Office of Public Affairs

John R. Hess, Jr., Director

This brochure will fit in a legal size (No. 10) envelope and can be mailed first-class for 10¢ or third-class for 4¢. Additional copies are available at 25¢ each, 5 for \$1, 30 for \$5, 100 for \$15. Address Office of Public Affairs, NRA, 1600 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Dear Mr. Mulford, Most
congratulate on your
stand on firearms for
public use. I am sure
the majority of citizens sup-
port you whole heartedly.
I also hope this intrusion
of the Panthers will confirm
the fact that minorities are
attempting to influence all
legislation & in numer-
ous cases are successful
in this country. The major-
ity is the forgotten man & I
wonder if we shall ever
take our stand & do some-
thing about it, in spite of the
fact we are being run chiefly by
minorities. I hope to you legis-
latures! Sincerely, *W. R. M. [unclear]*



MRS. WALTER L. MAXSON
CARMEL VALLEY MANOR
P. O. BOX 6087
CARMEL, CALIFORNIA

THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS



Assemblyman Don Grubb
& Associates
California

June 20, 1967

Mrs. Irene M. Stallings
3223 Tennessee Street
Vallejo, California

Dear Mrs. Stallings:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

0 091
MAY 10 1967

May 6th 1967

The Hon. Don Mulford
Member of the California Legislature
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:-

Well I saw it, I heard it and I read all about it, but I still can hardly believe it! I am talking about that armed gang of hoodlums who invaded our State Capitol and the Assembly last week. It might have turned into a dreadful tragedy, with all those school children who were on the lawn, as well as our legislators and officials who were there.

I am so glad to learn our lawmakers in Sacramento are up in arms about it, and I am sure the Committee looking into this matter will see to it that it doesn't happen again.

It would be a sad commentary of our times if the rest of the residents of California were to arm themselves as protection against this pack of hoodlums and others like them. We'd be living back with the Pilgrims who never stepped outside their home without their musket because it wasn't safe to do so.

Well, I am sure the people of California are about fed up with actions of this kind, such a disregard for law and order and endangering the lives of decent citizens. But we'll be hearing from the "do-gooders" defending this gang's actions for this reason or that. Well, as far as I am concerned, there is no excuse that would justify behavior like that.

I am very grateful that the incident was not more serious and that none of our legislators or officials were injured and I know that you have always been against actions and demonstrations like this.

I have said this before, but I'd like to repeat it, I wish I were a member of your constituency and have you represent me. Your actions and feelings are similar to mine and many more of the good law abiding citizens.

Thank you for listening to me. I am in favor of any legislation that may be passed to stop this sort of incident. Surely, the decent law abiding citizens are entitled to some protection from this and similar packs of armed hoodlums.

You can count on the support of all decent citizens for any law that will stop this kind of violence.

Thank you again and may I remain

Most sincerely,

Gene M. Stallings

*(Mrs. W. Shelby Stallings)
3223 Tennessee Street
Vallejo, Calif. 94590*

IMS

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Miss Mary A. Boland
550 Battery Street, Apt. 910
San Francisco, California

Dear Miss Boland:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

1591
yet

550 Battery St. Apt. 910
San Francisco, Calif. 94111

May 3, 1967

MAY 4 1967

Hon. John Burton, Assemblyman
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Burton,

I am certain that I am not alone
in my outrage over the invasion of
the Assembly yesterday by the "Black
Panthers".

Of more lasting import, to me,
was the impatency of the police to
arrest them on sight. If Mr. Mulford's
pending bill will solve the problem
I urge you to vote for it or for a
similar bill at the earliest possible
opportunity. (I know only what was in the papers.)

It is indeed time that the
maximum protection be afforded to
our citizens and lawmakers alike.

Very truly yours

Mary O. Baland
Sacramento, California

June 20, 1967

Mr. George R. Robinson
Suburban Hills Sanitarium
17926 Apricot Way
Castro Valley, California

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

Suburban Hills Sanitarium

17926 Apricot Way - Castro Valley, California
Jefferson 8-3030

May 3 1967

MAY 4 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento California


Dear Mr Mulford:

What in God's name is happening in this country when armed insurrectionists fully armed invade the deliberations of the State Legislature?

I heard the fulminations of the "Defense Minister" of the Black Panthers in the interview on KNEW last night and it seems to me there ought to be some law under which this individual and others like him could be locked up as a threat to the peace.

Some of these people have been aroused to a maniacal frenzy as a result of "civil rights" agitation and it is high time to call a halt. His "demand" for a "nationalization of industry" "sharing of wealth" at the point of a gun and other inflammatory shouts must be silenced or a full civil war may erupt in our midst.

Sincerely



George R. Robinson

June 20, 1967

Mr. Arthur Lamore
3921 Opal Street
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Lamore:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

Mr. Arthur ¹⁵²¹ Larwood
3921 Opal St.,
Oakland Calif.

Don Mulford, ^{ZIP: 94609}
Dear Sir;

MAY 10 1957

In the law which
you are about to propose
to protect people from men
carrying loaded guns.
I hope this will also
protect the people
from loaded hunters
which is much more of
a danger than just
the loaded guns.
people kill people.
guns alone can not
(over)

If people can not
carry loaded guns
you most certainly
will have to stop
folks from having
bullet on them
because if they have
unloaded guns but have
bullets in their pockets
it takes just a few
seconds to load up
so unless you take
this point into consideration
the law you propose
will be of no avail.

Respectfully

M. C. Lamore

M. Arthur Lamm ¹⁵⁹¹
3921 Opal St.
Oakland Calif.

Assemblymen
Don Mulford

Dear Sir,

In retrospect
"a hind sight."

As regards your legislation
pertaining to the gun law.

Please tell me,

Why did our law men in
the early days of the state,
make themselves hang up
their guns or entering the city?
Certainly there are no bears
more for deer to shoot at
on our main streets or why?
not again want that they
hang up their guns when entering
our city or our communities?

It allowed to carry
even empty guns.

I'm sure the big trouble
would start when police
started checking guns to
see if they were loaded.
This would entail a lot of
unnecessary trouble for law
enforcement.

In other words the law
could cover all the above
trouble by allowing guns but
hang them up while on our
city streets.

Respectfully,
M. A. Lamo

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. Kenneth M. Colson
1315 Pershing Avenue
San Mateo, California

Dear Mr. Colson:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bmh
Enclosure

May 2, 1967

Kenneth M. Colson
1315 Pershing Ave.
San Mateo, Ca..

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Senate Office Building

Dear Mr. Mulford:

The actions of the "Black Panthers" points to the necessity of restricting the use and possession of guns. While it is indeed a Constitutional right to bear arms, we cannot ignore the misuse of this right. The appalling use of firearms in violent crimes must be stopped. I, as I know you are, was shocked by this criminal behavior of a group of armed men entering the State Capital Offices to intimidate you and the other members of the committee. This irrational behavior by men carrying weapons points to the obvious need to control the use of firearms in the hands of potentially dangerous individuals. I, as I am certain others will agree, would appreciate anything you can do to limit and control the sale and use of firearms.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Colson

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 20, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Bent
376 Santa Clara Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Bent:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored. This measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves.

The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bak
Enclosure

98 1591

MAY 4 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
Member of the Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

May 3, 1967

Dear Sir:

Literally thousands will be "up in arms" over the childish exhibition yesterday by the "Black Panther" group who classify themselves thus, as animals.

The "Right to bear arms" carries a responsibility with it. To go as a group, fully and militaristically armed into an occupied building with the intent of protesting shows immaturity, and irresponsibility. As usual, these protestors denied the rights of everyone else in the building—that of safety, peace of mind, and security. This was no protest in token—this was planned to frighten people. Had anyone challenged the marchers there would have been bloodshed.

We contend they marched militaristically because of the loaded ammunition, the posture of the guns held, and illegality of certain weapons. True, they were not concealed weapons. This is not the first public display this group has displayed.

We suggest the following legislation:

1. No group of people may appear on the streets (amid the public) carrying loaded weapons. (This excluded the obvious police and military).
2. Every gun must be registered and a permit accompanying the weapon whenever carried.
3. No one under the age of twenty-one may own or carry a gun. A responsible adult may own the gun a youngster uses. (This is for the members of gun and rifle clubs).
4. Owners of guns must be mentally capable.

If the laws are too stringent that very factor will enhance the present fad of groups like the MinuteMen, Nazi Party, and Black Panthers who are self-styled protectors of the American public.

This negro group is not helping anyone to like them or the members of their race. And only because California is too liberal in its weapons laws do they come here and display themselves.

Sincerely,
Mr & Mrs C.W. Bent
C.W. Bent
376 Santa Clara Avenue
Oakland, California 94610

June 21, 1967

Mr. Alfred E. Gustavson
425 Thirty-Third Street
Richmond, California

Dear Mr. Gustavson:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

May 26, 1967

Mr. Alfred E. Gustavson
425 Thirty-Third Street
Richmond, California 94804

Dear Mr. Gustavson:

Thank you for taking the time to write to me about my
gun-control bill, AB 1591.

I want you to know that there is no provision in the
bill that prohibits any person licensed to carry a gun
from doing so. The bill will make it against the law
for any unauthorized individual to carry a loaded gun
in a public place or on a public street.

I will be happy to send you a copy of the bill as soon
as it has been printed.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

425 - 33rd. Street
Richmond, Calif. 94804
23 May 1967.

MAY 24 1967

Mr. Don Mulford, Assemblyman
Piedmont, California

Dear Mr. Mulford,

This letter is to express my concern regarding legislation which you are presently sponsoring, which purports to be intended to control irresponsible use of firearms by (let's say it out loud) ignorant black men for purposes of intimidation of white men. I am concerned because it is sometimes quite difficult to shoot the chicken hawk without endangering the barnyard poultry.

I have been unable to learn how the bill is worded. I understand that it is not directed at the law abiding (Sportsmen, collectors, etc.) but at whom is it directed?

May I delineate my own case? I am a retired, federal employee. A civil engineer by profession; ex Navy, Pub. Wks. Dep't. Having been in a "sensitive" position, I have had a "concealed weapons permit" for about twenty-five years, issued for "self protection". Since retiring, I have experienced an accident which caused "moderately massive" brain hemorrhages on my right side and consequent partial paralysis on my left side. I have practically recovered from the paralysis but I am in no condition to assimilate a terrific beating from anyone; black or white, juvenile or adult. So I now find myself in a position where I really feel the need of that permit I carry. And am much more comfortable with the .380 which it allows me to carry.

It is not generally known that I have these "solacing items". I do not go where I expect trouble to develop. I do not display them in public or in private. My immediate family knows I have them. But they are not concerned for they are accustomed to my having them and they know how I comport myself. But, if trouble develops and comes and hunts me up, I would not like to be found defenceless. "You sees de pickelment I is in" as Andy used to say.

Believing, as I do, that you are truly interested in the well-being of all of the people of the state may I suggest another line of attack? I would like to suggest that California statutes be amended to state that:

Every citizen shall have the right to purchase, own and keep in his home and/or place of business the following firearms and ammunition for them:

- at least one revolver or autoloading pistol,
- at least one small bore rifle,
- at least one big game rifle,
- at least one shotgun.

Nothing in any law or ordinance shall operate to deprive the citizen of this right or the right to use these weapons, lawfully, FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES for defence of his person and/or property.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Personally, I would feel much more secure if the California legal code; or better yet, the California Constitution; contained or embraced this statement of rights. And I feel that such assurance would go a considerable way toward assuaging fears and tensions now being made manifest in our mixed social scene.


Such assurance should do as much as can be done by law toward protecting people from rash or irresponsible actions of persons under emotional stress. At the same time it would be reassuring to sportsmen and others who 'just natcherly like guns'; who are distressed and bewildered at the multiphase attack on inoffensive peices of mechanism which they use for pleasure or keep for profit but who (almost to a man) declare "I'll never give up my guns".
LET US NOT MAKE OUTLAWS OF A GREAT MANY DECENT PEOPLE.

I am enclosing a publication by The National Rifle Association, entitled, "The Truth About Guns". You may not have seen it. I hope it will be of interest and use to you.

I have written to Governor Reagan in a similar vein on this matter. Let us hope that it can be brought to a ~~brought to a~~ just and equitable conclusion that will rest easily upon the shoulders of all people.

Until such time as we can discuss "the Thuth About Guns", person to person, I am and remain

Sincerely



Alfred H. Gustavson.

MAY 9 1967

Req. #19256

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In line 1 of the title of the printed bill,
strike out "add Sections 405.5" and insert:

amend Section 2006 of the Fish and Game Code, and to add
Sections 171c, 171d,

AMENDMENT NO. 2

In line 2 of the title, after "firearms" insert:

, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert:

Section 1

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "while on a public street or in a public place within any city" and insert:

or in a vehicle while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or in an inhabited area of unincorporated territory

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 2, after line 16, insert:

(5) Patrol special police officers appointed by the police commission of any city, county, or city and county under the express terms of its charter who also under the express terms of the charter (i) are subject to suspension or dismissal after a hearing on charges duly filed with the commission after a fair and impartial trial, (ii) must be not less than 21 years of age nor more than 40 years of age, (iii) must possess physical qualifications prescribed by the commission, and (iv) are designated by the police commission as the owners of a certain beat or territory as may be fixed from time to time by the police commission.

(6) Persons who are authorized to carry concealed weapons pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

(c) In order to determine whether or not a firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section, peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by anyone on his person or in a vehicle while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or inhabited area of an unincorporated territory. Refusal to allow a peace officer to inspect a firearm pursuant to the provisions of this section constitutes probable cause for arrest for violation of this section.

(d) As used in this section "inhabited area" means any place within 100 yards of a structure regularly occupied by any person as a dwelling or as a place of business.

(e) A firearm shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge, or shell in the firing chamber, magazine, or clip thereof.

(f) Nothing in this section shall prevent any person engaged in any lawful business, or any officer, employee, or agent of such person, from having a loaded firearm within such person's place of business.

Sec. 2. Section 171c is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171c. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, or a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, or the State Capitol, or any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of any public school, including the University of California and the state colleges, or the State Capitol, which is bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento.

Sec. 3. Section 171d is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171d. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code, or the Governor or a member of his immediate family, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Sec. 4. Section 2006 of the Fish and Game Code

is amended to read:

magazine, or clip there

2006. It is unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in any vehicle or conveyance or its attachments which is standing on or along or is being driven on or along any public highway or other way open to the public.

A rifle or shotgun shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in the firing chamber, but not when the only cartridges or shells are in the magazine.

The provisions of this section shall not apply to peace officers or members of the armed forces of this State or the United States, while on duty or going to or returning from duty.

Sec. 5. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting such necessity are:

An organized band of men armed with loaded firearms has recently entered the Capitol of the State of California, knocked aside an Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the Assembly and invaded the Chambers of the Assembly, thereby creating a serious threat to the orderly function of the government of the state. Existing laws are not adequate to prevent such serious interruptions in the orderly processes of the government of this state and threats to the safety and welfare of the officers of this state. It is, therefore, imperative that this statute, which will make unlawful actions such as these of the armed band which invaded the State Capitol, take effect immediately.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

#18789

3143

Assembly Bill No.

Introduced by Assemblyman Mulford

If more than one author, their signatures must appear upon the attached list.

An act to add Sections 9057 and 9058 to the Government Code, relating to crimes against the legislative power.

Revised under #18957

Introduced. Read first time. Held at the Desk.

Referred to Committee on To printer.

From printer. To committee.

31st day after introduction.

From committee chairman, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Committee on
Read second time, amended, to printer.

From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended.

From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended, and re-refer to Committee on

From committee: Amend, and be re-referred to Committee on

From committee: Do pass, and be re-referred to Committee on Re-referred.

From committee: Do pass.

Read second time. To engrossment.

Read second time, amended, to printer.

Ordered returned to second reading file.

From printer. To engrossment.

Reported correctly engrossed.

From committee without action.

MULFORD ACT FILES ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

By Assemblymen (1) Murphy (2) _____

(3) _____ (4) _____

If there be more than four authors to this measure, each must affix his signature opposite his name in the following list:

Badham	Knox
Bagley	Lanterman
Barnes	MacDonald
Bear	McGee
Bee	McMillan
Belotti	Meyers
Biddle	Milias
Brathwaite	Miller
Briggs	Mobley
Britschgi	Monagan
Brown	Moorhead
Burke	Moretti
Burton	Mulford
Campbell	Murphy
Chapel	Negri
Chappie	Pattee
Collier	Porter
Conrad	Powers
Cory	Priolo
Crandall	Quimby
Crown	Ralph
Cullen	Roberti
Davis	Russell
Deddeh	Ryan
Dent	Schabarum
Duffy	Shoemaker
Dunlap	Sieroty
Elliott	Stacey
Fenton	Stull
Fong	Thomas
Foran	Townsend
Gonsalves	Unruh
Greene, B.	Vasconcellos
Greene, L.	Veneman
Hayes	Veysey
Hinckley	Wakefield
Johnson, H.	Warren
Johnson, R.	Wilson
Karabian	Z'berg
Ketchum	Zenovich

- ✓ ① Nejedly - Clyde
 " - Orlando
 " - Council of Community
 Services Incident,
- ✓ ② Undersheriff Harry Ramsey
 Incident in no
 Richmond + Martinez.
- ✓ ③ ~~Julian Lyons~~
 Julian Lyons
 Walter Helms School.
- ④ Deputy Chief Joseph Veretto
 Oakland Police Department.
 Will cover incidents in Oakland.
- ⑤ Call Nejedly last-cover
 meeting of Black Panthers
 at Richmond last Saturday (4/30)
 with pictures

Julian Lyons is
Principal of Walter Helms
Junior Hi School.

✓ Officer Chapman
Disrespected Black panthers

✓ Rooney -

✓ 21 arrested today
✓ 17 guns were loaded

Mr man
S.P. presence
gunman at
wedding
Port Clyde
Black panthers

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

RE AB 1591

Proposed Amendments:

Any firearm that has a cartridge in the chamber, the magazine or clip thereof.

(I am seeking a more accurate description of "loaded" because present law indicates one in the chamber.)

Amend:

line 15 to read "Persons who are using target ranges for the purpose of practice shooting with a firearm, shooting clubs, but only on the premises thereof, for the purpose of hunting."

(Exclusion to protect one's self on one's own property)

Tod Sloan National Rifle
Association
re ar 1591

Self-defense?
Why did you leave out
"air force"?

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
INCORPORATED 1871

E. F. "TOD" SLOAN
REPRESENTATIVE

2502 GOODWIN AVENUE
REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA

a firearm shall
be deemed to be
loaded ~~when there~~
for the purposes
of this section
when there is
an expended
cartridge or shell
in the firing
chamber. ~~or~~
~~cartridges or shells~~

MAY 6 1967

Req. #19102

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In line 1 of the title of the printed bill, strike out "Sections 405.5" and insert:

Section 9057 to the Government Code, and to add Sections 171c, 171d,

AMENDMENT NO. 2

In line 2 of the title, strike out "firearms" and insert:

crimes, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out line 1, and insert:

Section 1. Section 9057 is added to the Government Code, to read:

9057. ~~Any person who refuses to obey a law~~
lawful order of a Sergeant at Arms or Assistant Sergeant

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

at Arms of the Senate or Assembly given in the performance of his duties is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sec. 2. Section 171c is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171c. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, or a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

penalty to art 3 CE

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, the State Capitol or any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of the State Capitol, which are bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento.

Sec. 3. Section 171d is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171d. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm, or the Governor or a member of his immediate family, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

penalty to art 3

and of work a bill Action

If property used was on a card
FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES
or for other purposes

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 1, strike out lines 2 to 5, inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert:

Sec. 4.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 1, line 8, strike out "on a" and in line 9, strike out "public street or in a public place within any city" and insert:

in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or in an inhabited area of unincorporated territory

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

thereby creating a serious threat to the orderly function of the government of the state. Existing laws are not adequate to prevent such serious interruptions in the orderly processes of the government of this state and threats to the safety and welfare of the officers of this state. It is, therefore, imperative that this statute, which will make unlawful actions such as these of the armed band which invaded the State Capitol, take effect immediately.

MAY 7 1967

Req. #18923

Juddell

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill insert:

(5) Patrol special police officers appointed by the police commission of any city, county, or city and county under the express terms of its charter who also under the express terms of the charter (i) are subject to suspension or dismissal after a hearing on charges duly filed with the commission after a fair and impartial trial, (ii) must be not less than 21 years of age nor more than 40 years of age, (iii) must possess physical qualifications prescribed by the commission, and (iv) are designated by the police commission as the owners of a certain beat or territory as may be fixed from time to time by the police commission.

MAY 6 1967

Req. #19102

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In line 1 of the title of the printed bill, strike out "Sections 405.5" and insert:

Section 9057 to the Government Code, and to add Sections 171c, 171d,

AMENDMENT NO. 2

In line 2 of the title, strike out "firearms" and insert:

crimes, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out line 1, and insert:

Section 1. Section 9057 is added to the Government Code, to read:

9057. Any person who refuses to obey a lawful order of a Sergeant at Arms or Assistant Sergeant

at Arms of the Senate or Assembly given in the performance of his duties is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sec. 2. Section 171c is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171c. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, or a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, the State Capitol or any hearing room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of the State Capitol, which are bounded by 10th, L, 15th, and N Streets in the City of Sacramento.

Sec. 3. Section 171d is added to the Penal Code, to read:

171d. Any person, except a peace officer or a member of the military forces of this state or of the United States engaged in the performance of his duties, a person holding a valid license to possess the firearm, or the Governor or a member of his immediate family, is guilty of a felony if he does any of the following:

Handwritten notes:
- Xref
to
Art. 3
etc
↑

1. Brings a loaded firearm into, or possesses a loaded firearm within, the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

2. Brings a loaded firearm upon, or possesses a loaded firearm upon, the grounds of the Governor's mansion, or any other residence of the Governor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 1, strike out lines 2 to 5, inclusive.

*Put
4
loaded*

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert:

Sec. 4

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 1, line 8, strike out "on a" and in line 9, strike out "public street or in a public place within any city" and insert:

in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or in an inhabited area of unincorporated territory

AMENDMENT NO. 7

On page 2, after line 16, insert:

(5) Persons who are authorized to carry concealed weapons pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code.

(c) In order to determine whether or not a firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section, peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by anyone on his person while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or inhabited area of an unincorporated territory.

(d) As used in this section "inhabited area" means any place within 100 yards of a structure regularly occupied by any person as a dwelling or as a place of business.

Sec. 5. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting such necessity are:

An organized band of men armed with loaded firearms has recently entered the Capitol of the State of California, knocked aside an Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the Assembly and invaded the Chambers of the Assembly,

*Request
to allow
state
create
penalty
that
is
bad*

*fuzzy -
won't
against
in violation?*

thereby creating a serious threat to the orderly function of the government of the state. Existing laws are not adequate to prevent such serious interruptions in the orderly processes of the government of this state and threats to the safety and welfare of the officers of this state. It is, therefore, imperative that this statute, which will make unlawful actions such as these of the armed band which invaded the State Capitol, take effect immediately.

MAY 7 1967

Req. #18923

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill strike out
"(b)" and insert:

(c)

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, between lines 10 and 11, insert:

(b) Except as provided in subdivision (c), every person who possesses any firearm, loaded or unloaded, within any building used for public purposes by the state or any city, county, city and county, or other public agency is guilty of a misdemeanor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, line 11, strike out "(b) Subdivision (a)"
and insert:

(c) Subdivisions (a) and (b)

MAY 7 1967
Req. #18923

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill insert:

(5) Patrol special police officers appointed by the police commission of any city, county, or city and county under the express terms of its charter who also under the express terms of the charter (i) are subject to suspension or dismissal after a hearing on charges duly filed with the commission after a fair and impartial trial, (ii) must be not less than 21 years of age nor more than 40 years of age, (iii) must possess physical qualifications prescribed by the commission, and (iv) are designated by the police commission as the owners of a certain beat or territory as may be fixed from time to time by the police commission.

Revised under Reg # 1895

MAY 3 1967

Req. #18789

#18957

An act to add Sections ~~9057 and 9058~~ to the Government Code, relating to crimes ~~against the legislative power.~~

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. Section 9057 is added to the Government Code, to read:

9057. Any person, other than a peace officer *or a* engaged in the performance of his duties, who brings any loaded firearm into, or has any loaded firearm in his possession in, ~~the Senate or Assembly Chambers, any hearing room of the Senate or Assembly, or any room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing,~~ is guilty of a felony.

*Mult. reporter
5/20
from 20*

Sec. 2. Section 9058 is added to the Government Code, to read:

9058. Any person who refuses to obey a lawful order of a Sergeant at Arms or Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or of the Assembly given in the performance of his duties is guilty of a misdemeanor.

*Capitol Bldg
and the
place/here
delivered*

19036
A
GF

MAY 2 1967

Req. #18745

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In line 1 of the title of the printed bill,
strike out "Sections 405.5 and" and insert:

Section

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert:

Section 1

1903E

[Handwritten signature]
MAY 2 1907
Reg #1871

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 15, of the printed bill,
insert:

(c) In order to determine whether or not a firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section, peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by anyone on his person while on a public street or in a public place (within any city.)

*Proposed By
Paul Anderson
Peace Officers Assn.*

B

ASSEMBLY BILL 1591


AMENDMENT NO. 1

A peace officer shall have the right to inspect any firearm being carried on the person ~~within~~ any city for the purpose of ascertaining if such firearm is loaded.

use language from face of request

MAY 2 1967

Req. #18718



AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill,

insert:

(c) In order to determine whether or not a firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section, peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by anyone on his person while on a public street or in a public place within any city, provided that the circumstances are such that they would give a reasonable man probable cause to believe that such firearm is loaded.

MAY 2 1967.

Req. #16719

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill,
insert:

(c) In order to determine whether or not a
firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section,
peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried
by anyone on his person while on a public street or in a
public place within any city, provided that the circumstances
are such that they would give a reasonable man probable
cause to believe that such firearm is loaded.

Mulford

APR 25 1967
Req. #1817
[Handwritten signature]

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2 of the printed bill, after line 16,
insert:

(5) Persons who are authorized to carry concealed weapons pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 12050) of Chapter 1 of Title 2 of Part 4 of the Penal Code.

~~Out~~ no

No person, except those listed in Penal Code Section 12025, shall ~~carry~~ or have in his possession or under his control ^{in any public place} any dangerous weapon. It shall be a defense to any prosecution for a violation of this section if, at the time of the alleged violation, such weapon was in good faith controlled or possessed for use in a lawful occupation or employment or for the purpose of lawful recreation. In order to determine if any weapon shall be in violation of this section peace officers are authorized to examine any vehicle or container when reasonable grounds exist to believe this section has been violated.

*Revised
under
Reg # 18957*

Date: 5/3/67
Request No. 18789

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

_____ as introduced, Mulford _____ (_____)

Bill No. _____ Author _____ Committee _____

Crimes against legislative power.

General Subject

Adds Secs. 9057 and 9058, Gov. C.

Makes it a felony for any person, other than a peace officer in the performance of his duties, to bring any loaded firearm into, or to have any loaded firearm in his possession in, the Senate or Assembly Chambers, any hearing room of the Senate or Assembly, or any room in which any committee of the Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing.

Makes it a misdemeanor for any person to refuse to obey an order of a Sergeant at Arms or Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or Assembly, given in the performance of his duties.

Vote - Majority; Appropriation - No; State Expense - No.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

ASSEMBLY BILL 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On line 8

STRIKE WORD LOADED.

MAY 2 1967

Req. #18720

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill, insert:

(5) Members of shooting clubs, but only while on the premises of such clubs.

(c) A firearm shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in the firing chamber, magazine, or clip thereof.

MAY 2 1967

Req. #18720

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill, insert:

(5) Members of shooting clubs, but only while on the premises of such clubs.

(c) A firearm shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in the firing chamber, magazine, or clip thereof.

APR 22 1967
Reg. #18011

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, strike out "(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), every" and insert:

Every

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 1, line 8, after "who" insert:

, unless legally authorized to do so,

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 1, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive.

MAY 2 1967

Req. #18718

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, after line 16, of the printed bill,
insert:

(c) In order to determine whether or not a
firearm is loaded for the purpose of enforcing this section,
peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried
by anyone on his person while on a public street or in a
public place within any city, provided that the circumstances
are such that they would give a reasonable man probable
cause to believe that such firearm is loaded.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MULFORD

Permission to waive

REQUEST TO CONSIDER AND ACT ON ~~BILL~~ ~~CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT~~ WITHIN 30 CALENDAR DAYS

30 day hearing rule
AB 1591

The following request to consider and act on a ~~bill~~ ~~constitutional amendment~~ within 30 calendar days

introduction, heretofore filed with the Chief Clerk pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Rules, was received, and read:

APR 25 1967

Assembly Chamber, -----

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Joint Rule No. 10.8, I request permission to introduce a resolution providing that the following bill ~~constitutional amendment~~ may be heard in committee, and acted upon by the Assembly before 30 calendar days have elapsed:

AB No. 1591
(Insert title)

1591—Mulford. To Com. on Crim. Pro.
An act to add Sections 405.5 and 12081 to the Penal Code, relating to firearms.



(Signature)

Above request ordered transmitted to the Committee on Rules.

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

July 27, 1967

MEMORANDUM TO THE ASSEMBLY:

RE: AB 1591

Three days ago I was notified of potential violence in some communities in California.

Law enforcement officials requested that I do everything possible to expedite the passage of AB 1591. Yesterday afternoon the Senate approved AB 1591, as amended in the Senate June 27, 1967.

In my opinion the Senate amendments strengthen the bill and add to the excellent work of our own Assembly Judiciary Committee in making AB 1591 responsible legislation.

The amendments do the following:

1. Page 2, line 5 of the bill, add "members of the California State Police."

The California State Police wanted specific mention in view of the fact that the California Highway Patrol was specifically designated.

2. Page 3 of the bill, line 14, clarifying language adds humane officers.

It was pointed out that in rural areas humane officers must carry weapons in connection with their duties.

3. Page 3, line 47, clarifying language in connection with no restriction of hunting in Sacramento.

Although general language is used, I am not aware of any city, other than Sacramento, that requires this language.

4. Page 4, line 11, add the California State Police and Sergeant at Arms.

5. Page 4, line 47, add California State Police.

6. Page 5, line 9, broadens the language, "a person acting with his permission." Lines 12 through 16, further clarify the same subject and adds members of the Legislature.

The Senate Judiciary Committee felt that legislators may be subject to harassment and should be included in this bill.

7. On page 5, lines 25 and 29, add the residence of any member of the Legislature.

8. On page 5, line 36, clarifying language regarding inspection of loaded weapons.

Your concurrence is respectfully solicited.

DON MULFORD

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

July 27, 1967

MEMORANDUM TO THE ASSEMBLY:

RE: AB 1591

Three days ago I was notified of potential violence in some communities in California.

Law enforcement officials requested that I do everything possible to expedite the passage of AB 1591. Yesterday afternoon the Senate approved AB 1591, as amended in the Senate June 27, 1967.

In my opinion the Senate amendments strengthen the bill and add to the excellent work of our own Assembly Judiciary Committee in making AB 1591 responsible legislation.

The amendments do the following:

1. Page 2, line 5 of the bill, add "members of the California State Police."

The California State Police wanted specific mention in view of the fact that the California Highway Patrol was specifically designated.

2. Page 3 of the bill, line 14, clarifying language adds humane officers.

It was pointed out that in rural areas humane officers must carry weapons in connection with their duties.

3. Page 3, line 47, clarifying language in connection with no restriction of hunting in Sacramento.

Although general language is used, I am not aware of any city, other than Sacramento, that requires this language.

4. Page 4, line 11, add the California State Police and Sergeant at Arms.

5. Page 4, line 47, add California State Police.

6. Page 5, line 9, broadens the language, "a person acting with his permission." Lines 12 through 16, further clarify the same subject and adds members of the Legislature.

The Senate Judiciary Committee felt that legislators may be subject to harassment and should be included in this bill.

7. On page 5, lines 25 and 29, add the residence of any member of the Legislature.

8. On page 5, line 36, clarifying language regarding inspection of loaded weapons.

Your concurrence is respectfully solicited.

DON MULFORD

JUN 20 1967

Req. #22807

AMENDMENTS TO ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1591

AS AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 6, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 3, between lines 5 and 6 of the printed bill as amended in Assembly June 6, 1967, insert:

(6) The carrying of weapons by persons who are authorized to carry such weapons pursuant to Section 607f of the Civil Code, while actually engaged in the performance of their duties pursuant to such section.

OCT 1 1967



SACRAMENTO REPORT

STATE ROUNDUP STATE SENATOR JOHN G. SCHAEFER August 19, 1967

THE MULFORD GUN CONTROL BILL IN OPERATION

During the last week of July one of the worst gun bills in California history was passed by the Senate and signed into law. This was Assemblyman Mulford's A.B. 1591 which bans the carrying of loaded guns on any public street or highway by private citizens who cannot prove themselves to be in "imminent danger" of attack.

This bill was rushed through the Assembly early in June in hasty, panicky reaction to the "invasion" of the Assembly chamber by "Black Panthers" carrying loaded guns. Since then, security procedures at the Capitol have been tightened, which together with new administrative regulations could easily prevent a recurrence of this incident. But as a direct result of it, the people of California have been saddled with a law which violates their fundamental rights, a law which will be ignored by criminals but has almost unlimited potential for the harassment of law-abiding citizens.

The Mulford Act provides a penalty of a year's imprisonment or a \$1000 fine for anyone found with a loaded gun in his possession on any public street or highway. A "loaded gun" as defined in this bill is a gun ready to fire, with a round in the chamber; it is a gun which has bullets in any way attached to it, as for example in a clip.

I made every effort to defeat this bill in the Senate, but its passage for over a month, until finally two Senators who were opposed to the bill were prevailed upon to vote for it. Members of the National Rifle Association in California should know that...

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

SEN. SCHMITZ SACRAMENTO REPORT AUGUST 17, 1966

Despite its record of opposing gun control bills in the past, favored this bill and that without NRA support it almost certainly would have been defeated.

During discussions and debate on A.B. 1591 I was told over and over again by its supporters that the bill was not aimed at law-abiding individuals wishing only to provide for their own defense. But now we find that the first victim of the Mulford Act is not a "Black Panther," nor a rioter, nor a criminal. He is a good citizen with an unblemished record who was a Republican candidate for the state legislature in last year's general election.

This man drives to work every morning at 4:00 A.M. His route takes him through areas of Los Angeles where the crime rate is high and riots threaten. For his own protection he carries a gun, in plain view on the front seat of his car. His ammunition is in a clip attached to the gun, but he has no round in the chamber.

On August 16 this man was arrested and charged with violating the Mulford Act. It was not the intent of Assemblyman Mulford and the supporters of A.B. 1591 to penalize this kind of man. But their bill has done so, just as all gun control legislation hurts good citizens. The law-abiding suffer, either through obeying the law and depriving themselves of protection, or through violating it unawares, while the criminals, well aware of the law, blithely ignore it because they are already law-breakers.

Aroused citizens from all over California have written me to protest the passage of A.B. 1591, and their just anger will grow when they learn of the manner in which it is being enforced. This law should be repealed, or at least amended to restore the right of the citizen to carry a loaded gun for his own protection in his own car.

2150 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
836-3050

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
95814
445-7354

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION
RULES EX OFFICIO

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

Dear

I have received many letters regarding gun legislation.


I am the author of the first gun control law to be passed in California in many years and, in my opinion, one of the toughest laws to be passed in the United States on the subject of gun control. I enclose letters from law enforcement officials reporting on the effectiveness of this law.

We are in the final few weeks of this Session of the Legislature. It is my understanding that a gun control bill will be introduced within the next few weeks. I intend to examine this legislation, if introduced, very carefully. I personally believe the subject requires federal legislation in order to be truly effective. What good is it to have a California gun law if a person may obtain a gun from the neighboring states of Nevada, Arizona, and Oregon, or through the mail.

This is a serious and complex problem. I assure you I will approach the subject very seriously.

I appreciate hearing from you on this subject.

Sincerely,



DON MULFORD

hrt

Enclosures - 3

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

November 15, 1967

Honorable Don Mulford
California State Legislature
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:

Since the recent enactment of the Mulford Firearms Control Act by the California Legislature there have been two occasions in which it was necessary to use the Act to avert serious civil disorder in the City of Berkeley.

In both cases the responsible person was carrying a loaded firearm under conditions that would have been lawful prior to the adoption of the Mulford Act by the Legislature. In one instance the arrested person who was carrying the firearm openly in his automobile had a long criminal record and a history of violence. In addition to the firearms violation under Section 12031 of the California Penal Code the subject was also found to have narcotics in his possession.

While these are only two examples, it has occurred to me that you might be interested to know of the use that has been made to date of your Legislative efforts to prevent irresponsible and potentially dangerous persons from transporting and using firearms in public streets and other places covered by the statutes.

The new Legislation has been and will continue to be of significant help to law enforcement and public safety.

Best regards,

W. P. BEALL
Chief of Police

C1/201

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

OFFICE OF
C. E. BROWN
CHIEF OF POLICE



December 22, 1967

Hon. Don Mulford, Assemblyman
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94612

Dear Sir:

I thought you might be interested in the fact that the revisions of the Penal Code concerning the carrying of loaded firearms, under your instigation, were very important to our citizenry last night.

Co-incidental with the funeral services in our city of a murdered San Francisco Police Officer, two alleged black panthers were observed carrying a .30 caliber M1 Carbine in our downtown business area. We also had other problems from the panthers directly connected with the funeral.

Because of the new teeth in the law, we were able to minimize the effect the panthers wished to convey by searching and identifying them and their weapon.

No arrest was made because the weapon was not loaded and ammunition was not immediately available to them. We were, however, able to immediately allay the fears of merchants and citizens present.

It also enabled us to legally contact, identify and surveil the men without fear of being accused of illegal search or harassment.

Thanks for the good work on behalf of law enforcement.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "C. E. Brown".

C. E. BROWN
Chief of Police

CEB:ML

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

Oak Tribune
**Gun Curb
 Law Goes
 To Reagan**

By ED SALZMAN

Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — The Mulford gun-control act, aimed directly at the Eastbay's Black Panther organization, today headed for the desk of Gov. Ronald Reagan and could go into effect by the end of the week.

The State Senate approved the bill, strongest anti-gun measure enacted in California for many years, on a 29 to 7 vote late yesterday. And today the Assembly adopted technical Senate amendments, sending the bill to the governor. Reagan has indicated he will sign the measure.

Authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, the legislation was requested by the Oakland Police Department after Black Panthers started appearing on city streets carrying weapons.

A band of Panthers, protesting the bill, burst into the Assembly chamber with loaded guns. Result: The measure was strengthened and Mulford added an urgency clause putting the law into effect the moment Reagan signs it.

The bill prohibits anyone from carrying a loaded weapon in any place where it is already illegal to discharge a firearm. In addition, it would be a felony to carry a loaded gun in the State Capitol, any public school and in various public buildings.

Sen. Donald L. Grunsky, R-Watsonville, told the Senate that "there is absolutely no reason for any intelligent person to carry a loaded firearm unless he intends to use it."

He emphasized that the bill does not restrict the right of any law-abiding citizen to defend himself and does not

Continued Page 3, Col. 7

Gun Control Act Goes to Reagan

Continued from Page 1

work a hardship on any legitimate hunter.

Grunsky reported that some individuals carry weapons "to unconscionably intimidate society."

He described the Panther visit to the Assembly chamber and reported other incidents attributed to the militant Negro organization.

The bill was supported by Senators Nicholas C. Petris, D-Oakland, and Lewis D. Sherman, R-Berkeley. Sen. George Miller Jr., D-Martinez, voted against the measure.

Petris declared the bill is "probably 100 years too late . . . We have a very sordid record . . . The heroes of the West shot down people in cold blood . . . We still see these heroes on television."

The Oakland senator reported that 750,000 Americans have been killed by guns since 1900 — "more than we have lost in all our wars put together."

Petris called the proposal "a weak bill. We ought to start taking guns away from people."

Sen. James R. Mills, D-San Diego, challenged Petris.

"If we are to take away weapons because they kill people," he declared, "we ought to start with the automobile."

But the principal argument against the bill was presented by Sen. John G. Schmitz, R-Orange County, who charged that the legislature "is destroying the Second Amendment to the Constitution — the right to bear arms."

He described himself as "the legislature's only avowed member of the California Rifle and Pistol Assn. He is more frequently identified as the legislature's only avowed member of the John Birch Society."

"All restrictive gun legislation is discrimination against the law-abiding citizen," he said, "because the lawless violate the gun laws."

He asked why Black Panthers carry guns in public.

"To intimidate people," he said. "Unloaded weapons are pretty intimidating too."

Schmitz said the Mulford bill would be one step toward the establishment of totalitarian government because the right to bear arms is a cornerstone of Democracy.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

AB 1591 (MULFORD)

One of the major pieces of legislation pertaining to the control of firearms enacted by the 1967 Session of the Legislature was authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford (R-Oakland), Chairman of the Republican Caucus.

Assembly Bill 1591 makes it unlawful for unauthorized persons to carry a loaded firearm in a public place, on a public street or in an unincorporated area where it is illegal to fire a gun.

This measure, which became law July 29, the day it was signed by Governor Reagan, does not work a hardship on the honest citizen or the legitimate sportsman. The intent of the bill is to stop armed bands from parading up and down city streets brandishing loaded firearms with the express purpose of intimidating law-abiding citizens.

With specified exceptions the bill makes it unlawful for anyone to bring a loaded firearm onto, or possess a loaded firearm within, any public school, the State Capitol, any legislative office, any hearing room in which a committee of the State Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing, or any office of the Governor or other constitutional officer. The prohibition extends to any residence of the other constitutional officers, as well as the residence of any member of the Legislature.

Peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by anyone on his person or in a vehicle while in areas in which such possession is prohibited. Refusal to allow a police officer to inspect a firearm is probable cause for arrest.

The new law explains what is deemed a "loaded firearm."

In the section pertaining to a public place, a public street or an unincorporated area, a firearm shall be considered loaded when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm.

In the section of the new law concerning public schools, including the University of California and the State Colleges, the State Capitol, and the homes and meeting places of the constitutional officers and members of the Legislature, a firearm shall be deemed loaded whenever both the firearm and unexpended ammunition capable of being discharged from such firearm are in the immediate possession of the same person.

Nothing in the new law prohibits citizens from having a loaded firearm in their homes or places of business.

* * *

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

SUNDAY, May 14, 1967

Nazis Drill At 'Panther' Building

OAKLAND (UPI)—A band of Nazi party members yesterday staged a weapons drill in front of the headquarters of the Black Panther party, a spokesman for the group said.

Police stopped a station wagon near the Black Panther office and found three .30 caliber rifles, one 12-gauge shotgun, a pistol and a revolver in it.

One of the six men in the vehicle, all of whom wore uniforms with swastikas, said they had conducted a gun drill in front of the Panther building, apparently in response to the Negro group's armed displays in recent weeks.

Police issued no citations against the Nazi group.

OAKLAND TRIBUNE
May 3, 1967

Armed Foray In Assembly Stirs Wrath

By ED SALZMAN
Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Shocked by an invasion by armed members of the Eastbay's "Black Panther Party For Self Defense," the Assembly today appears prepared to enact tough legislation prohibiting anyone from carrying a loaded gun in public.

A dozen Panthers carrying loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns yesterday knocked down a sergeant-at-arms and barged into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session.

About 25 more armed men, most of them from the Eastbay, circulated in the Capitol at the same time to protest a bill by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, outlawing carrying of loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place.

Upon departure from the capitol, 24 of the Panthers aged 17 to 25 were arrested.

About four hours after the invasion, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee met to consider Mulford's bill.

The assemblyman asked that the committee take the measure under submission—but only to give him time to prepare amendments tightening up the bill and making it a felony for anyone to enter the legislative chambers carrying a loaded weapon.

He also reported he must resolve a constitutional question about the right to bear arms.

Some members of the committee said that they were willing to go even further than Mulford and enact comprehensive gun-registration laws.

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Richmond, suggested an urgency clause which would place the bill into effect

'Panther' Invasion Shocks Assembly

Continued from Page 1

immediately after it is signed by the governor.

The invasion of the Assembly began when Sergeant-At-Arms James Rodney was knocked down attempting to prevent the armed band from entering the chamber.

The Panthers were surrounded by cameramen as they entered the chamber. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, D-Hayward speaker pro tempore, was presiding and spotted only the photographers.

"Sergeant-At-Arms," he shouted, "will you remove the cameramen? They have no permission to be in this chamber."

Sergeant-at-arms Tony Beard managed to expel both the photographers and the Panthers. "They broke right through the men guarding the entrance to the chamber," he reported. "We hustled them out as fast as we could."

State police temporarily disarmed the men. The weapons were returned unloaded.

Meanwhile, Mulford told the Assembly that there had been an "historical invasion and I am shocked beyond belief." He said his bill is directed against "this same type of shocking episode."

Panther Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was protesting "the racist Oakland police" and demonstrating for the right to bear arms.

The armed visitors handed out mimeographed sheets signed by Huey P. Newton, identified as the party's "minister of defense."

The leaflet stated that the "racist California Legislature" is considering a bill "aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was also protesting what he called the "racist" shooting April 1 of Deniz Dowell, 22, a Richmond laborer killed by a Contra Costa sheriff's deputy investigating an attempted burglary in North Richmond.

A coroner's jury ruled the death justifiable homicide.

Two of those arrested yesterday were Dowell's brothers, James, 17, and George, 20.

The armed band left the Capitol just before Gov. Ronald Reagan was scheduled to join a group of Pleasant Hill youngsters for a picnic on the west lawn of the Capitol.

The governor was mobbed by newsmen and spectators. As a result, the luncheon was moved indoors to Reagan's office.

"Americans don't go around carrying guns with the idea of using them to influence other Americans," Reagan declared. "This is a ridiculous way to solve problems . . . anyone who would approve of this type of demonstration must be out of his mind."

By the time the committee met to consider Mulford's bill,

most of the Panthers were under custody of the Sacramento police and there was no need for a heavy police guard in the committee room.

Mulford said the bill was proposed by law enforcement officials as a result of incidents in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

Some of the problems, he emphasized, have been caused by Caucasians "and this has nothing whatsoever to do with the charge that it is pointed at one ethnical group."

Police, Mulford declared, are becoming alarmed at the number of bands of armed citizens "intimidating and coercing people in the streets of our communities."

Supporting the bill were Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly, Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly and Undersheriff Harry Ramsey of Contra Costa County, Deputy Chief Joseph J. Veretto of the Oakland Police Department and Jules Lyons, principal of Walter T. Helms Junior High School in San Pablo.

They described a series of incidents in Clyde, Orinda, North Richmond, and Oakland in which armed bands have become serious problems for police.

Capitol Flurry In Gun Protest

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with sergeants-at-arms and were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivet as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim-faced, the group walked upstairs to the second floor, past open-mouthed employees and visitors. Two or three special

See Page 16, Col. 1

Panther Protest At State Assembly

From Page 1

guards followed them.

When the band reached the closed gates that stand about 50 feet in front of the Assembly chamber, a dozen of the Panthers burst through, knocking Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms Jim Rooney off his feet.

HALLWAYS

Some waited outside, some strode the hallways and a few pushed their way into the Assembly chamber.

Only a few of the legislators were actually aware of the intrusion. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee (Dem-Hayward), who was facing the door saw only a gaggle of news and television cameramen in what seemed to be a stampede.

Angrily he shouted for the sergeant-at-arms, Tony Beard, to remove the intruding photographers. But Assemblyman Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont) rose to inform the Assembly: "A serious incident has just occurred. People with weapons forced their way into this chamber and were ejected."

INVASION

Mulford described the invasion as a "direct attempt" to intimidate him.

His bill — prohibiting instruction in the use of firearms for the purpose of rioting and prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms on public streets and in public places by all except peace officers, guards and members of the armed forces — was scheduled for a hearing last night before the Assembly's Committee on Criminal Procedure.

Mulford said the incident had inspired him to toughen the bill.

LUNCH

Outside the Assembly chamber, the Panthers were met by State police who took them downstairs and began

confiscating their weapons. The guns were unloaded and returned when it was decided the Panthers had broken no laws.

The group started down the Capitol steps to meet their armed colleagues just as Governor Ronald Reagan was emerging to have a picnic lunch on the lawn with 30 youngsters from the Valley View Intermediate School in Pleasant Hill.

The Governor, the visiting children and their teachers were herded back into the Capitol by security officers and State police and the picnic was held in Reagan's office.

Later, Reagan said the Black Panthers had a right to bear arms, but added: "There's no reason why on a street today any citizen should be carrying a loaded weapon."

He called this a "ridiculous way to solve problems among people of good will."

As the Governor was speaking, police, armed with riot guns and pistols moved in on about 25 of the Black Panthers who had assembled at a service station near the Capitol. They were disarmed, loaded into patrol wagons and taken to headquarters where some were booked for violating the Fish and Game Code which prohibits loaded guns in a vehicle.

When final inventory was taken, police said they had booked a total of 26 men between the ages of 17 and 25 on a variety of charges, including brandishing a gun in a threatening manner and possession of two sawed-off shotguns. Fifteen weapons were confiscated.

The Black Panthers offered no resistance. Bobby George Seale, 30, of Oakland, chairman of the organization, read a statement to newsmen which was signed by Huey P. Newton, 25, the party's "Minister of Defense."

It called on Americans — Negroes in particular — to "take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies . . . are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Seale said "the black people have prayed and demonstrated . . . and everything else. All their efforts have been answered by oppression. City Hall turns a deaf ear to pleas for help against this terror."

BILL

Meanwhile Mulford said it was "ridiculous to think my bill is aimed at any ethnic group . . . It is aimed at white people as much as anyone."

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown Jr. (Dem-S.F.), a Negro, agreed the proposed legislation has no racial implications but questioned Mulford's motives in offering it.

Brown said Mulford had previously opposed such bills "until Negroes showed up in Oakland — his district — with arms and then he seeks restrictive legislation." Brown added he is acquainted with some of the Black Panther group and called them "decent kids."

Another Negro, Assemblyman Leon Ralph (Dem-L.A.) said he felt the bill is "aimed at Nazis, the KKK the Minutemen and others, and should be applied equally to all, black or white."

Bee, commenting later at the Capitol session, said the Legislature is "certainly upset" by the whole episode.

"This," he said, "will help the bill pass."

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

Black Panther Episode Was A Senseless Thing

The Black Panthers who barged into the Capitol this week showing off loaded guns in a coarse act of public intimidation should learn more about the Constitution and Bill of Rights they used as their shields and battle cries.

Pleading repeatedly for "constitutional rights! constitutional rights!" these misguided exponents of armed force committed an intolerable injustice to their cause and defiled the very documents they quoted.

There are times when civil rights are turned into civil wrongs, and this was one of them. The Constitution does not specifically say a citizen cannot carry a gun, but it also does not specifically allow a citizen to use a gun to frighten the populace, to disturb the community tranquility, disrupt the orderly processes of government, or even to provoke publicity.

Nor does the constitutional provision for free speech guarantee a citizen the right to shout "fire!" in a crowded theater and thereby panic the audience.

The thing about loaded guns is that they have the propensity for going off at the wrong times. The final mechanical function of a gun is to kill or injure and no unloaded gun ever fired a bullet.

There was but one consoling factor in this episode. The State Police, the Assembly sergeants at arms and the city police acted with reserve and did not meet the provocation with the force they lawfully could have employed. The gunfire which could have erupted — accidentally or otherwise — could have injured or killed bystanders, including some school children who were visiting the Capitol to learn more about their government.

Society cannot and will not tolerate these kinds of bully-boy tactics whether they be performed by Black Panthers, Nazis, Minutemen, KKKs or any other bands of self-appointed law enforcers.

Assemblyman Bill Greene of Los Angeles County, a Negro active in civil rights movements, had the proper observation when he called the action senseless and one which no person, black or white, can condone.

Capitol Flurry In Gun Protest

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with sergeants-at-arms and were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivet as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim - faced, the group walked upstairs to the second floor, past open - mouthed employees and visitors. Two or three special

See Page 16, Col. 1

Panther Protest At State Assembly

From Page 1

guards followed them.

When the band reached the closed gates that stand about 50 feet in front of the Assembly chamber, a dozen of the Panthers burst through, knocking Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms Jim Rooney off his feet.

HALLWAYS

Some waited outside, some strode the hallways and a few pushed their way into the Assembly chamber.

Only a few of the legislators were actually aware of the intrusion. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee (Dem-Hayward), who was facing the door saw only a gaggle of news and television cameramen in what seemed to be a stampede.

Angrily he shouted for the sergeant-at-arms, Tony Beard, to remove the intruding photographers. But Assemblyman Don Mulford (Rep-Piedmont) rose to inform the Assembly: "A serious incident has just occurred. People with weapons forced their way into this chamber and were ejected."

INVASION

Mulford described the invasion as a "direct attempt" to intimidate him.

His bill — prohibiting instruction in the use of firearms for the purpose of rioting and prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms on public streets and in public places by all except peace officers, guards and members of the armed forces — was scheduled for a hearing last night before the Assembly's Committee on Criminal Procedure.

Mulford said the incident had inspired him to toughen the bill.

LUNCH

Outside the Assembly chamber, the Panthers were met by State police who took them downstairs and began

confiscating their weapons. The guns were unloaded and returned when it was decided the Panthers had broken no laws.

The group started down the Capitol steps to meet their armed colleagues just as Governor Ronald Reagan was emerging to have a picnic lunch on the lawn with 30 youngsters from the Valley View Intermediate School in Pleasant Hill.

The Governor, the visiting children and their teachers were herded back into the Capitol by security officers and State police and the picnic was held in Reagan's office.

Later, Reagan said the Black Panthers had a right to bear arms, but added: "There's no reason why on a street today any citizen should be carrying a loaded weapon."

He called this a "ridiculous

way to solve problems among people of good will."

As the Governor was speaking, police, armed with riot guns and pistols moved in on about 25 of the Black Panthers who had assembled at a service station near the Capitol. They were disarmed, loaded into patrol wagons and taken to headquarters where some were booked for violating the Fish and Game Code which prohibits loaded guns in a vehicle.

When final inventory was taken, police said they had booked a total of 26 men between the ages of 17 and 25 on a variety of charges, including brandishing a gun in a threatening manner and possession of two sawed-off shotguns. Fifteen weapons were confiscated.

The Black Panthers offered no resistance. Bobby George Seale, 30, of Oakland, chairman of the organization, read a statement to newsmen which was signed by Huey P. Newton, 25, the party's "Minister of Defense."

It called on Americans — Negroes in particular — to "take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies . . . are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Seale said "the black people have prayed and demonstrated . . . and everything else. All their efforts have been answered by oppression. City Hall turns a deaf ear to pleas for help against this terror."

BILL

Meanwhile Mulford said it was "ridiculous to think my bill is aimed at any ethnic group . . . It is aimed at white people as much as anyone."

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown Jr. (Dem-S.F.), a Negro, agreed the proposed legislation has no racial implications but questioned Mulford's motives in offering it.

Brown said Mulford had previously opposed such bills "until Negroes showed up in Oakland — his district — with arms and then he seeks restrictive legislation." Brown added he is acquainted with some of the Black Panther group and called them "decent kids."

Another Negro, Assemblyman Leon Ralph (Dem-L.A.) said he felt the bill is "aimed at Nazis, the KKK the Minutemen and others, and should be applied equally to all, black or white."

Bee, commenting later at the police station, said the Legislature is "certainly upset" by the whole episode.

"This," he said, "will help

Armed Foray In Assembly Stirs Wrath

By ED SALZMAN
Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Shocked by an invasion by armed members of the Eastbay's "Black Panther Party For Self Defense," the Assembly today appears prepared to enact tough legislation prohibiting anyone from carrying a loaded gun in public.

A dozen Panthers carrying loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns yesterday knocked down a sergeant-at-arms and barged into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session.

About 25 more armed men, most of them from the Eastbay, circulated in the Capitol at the same time to protest a bill by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, outlawing carrying of loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place.

Upon departure from the capitol, 24 of the Panthers aged 17 to 25 were arrested.

About four hours after the invasion, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee met to consider Mulford's bill.

The assemblyman asked that the committee take the measure under submission—but only to give him time to prepare amendments tightening up the bill and making it a felony for anyone to enter the legislative chambers carrying a loaded weapon.

He also reported he must resolve a constitutional question about the right to bear arms.

Some members of the committee said that they were willing to go even further than Mulford and enact comprehensive gun-registration laws.

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Richmond, suggested an urgency clause which would place the bill into effect

'Panther' Invasion Shocks Assembly

Continued from Page 1

immediately after it is signed by the governor.

The invasion of the Assembly began when Sergeant-At-Arms James Rodney was knocked down attempting to prevent the armed band from entering the chamber.

The Panthers were surrounded by cameramen as they entered the chamber. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, D-Hayward speaker pro tempore, was presiding and spotted only the photographers.

"Sergeant-At-Arms," he shouted, "will you remove the cameramen? They have no permission to be in this chamber."

Sergeant-at-arms Tony Beard managed to expel both the photographers and the Panthers. "They broke right through the men guarding the entrance to the chamber," he reported. "We hustled them out as fast as we could."

State police temporarily disarmed the men. The weapons were returned unloaded.

Meanwhile, Mulford told the Assembly that there had been an "historical invasion and I am shocked beyond belief." He said his bill is directed against "this firearms shocking episode."

Panther Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was protesting "the racist Oakland police" and demonstrating for the right to bear arms.

The armed visitors handed out mimeographed sheets signed by Huey P. Newton, identified as the party's "minister of defense."

The leaflet stated that the "racist California Legislature" is considering a bill "aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was also protesting what he called the "racist" shooting April 1 of Deniz Dowell, 22, a Richmond laborer killed by a Contra Costa sheriff's deputy investigating an attempted burglary in North Richmond.

A coroner's jury ruled the death justifiable homicide.

Two of those arrested yesterday were Dowell's brothers, James, 17, and George, 23.

OAKLAND TRIBUNE
May 3, 1967

The armed band left the Capitol just before Gov. Ronald Reagan was scheduled to join a group of Pleasant Hill youngsters for a picnic on the west lawn of the Capitol.

The governor was mobbed by newsmen and spectators. As a result, the luncheon was moved indoors to Reagan's office.

"Americans don't go around carrying guns with the idea of using them to influence other Americans," Reagan declared. "This is a ridiculous way to solve problems . . . anyone who would approve of this type of demonstration must be out of his mind."

By the time the committee met to consider Mulford's bill,

most of the Panthers were under custody of the Sacramento police and there was no need for a heavy police guard in the committee room.

Mulford said the bill was proposed by law enforcement officials as a result of incidents in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

Some of the problems, he emphasized, have been caused by Caucasians "and this has nothing whatsoever to do with the charge that it is pointed at one ethnical group."

Police, Mulford declared, are becoming alarmed at the number of bands of armed citizens "intimidating and coercing people in the streets of our communities."

Supporting the bill were Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly, Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly and Undersheriff Harry Ramsey of Contra Costa County, Deputy Chief Joseph J. Veretto of the Oakland Police Department and Jules Lyons, principal of Walter T. Helms Junior High School in San Pablo.

They described a series of incidents in Clyde, Orinda, North Richmond, and Oakland in which armed bands have become serious problems for police.

Gun Curbs Plan Moves to Assembly

Conspiracy Charge Faces Gun-Toters

SACRAMENTO — Five juveniles and 19 adults, members of the "Black Panther Party for Self Defense," were charged with conspiracy yesterday after forcing their way into the State Capitol with loaded weapons.

Only two, well-known activists Mark Comfort, 33, of 6914 Lockwood St., and Bobby Seal, 30, of 809 57th St., both Oakland, were released on \$2,200 bail. The others were held overnight in the city jail or Juvenile Hall.

Bail of \$2,200 each was also set for seven others after attorneys contacted municipal judges, but Comfort and Seal were the only ones who posted bond during the evening.

The rest of the group was expected to appear in Municipal Court today, probably before Judge Arthur Eissinger, for setting of bail.

Besides the blanket conspiracy charge, a felony, the group was also booked initially on various other charges which were later dropped. They included carrying concealed weapons, brandishing a weapon in a threatening manner and possession of loaded weapons in vehicles.

Most of the dropped charges were misdemeanors but one, possession of a sawed-off shotgun, was a felony.

While the conspiracy charge was filed against all 24 members of the group, additional charges were levied against E. J. D. Cleaver, 31, 3301 Broadway St., San Francisco, and Reginald Forte, 18, 1120 54th St., Oakland.

Cleaver was charged with

violation of parole and booked en route to his parole officer in San Francisco. Forte was charged with assault with a deadly weapon against a police officer.

Police said the rest of the group, charged solely with conspiracy, included:

Johnny Bethea, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;

Ardell Butler, 17, 1038 61st St., Oakland;

Kenneth Carter, 19, 1184 82nd Ave., Oakland;

Bruce Cockerhan, 18, 1014 54th St., Oakland;

Albert Commo, 21, 1342 85th St., Oakland;

Emery Douglas, 23, 900 Haight St., San Francisco;

George Dowell, 23, 1360 Filbert St., Richmond;

James Dowell, 17, 104 Market Ave., Richmond;

Sherwin Forte, 19, 1135 54th St., Oakland;

Truman Harris, 18, 1909 1/2 Herman St., Berkeley;

Oleander Harrison Jr., 17, 5810 Grove St., Apt. D, Oakland;

Ernest Hatter, 18, 1472 81st St., Oakland;

Mike Hall, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;

Bobby Hutton, 17, 898 56th St., Oakland;

Lafayette Robinson, 17, 1223 77th Ave., Oakland;

John Sloan, 30, 1823 63rd St., Berkeley;

Willie Thompson, 20, 109 Hunter Ave., Oakland;

Lee Torris, 22, 104 Market St., Richmond;

Warren Tucker, 19, 554 63rd St., Oakland;

Benney Yates, 19, 54th St., Oakland.

SACRAMENTO (UPI)—The Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee has approved legislation clamping new restrictions on the sale and possession of anti-tank guns, cannons, bazookas mortars machine guns, zip guns and other exotic armaments.

Action came late last night after the committee heard an appeal by Deputy State Atty. Gen. Charles A. O'Brien to arm law enforcement with legal tools to curb the accumulation of private arsenals by individuals and paramilitary groups.

The committee approved legislation by chairman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside, which would:

—Require registration with the state of the mail order sale of concealable weapons.

—Outlaw the possession of machine guns and machine gun parts.

—Require a state permit to possess bombs, grenades, rockets, missile cannons and similar devices.

—Broaden the scope of the state's dangerous weapons control law to include any parts of such weapons.

Assemblyman Robert W. Crown D-Alameda, said he favored such legislation, but "I wish it had gone farther. I would be much happier if it did require some sort of registration of weapons that are now in the state."

"We're walking away from the real problem," he said.

O'Brien told the committee he was "happy to admit" the attorney general's office was conducting "a crusade against private military groups in California," adding that he could see "no legitimate constitutional reason for tolerating the dangers that exist due to the lack of these laws.

"Some well-meaning citizens seem bitterly determined to confuse patriotism with armed paranoia," he said.

Displayed before committee members was a wide-ranging assortment of weaponry confiscated by law enforcement agencies in recent months.

O'Brien centered a major part of his testimony on the recent seizure in San Francisco of a massive 77-ton cache of weapons from a home owned by William E. Thoresen.

O'Brien said Thoresen in the past 11 years has been arrested at least 11 times on charges including assault, grand larceny, sex perversion, setting explosives, possession of blackjacks and brass knuckles and resisting arrest.

"I present this record because I believe that we should consider the present law which allows such a man to legally own a military arsenal," he said.

'Panther' Invasion Riles Legislature

(Photo on A-2)

SACRAMENTO, May 3 (AP)—A stunned California Legislature surveyed its security precautions today while Negroes who burst into the Capitol bearing a variety of loaded guns at noontime yesterday were summoned to court.

Twenty-six youths aged 17 to 25 were arrested by city police with drawn revolvers and hauled to the police station in a paddy wagon shortly after they left the Capitol agog Tuesday.

They were accused of possessing two illegal sawed-off shotguns, brandishing weapons in a threatening manner, disrupting the Legislature in session and carrying a fully loaded weapon in a car.

CAPITOL ACTION

At the Capitol today, support mounted among amazed and disgruntled lawmakers for tightening security and imposing more severe penalties on those who disrupt an Assembly or Senate session.

It was a noon-hour session of the Assembly that a dozen of the armed youth—members of the "Black Panther Party"—succeeded in penetrating briefly before they were ushered out and several of the loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns taken away by two state policemen in a mild struggle.

No guns were fired at any time, and the armed men took care while in the Capitol not to threaten overtly anyone with the guns.

They remained silent except for a spokesman, Bobby Seale, 25, of Oakland. He said they appeared to defend their constitutional right to bear arms, criticized "racist Oakland police" and opposed a bill outlawing the carrying of loaded weapons in public.

No one could remember

STATE 'PANTHER' PROBLEM

(Continued from Page 1)

anything like it happening before. Reaction ranged from simple amazement to anger. A Democratic Negro assemblyman from the Watts district of Los Angeles, Bill Greene—considered a militant advocate of Negro rights—commented: "This action was not militant, it was senseless. No person black or white can condone this action."

Jim Rooney, one of three sergeants-at-arms manning the swinging gates that block off the Assembly chamber door 50 feet away, said that suddenly "a wave of them just rushed

in and shoved us out of the way."

He was knocked into a chair by someone in the traveling mob of about 50 Black Panther members, reporters and television cameramen.

The man presiding when the armed men burst into the rear of the chamber, speaker pro tem Carlos Bee, D-Hayward, remarked later: "The Legislature is certainly upset by the whole episode. People must be identified and have passes to come onto the floor. Any citizen can get a pass and there is no reason for anyone to push through in this manner."

Assemblyman Don Mulford-R-Piedmont, author of the control bill the group protest said he was "shocked beyond belief. It's a direct attempt to coerce me. This whole thing is an affront to the people."

The bill was taken under session. Mulford said he would seek to include a provision make it a felony to disrupt legislative house in session.

Capitol Gun-Toters Draw Solons' Fury

Incident May Prompt New Control Law

Other stories related to the Black Panther incident in the Assembly are on pages A4, A7, A12 and C1.

By Martin Smith

An unprecedented invasion of the State Capitol by gun-wielding members of the militant Black Panther party for Self-Defense demonstrating against a bill to prohibit carrying loaded weapons in public may have had the reverse effect and increased support of the measure.

Individual legislators speculated that the appearance of the armed band carrying loaded shotguns, rifles and sidearms has improved chances that the proposal, Assembly Bill 1591, eventually will be approved.

New Amendments

Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, author of the bill, yesterday had the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure delay action on the measure so he could prepare amendments to broaden and strengthen the proposal.

Among other things, he wants also to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly or Senate with a loaded weapon.

Approximately half of the 24 men — all from the bay area — ultimately arrested yesterday did force their way into the lower house as it was in session during the noon hour. They did so as a bitter debate was in progress on a labor relations bill affecting firemen.

Swarming into the Assembly chamber with them was a knot of television and newspaper photographers. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee, presiding at the time, saw the men with cameras but, at first, did not notice the heavily-armed Negroes. Bee ordered the sergeant-at-arms to remove the photographers from the Assembly floor.

Moved Off Floor

Chief Sergeant-at-Arms Tony Beard, his assistants and State Police officers moved the entire group off the floor.

Bee termed the incident "one of the most flagrant violations of the rules" he has ever seen in his 13 years as an assemblyman. He confirmed he noticed only the cameramen at first.

"When I saw all those TV cameras coming, it was almost unbelievable," he declared.

Bee said the demonstration was of no value to the group in their efforts to prevent Mulford's bill from being approved and actually may have helped its chances.

'Does No Good'

"Our job is to make the laws, and this type of thing does no good," he added.

Assemblyman Bill Greene, a liberal Democratic legislator from Los Angeles and himself a Negro active in civil rights movements, declared:

"This action was not militant. It was senseless. No person, black or white, can condone this action."

Assemblyman E. Richard Barnes, R-San Diego County, whose seat in the rear of the Assembly chamber was near the action, predicted:

"I think this incident will result in a strict law prohibiting the bringing of firearms into any state building. I think it

Solons Assail Armed Band For Entering Capitol

From page A1

should be a felony. I will vote for it."

Lt. Ernest Holloway, a veteran on the State Police staff in the Capitol, said:

"Twenty-five years and I've never seen anything like this."

He noted previous incidents which were termed "invasions" of the Capitol included one by a group of striking lumber workers who appeared during the depression.

"They were peaceful," said the lieutenant. "We put them up at the fair ground."

A civil rights sit-in in the Capitol in 1963 was recalled by Holloway but he said "that was nothing" compared to yesterday's tense incident.

Well-Organized

The Black Panther group was well-organized, said Holloway.

"They knew how far they could go," he said. "They were quoting the Constitution verbatim about their right to bear arms."

The men removed from the Assembly, accompanied by ever-growing numbers of newsmen and also by the rest of the armed band who had been outside on the west steps of the Capitol, were taken to the first floor police office in the Capitol.

There the guns of several men were taken from them, over their strong protests, and examined by officers. The weapons were loaded although no shells were in their firing chambers. Because the weapons were being carried openly without any attempt at concealment the half-dozen officers returned the weapons to the men.

Verbal Abuse

In the Capitol, the men who had their guns taken from them temporarily did not physically resist the officers but heaped verbal abuse on them, calling them "racist dogs."

Most of the band's members

ignored questions by newsmen. But one man, Bobby Seale, a spokesman for the organization, read a statement issued in the name of Huey P. Newton, "minister of defense" for the Black Panther party for Self-Defense.

Statement's Contents

The statement called "upon the American people in general and the black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

The statement accused the American government of waging a racist war in Vietnam and reactivating concentration camps which had been used to confine Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II. The camps "are being prepared for black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary," according to the statement.

Other Contentions

After also attacking the United States for lynchings, the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, "genocide practiced on the American Indians" and enslavement of Negroes, the statement concluded:

"The Black Panther party for Self-Defense believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction."

The armed men, accompanied by several young women, returned to their cars after gathering briefly on the west steps of the Capitol again. Visiting school children gawked at them and their weapons while leaders of the youngsters attempted to get some groups inside the Capitol away from the hubbub.

Arrests Are Made

The arrests of the men occurred minutes later as they, in five automobiles, drove into a service station at 15th and L Streets across from Capitol Park. City police officers swarmed over the station, took away their guns and placed them in a paddy wagon.

A little used section of the State Government Code, prohibiting the disruption of the state legislature while it is in session, was used to charge a number of men.

Police officers said one man pulled out his gun but was disarmed quickly. He was accused of assault with a deadly weapon.

One man arrested was identified as Eldredge Cleaver, a reporter for Ramparts magazine, a militant "New Left" publication. His attorney, Lawrence K. Karlton of Sacramento, said Cleaver was not carrying a gun, only a camera, and was present as a reporter.

Attorney's Comment

"They arrested everyone who was black," said Karlton. "He was the wrong color."

One of the women, Barbara Auther, of Berkeley, a pre-law student at the University of California, denied the Black Panther organization was a racist group. She was not arrested.

She said members, however, carry weapons wherever they go because of "police brutality."

Mrs. Auther denied any of the members of the group had broken the law.

"We conducted ourselves as ladies and gentlemen," she told reporters in a sidewalk interview.

Mrs. Auther indicated the group was incensed over the slaying of a Negro burglary suspect in the Richmond area by a Contra Costa County deputy sheriff. She termed the slaying "murder."

Asked if she thought the demonstration would persuade any legislators to vote against AB 1591, she said:

"I think it wouldn't make any difference."

Purpose Of Bill

The bill to which the Black Panthers object would, except

in certain instances, prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in the use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Officer Goes Down

The only thing close to violence which actually occurred, instead of being threatened, was when the group stormed into the Assembly. At an outer swinging gate, an elderly deputy sergeant-at-arms, James Rooney, brother of Sacramento Police Chief Joseph Rooney, was knocked back when the Black Panthers moved through.

He fell into a chair. He got up unhurt but angry.

State police officers tightened security arrangements at yesterday afternoon's hearing on the Mulford bill, but it was a calm meeting.

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This reminder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish them in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpended cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally, the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally, anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a hand gun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

Police Arrest 24 Capitol Invaders, Get 11 Weapons

The police arrested 24 persons and seized 11 shotguns, rifles and pistols in rounding up the bay area Black Panthers who charged into the State Assembly chamber carrying weapons yesterday afternoon. Reginald W. Forte, 18, of Oakland, was

charged with conspiracy to commit a crime and assault with a dangerous weapon upon a police officer. Detectives Joseph Del Ponte and Donald Shierts reported Forte raised a loaded .38 caliber revolver nearly out of a holster in a move toward them until they grabbed the weapon and disarmed him.

Eldridge Cleaver, 31, of San Francisco was booked in the city jail for possible parole violation. The officers said he is on parole in San Francisco for two counts of assault with intent to commit murder, two counts of assault to rape and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon.

Others Charged

All the others were charged with conspiracy. They are:

Sherwin Forte, 19, of Oakland; John Bethea, 18, of Oakland; Bruce Cocherhan, 18, of Oakland; George E. Dowell, 28, of Richmond; Willie Thompson, 20, of Oakland; Warren Tucker, 19, of Oakland; John Sloan, 30, of Berkeley; Ernest Hatter, 18, of Oakland; Truman Harris, 18, of Berkeley; Mikel Hall, 18, of Oakland; Benny Yates, 19, of Oakland; Albert Commo, 21, of Oakland; Kenneth Carter, 19, of East Oakland; Emery Douglas, 23, of San Francisco; Torris Lec, 22, of Richmond; Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland; Mark Comfort, 33, of Oakland; Oleaner Harrison, 17, of Oakland; Bobby Hutton, 17, of Oakland; Lafayette Robinson, 17, of East Oakland; Ordell Butler, 17, of Oakland, and James Dowell, 17, of Richmond.

Seale and Comfort were released last night on \$2,200 bail. The five 17-year-olds were taken to the Juvenile Center.

The arrest reports stated all were part of the group which knocked two sergeants-at-arms to one side and forced their way into the State Assembly chambers.

Sets \$2,200 Bail

Municipal Judge Arthur E. Eissinger this morning set bail at \$2,200 on each of the adults except Cleaver, whom he said could be released on his own recognizance. However, Cleaver has a parole "hold" against him which means he will remain in custody until parole officials permit him to be released.

Attorneys Lawrence Karlton of Sacramento and Beverly Axelrod of San Francisco pleaded unsuccessfully for reduction of bail for Comfort, who was released last night on \$2,200 bail.

Attorney S. Carter McMorris of Sacramento also asked the court unsuccessfully for a reduction in the bail for the other defendants.

Miss Axelrod, in pleading for Cleaver said he was arrested "by mistake" because he was with the Black Panthers on an assignment as a reporter for Ramparts magazine.

Assembly Unit Okays Gun Control Bills; Another Is Deferred After Intrusion

By Wilson K. Lythgoe

Concerned over the ease with which a person can arm his own army, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee late last night acted to tighten rules and penalties of laws on larger military-type guns and ammunition.

Members of the committee, headed by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside County, were among those alarmed earlier in the day when armed Negroes shouldered their way into the Assembly carrying rifles and shotguns. The intruders said they were members of the Black Panther Party.

This incident and discovery and seizure of 77 tons of military arms in the home of William Thoresen in San Francisco overshadowed the hearing last night and another in the afternoon on firearms legislation.

Tense Atmosphere

The hearing amidst a charged atmosphere in the afternoon centered upon AB 1591 by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, which the armed Negroes said they were protesting.

This proposal would prohibit, except in certain instances, the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Mulford, himself, asked that the bill be put over, and said the Black Panther incident had caused him to consider amendments to broaden and toughen the bill.

Among other things, Mulford said he wanted to include an amendment to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly with a loaded weapon.

Special Attention

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Contra Costa County, noted that often when bills are put over that that is the last heard of them, but he said Mulford's bill would be worked on in conferences and in committee again to "stop the spread of this problem." He said Black Panther incidents had previously occurred in the bay area.

A Negro Assemblyman and member of the committee, John J. Miller, D-Oakland, decried what he termed to be a "circus atmosphere" and asked that the committee consider the bill in an objective manner "without reference to what happened this afternoon."

Mulford called it ridiculous to think that the legislation was aimed at any ethnic group, but despite an obvious attempt on his part and by other witnesses, the "Assembly incident" cropped up time and time again.

On Larger Weapons

The Assembly committee last night approved the main parts of its package of bills to tighten laws on larger caliber guns and ammunition. Twenty-five of these weapons, ranging from a 50 mm mortar to sidearms, were displayed for committeemen.

The legislation, boosted by the office of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and authored by Biddle, is based on findings and recommendations of a two year study made by the committee.

But Charles O'Brien, deputy attorney general, said pistols, rifles and shotguns used as hunting weapons would not be changed by the measures.

He mentioned Minutemen in California as one group that the new legislation is aimed at, and Thoresen as an individual whom it could affect.

Return Arsenal

Under present law, he said, much of the arsenal taken from Thoresen may have to be returned. O'Brien said the present law is so weak that Thoresen was nearly arrested for possessing a fire hazard.

Assemblyman Floyd L. Wakefield, R-Los Angeles County, blamed gathering of arsenals on laxity of the federal government. He said this became evident after World War II when many military-type weapons were allowed in from abroad.

"It's just too bad, as a demonstration in the Assembly showed us," Wakefield said.

The approved bills are:

AB 1326 which, for the first time, proposes to outlaw private possession of heavy military weapons, including anti-tank guns, bombs, booby traps and explosives.

Imported Weapons

AB 1324 to require Californians who buy concealable guns out of state to notify their local police or sheriff's officers and provide them with the same information required if they had bought the handguns in California.

AB 1325 which would define hand rocket launchers as concealable firearms. Gas-operated pistols were amended out of the bill.

AB 1323 would ban possession of machine gun parts. The bill was amended so it would not apply to semi-automatic weapon parts.

Final Comments

Col. E. F. Sloan of Redwood City, representative of the National Rifle Association, said he supported the basic principles of the bills, and offered suggestions to make them more workable.

The only serious objection came from William Andrews, Berkeley attorney, who asked that gas-operated pistols not be defined as concealable firearms because they "are not a lethal weapon."

And Richard Spear, Oakland attorney and cannon collector, said he could live with the bill, AB 1326, after it was made plain he could keep his cannons under permit from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

Black Panthers Believe Arming Is Needed To Fight 'White Oppression'

By Don Ferrell

Who are the Black Panthers and what do they stand for?

A check into their sketchy and somewhat vague background shows that the Black Panther Party is a spin-off of the Lowndes County, Ala., Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as its emblem.

The growing movement has since spread into other states and cities, including New York City, Detroit, Tennessee and San Francisco.

Before storming the Assembly Chamber in Sacramento yesterday the group—which can accurately be described as anti-white and revolutionary — had gained some small notoriety.

Previous Appearances

Last February, for instance, about 20 of them escorted the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown San Francisco. Later that day they caused a little nervousness among San Francisco officials when they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine.

But their latest public incident until yesterday was last month when a dozen or so armed Black Panthers showed up in Martinez

complaining about what they termed the murder of a Negro suspected of burglary in North Richmond.

Their goals, among other things, include an almost obsessed belief that the Negro community is oppressed by whites and that policemen are in reality an army which occupies Negro neighborhoods.

Other Convictions

They openly advocate arming the Negro community against policemen and other whites and oppose members of their race being sent to fight in the Vietnam war.

The Black Panthers also believe that all big businesses should be nationalized unless private enterprise makes jobs available for Negroes.

Most of those involved in yesterday's incident came from Oakland and it is estimated that about 40 Panthers live in the bay area.

Leader Participates

One of those in the group was Bobby George Seals, a leader in the Oakland Panther movement, who reportedly received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958 and served

a six-month term in military confinement for disrespect to an Air Force officer.

Until yesterday, none of the Black Panthers had been arrested because of carrying weapons because under California law it is not illegal to openly carry arms.

However, it is against the law to carry loaded guns in vehicles.

OFFICE OF
C. E. BROWN
CHIEF OF POLICE



December 22, 1967

Hon. Don Mulford, Assemblyman
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94612

Dear Sir:

I thought you might be interested in the fact that the revisions of the Penal Code concerning the carrying of loaded firearms, under your instigation, were very important to our citizenry last night.

Co-incident with the funeral services in our city of a murdered San Francisco Police Officer, two alleged black panthers were observed carrying a .30 caliber M1 Carbine in our downtown business area. We also had other problems from the panthers directly connected with the funeral.

Because of the new teeth in the law, we were able to minimize the effect the panthers wished to convey by searching and identifying them and their weapon.

No arrest was made because the weapon was not loaded and ammunition was not immediately available to them. We were, however, able to immediately allay the fears of merchants and citizens present.

It also enabled us to legally contact, identify and surveil the men without fear of being accused of illegal search or harassment.

Thanks for the good work on behalf of law enforcement.

Very truly yours,

C. E. BROWN
Chief of Police

CEB:ML

OFFICE OF
C. E. BROWN
CHIEF OF POLICE



December 22, 1967

Hon. Don Mulford, Assemblyman
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94612

Dear Sir:

I thought you might be interested in the fact that the revisions of the Penal Code concerning the carrying of loaded firearms, under your instigation, were very important to our citizenry last night.

Co-incidental with the funeral services in our city of a murdered San Francisco Police Officer, two alleged black panthers were observed carrying a .30 caliber M1 Carbine in our downtown business area. We also had other problems from the panthers directly connected with the funeral.

Because of the new teeth in the law, we were able to minimize the effect the panthers wished to convey by searching and identifying them and their weapon.

No arrest was made because the weapon was not loaded and ammunition was not immediately available to them. We were, however, able to immediately allay the fears of merchants and citizens present.

It also enabled us to legally contact, identify and surveille the men without fear of being accused of illegal search or harrassment.

Thanks for the good work on behalf of law enforcement.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'C. E. Brown'.

C. E. BROWN
Chief of Police

CEB:ML

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

SUNDAY, May 14, 1967

Nazis Drill At 'Panther' Building

OAKLAND (UPI)—A band of Nazi party members yesterday staged a weapons drill in front of the headquarters of the Black Panther party, a spokesman for the group said.

Police stopped a station wagon near the Black Panther office and found three .30 caliber rifles, one 12-gauge shotgun, a pistol and a revolver in it.

One of the six men in the vehicle, all of whom wore uniforms with swastikas, said they had conducted a gun drill in front of the Panther building, apparently in response to the Negro group's armed displays in recent weeks.

Police issued no citations against the Nazi group.

THE SACRAMENTO BEE

SUNDAY, May 14, 1967

Nazis Drill At 'Panther' Building

OAKLAND (UPI)—A band of Nazi party members yesterday staged a weapons drill in front of the headquarters of the Black Panther party, a spokesman for the group said.

Police stopped a station wagon near the Black Panther office and found three .30 caliber rifles, one 12-gauge shotgun, a pistol and a revolver in it.

One of the six men in the vehicle, all of whom wore uniforms with swastikas, said they had conducted a gun drill in front of the Panther building, apparently in response to the Negro group's armed displays in recent weeks.

Police issued no citations against the Nazi group.

Armed Foray In Assembly Stirs Wrath

By ED SALZMAN
Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Shocked by an invasion by armed members of the Eastbay's "Black Panther Party For Self Defense," the Assembly today appears prepared to enact tough legislation prohibiting anyone from carrying a loaded gun in public.

A dozen Panthers carrying loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns yesterday knocked down a sergeant-at-arms and barged into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session.

About 25 more armed men, most of them from the Eastbay, circulated in the Capitol at the same time to protest a bill by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, outlawing carrying of loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place.

Upon departure from the capitol, 24 of the Panthers aged 17 to 25 were arrested.

About four hours after the invasion, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee met to consider Mulford's bill.

The assemblyman asked that the committee take the measure under submission—but only to give him time to prepare amendments tightening up the bill and making it a felony for anyone to enter the legislative chambers carrying a loaded weapon.

He also reported he must resolve a constitutional question about the right to bear arms.

Some members of the committee said that they were willing to go even further than Mulford and enact comprehensive gun-registration laws.

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Richmond, suggested an urgency clause which would place the bill into effect

'Panther' Invasion Shocks Assembly

Continued from Page 1

immediately after it is signed by the governor.

The invasion of the Assembly began when Sergeant-At-Arms James Rodney was knocked down attempting to prevent the armed band from entering the chamber.

The Panthers were surrounded by cameramen as they entered the chamber. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, D-Hayward speaker pro tempore, was presiding and spotted only the photographers.

"Sergeant-At-Arms," he shouted, "will you remove the cameramen? They have no permission to be in this chamber."

Sergeant-at-arms Tony Beard managed to expel both the photographers and the Panthers. "They broke right through the men guarding the entrance to the chamber," he reported. "We hustled them out as fast as we could."

State police temporarily disarmed the men. The weapons were returned unloaded.

Meanwhile, Mulford told the Assembly that there had been an "historical invasion and I am shocked beyond belief." He said his bill is directed against "this same type of shocking episode."

Panther Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was protesting "the racist Oakland police" and demonstrating for the right to bear arms.

The armed visitors handed out mimeographed sheets signed by Huey P. Newton, identified as the party's "minister of defense."

The leaflet stated that the "racist California Legislature" is considering a bill "aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland, said his group was also protesting what he called the "racist" shooting April 1 of Denzil Dowell, 22, a Richmond laborer killed by a Contra Costa sheriff's deputy investigating an attempted burglary in North Richmond.

A coroner's jury ruled the death justifiable homicide.

Two of those arrested yesterday were Dowell's brothers, James, 17, and George,

OAKLAND TRIBUNE
May 3, 1967

The armed band left the Capitol just before Gov. Ronald Reagan was scheduled to join a group of Pleasant Hill youngsters for a picnic on the west lawn of the Capitol.

The governor was mobbed by newsmen and spectators. As a result, the luncheon was moved indoors to Reagan's office.

"Americans don't go around carrying guns with the idea of using them to influence other Americans," Reagan declared. "This is a ridiculous way to solve problems . . . anyone who would approve of this type of demonstration must be out of his mind."

By the time the committee met to consider Mulford's bill,

most of the Panthers were under custody of the Sacramento police and there was no need for a heavy police guard in the committee room.

Mulford said the bill was proposed by law enforcement officials as a result of incidents in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

Some of the problems, he emphasized, have been caused by Caucasians "and this has nothing whatsoever to do with the charge that it is pointed at one ethnical group."

Police, Mulford declared, are becoming alarmed at the number of bands of armed citizens "intimidating and coercing people in the streets of our communities."

Supporting the bill were Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly, Dist. Atty. John A. Nejedly and Undersheriff Harry Ramsey of Contra Costa County, Deputy Chief Joseph J. Veretto of the Oakland Police Department and Jules Lyons, principal of Walter T. Helms Junior High School in San Pablo.

They described a series of incidents in Clyde, Orinda, North Richmond, and Oakland in which armed bands have become serious problems for police.

Gun Curbs Plan Moves to Assembly

Conspiracy Charge Faces Gun-Toters

SACRAMENTO — Five juveniles and 19 adults, members of the "Black Panther Party for Self-Defense," were charged with conspiracy yesterday after forcing their way into the State Capitol with loaded weapons.

Only two, well-known activists Mark Comfort, 33, of 6914 Lockwood St., and Bobby Seal, 30, of 809 57th St., both Oakland, were released on \$2,200 bail. The others were held overnight in the city jail or Juvenile Hall.

Bail of \$2,200 each was also set for seven others after attorneys contacted municipal judges, but Comfort and Seal were the only ones who posted bond during the evening.

The rest of the group was expected to appear in Municipal Court today, probably before Judge Arthur Eissinger, for setting of bail.

Besides the blanket conspiracy charge, a felony, the group was also booked initially on various other charges which were later dropped. They included carrying concealed weapons, brandishing a weapon in a threatening manner and possession of loaded weapons in vehicles.

Most of the dropped charges were misdemeanors but one, possession of a sawed-off shotgun, was a felony.

While the conspiracy charge was filed against all 24 members of the group, additional charges were levied against Eldridge Cleaver, 31, 3301 Broadway St., San Francisco, and Reginald Forte, 18, 1120 54th St., Oakland.

Cleaver was charged with

violation of parole and booked en route to his parole officer in San Francisco. Forte was charged with assault with a deadly weapon against a police officer.

Police said the rest of the group, charged solely with conspiracy, included:

Johnny Bethea, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;

Ardell Butler, 17, 1038 61st St., Oakland;

Kenneth Carter, 19, 1184 82nd Ave., Oakland;

Bruce Cockerhan, 18, 1014 54th St., Oakland;

Albert Commo, 21, 1342 85th St., Oakland;

Emery Douglas, 23, 900 Haight St., San Francisco;

George Dowell, 23, 1360 Filbert St., Richmond;

James Dowell, 17, 104 Market Ave., Richmond;

Sherwin Forte, 19, 1135 54th St., Oakland;

Truman Harris, 18, 1909½ Herman St., Berkeley;

Oleander Harrison Jr., 17, 5810 Grove St., Apt. D, Oakland;

Ernest Hatter, 18, 1472 81st St., Oakland;

Mikel Hall, 18, 911 70th Ave., Oakland;

Bobby Hutton, 17, 898 56th St., Oakland;

Lafayette Robinson, 17, 1223 77th Ave., Oakland;

John Sloan, 30, 1823 63rd St., Berkeley;

Willie Thompson, 20, 109 Hunter Ave., Oakland;

Lee Torris, 22, 104 Market St., Richmond;

Warren Tucker, 19, 554 63rd St., Oakland;

Benney Yates, 19, 54th St., Oakland.

SACRAMENTO (UPI)—The Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee has approved legislation clamping new restrictions on the sale and possession of anti-tank guns, cannons, bazookas mortars machine guns, zip guns and other exotic armaments.

Action came late last night after the committee heard an appeal by Deputy State Atty. Gen. Charles A. O'Brien to arm law enforcement with legal tools to curb the accumulation of private arsenals by individuals and paramilitary groups.

The committee approved legislation by chairman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside, which would:

—Require registration with the state of the mail order sale of concealable weapons.

—Outlaw the possession of machine guns and machine gun parts.

—Require a state permit to possess bombs, grenades, rockets, missile cannons and similar devices.

—Broaden the scope of the state's dangerous weapons control law to include any parts of such weapons.

Assemblyman Robert W. Crown D-Alameda, said he favored such legislation, but "I wish it had gone farther. I would be much happier if it did require some sort of registration of weapons that are now in the state."

"We're walking away from the real problem," he said.

O'Brien told the committee he was "happy to admit" the attorney general's office was conducting "a crusade against private military groups in California," adding that he could see "no legitimate constitutional reason for tolerating the dangers that exist due to the lack of these laws.

"Some well-meaning citizens seem bitterly determined to confuse patriotism with armed paranoia," he said.

Displayed before committee members was a wide-ranging assortment of weaponry confiscated by law enforcement agencies in recent months.

O'Brien centered a major part of his testimony on the recent seizure in San Francisco of a massive 77-ton cache of weapons from a home owned by William E. Thoresen.

O'Brien said Thoresen in the past 11 years has been arrested at least 11 times on charges including assault, grand larceny, sex perversion, setting explosives, possession of blackjack and brass knuckles and resisting arrest.

"I present this record because I believe that we should consider the present law which allows such a man to legally own a military arsenal," he said.

'Panther' Invasion Riles Legislature

(Photo on A-2)

SACRAMENTO, May 3 (AP)—A stunned California Legislature surveyed its security precautions today while Negroes who burst into the Capitol bearing a variety of loaded guns at noontime yesterday were summoned to court.

Twenty-six youths aged 17 to 25 were arrested by city police with drawn revolvers and hauled to the police station in a paddy wagon shortly after they left the Capitol agog Tuesday.

They were accused of possessing two illegal sawed-off shotguns, brandishing weapons in a threatening manner, disrupting the Legislature in session and carrying a fully loaded weapon in a car.

CAPITOL ACTION

At the Capitol today, support mounted among amazed and disgruntled lawmakers for tightening security and imposing more severe penalties on those who disrupt an Assembly or Senate session.

It was a noon-hour session of the Assembly that a dozen of the armed youth—members of the "Black Panther Party"—succeeded in penetrating briefly before they were ushered out and several of the loaded rifles, pistols and shotguns taken away by two state policemen in a mild struggle.

No guns were fired at any time, and the armed men took care while in the Capitol not to threaten overtly anyone with the guns.

They remained silent except for a spokesman, Bobby Seale, 25, of Oakland. He said they appeared to defend their constitutional right to bear arms, criticized "racist Oakland police" and opposed a bill outlawing the carrying of loaded weapons in public.

No one could remember

STATE 'PANTHER' PROBLEM

(Continued from Page 1)

anything like it happening before. Reaction ranged from simple amazement to anger. A Democratic Negro assemblyman from the Watts district of Los Angeles, Bill Greene—considered a militant advocate of Negro rights—commented: "This action was not militant, it was senseless. No person black or white can condone this action."

Jim Rooney, one of three sergeants-at-arms manning the swinging gates that block off the Assembly chamber door 50 feet away, said that suddenly "a wave of them just rushed

in and shoved us out of the way."

He was knocked into a chair by someone in the traveling mob of about 50 Black Panther members, reporters and television cameramen.

The man presiding when the armed men burst into the rear of the chamber, speaker pro tem Carlos Bee, D-Hayward, remarked later: "The Legislature is certainly upset by the whole episode. People must be identified and have passes to come onto the floor. Any citizen can get a pass and there is no reason for anyone to push through in this manner."

Assemblyman Don Mulford-R-Piedmont, author of the control bill the group protest said he was "shocked beyond belief. It's a direct attempt to coerce me. This whole thing is an affront to the people."

The bill was taken under session. Mulford said he would seek to include a provision to make it a felony to disrupt legislative house in session.

May 3, 1967

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Capitol Gun-Toters Draw Solons' Fury

Incident May Prompt New Control Law

Other stories related to the Black Panther incident in the Assembly are on pages A4, A7, A12 and C1.

By Martin Smith

An unprecedented invasion of the State Capitol by gun-wielding members of the militant Black Panther party for Self-Defense demonstrating against a bill to prohibit carrying loaded weapons in public may have had the reverse effect and increased support of the measure.

Individual legislators speculated that the appearance of the armed band carrying loaded shotguns, rifles and sidearms has improved chances that the proposal, Assembly Bill 1591, eventually will be approved.

New Amendments

Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, author of the bill, yesterday had the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure delay action on the measure so he could prepare amendments to broaden and strengthen the proposal.

Among other things, he wants also to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly or Senate with a loaded weapon.

Approximately half of the 24 men — all from the bay area — ultimately arrested yesterday did force their way into the lower house as it was in session during the noon hour. They did so as a bitter debate was in progress on a labor relations bill affecting firemen.

Swarming into the Assembly chamber with them was a knot of television and newspaper photographers. Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Carlos Bee, presiding at the time, saw the men with cameras but, at first, did not notice the heavily-armed Negroes. Bee ordered the sergeant-at-arms to remove the photographers from the Assembly floor.

Moved Off Floor

Chief Sergeant-at-Arms Tony Beard, his assistants and State Police officers moved the entire group off the floor.

Bee termed the incident "one of the most flagrant violations of the rules" he has ever seen in his 13 years as an assemblyman. He confirmed he noticed only the cameramen at first.

"When I saw all those TV cameras coming, it was almost unbelievable," he declared.

Bee said the demonstration was of no value to the group in their efforts to prevent Mulford's bill from being approved and actually may have helped its chances.

'Does No Good'

"Our job is to make the laws, and this type of thing does no good," he added.

Assemblyman Bill Greene, a liberal Democratic legislator from Los Angeles and himself a Negro active in civil rights movements, declared:

"This action was not militant. It was senseless. No person, black or white, can condone this action."

Assemblyman E. Richard Barnes, R-San Diego County, whose seat in the rear of the Assembly chamber was near the action, predicted:

"I think this incident will result in a strict law prohibiting the bringing of firearms into any state building. I think it

Solons Assail Armed Band For Entering Capitol

From page A1
should be a felony. I will vote for it."

Lt. Ernest Holloway, a veteran on the State Police staff in the Capitol, said:

"Twenty-five years and I've never seen anything like this." He noted previous incidents which were termed "invasions" of the Capitol included one by a group of striking lumber workers who appeared during the depression.

"They were peaceful," said the lieutenant. "We put them up at the fair ground."

A civil rights sit-in in the Capitol in 1963 was recalled by Holloway but he said "that was nothing" compared to yesterday's tense incident.

Well-Organized

The Black Panther group was well-organized, said Holloway.

"They knew how far they could go," he said. "They were quoting the Constitution verbatim about their right to bear arms."

The men removed from the Assembly, accompanied by ever-growing numbers of newsmen and also by the rest of the armed band who had been outside on the west steps of the Capitol, were taken to the first floor police office in the Capitol.

There the guns of several men were taken from them, over their strong protests, and examined by officers. The weapons were loaded although no shells were in their firing chambers. Because the weapons were being carried openly without any attempt at concealment the half-dozen officers returned the weapons to the men.

Verbal Abuse

In the Capitol, the men who had their guns taken from them temporarily did not physically resist the officers but heaped verbal abuse on them, calling them "racist dogs."

Most of the band's members

ignored questions by newsmen. But one man, Bobby Seale, a spokesman for the organization, read a statement issued in the name of Huey P. Newton, "minister of defense" for the Black Panther party for Self-Defense.

Statement's Contents

The statement called "upon the American people in general and the black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of black people."

The statement accused the American government of waging a racist war in Vietnam and reactivating concentration camps which had been used to confine Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

The camps "are being prepared for black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary," according to the statement.

Other Contentions

After also attacking the United States for lynchings, the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, "genocide practiced on the American Indians" and enslavement of Negroes, the statement concluded:

"The Black Panther party for Self-Defense believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction."

The armed men, accompanied by several young women, returned to their cars after gathering briefly on the west steps of the Capitol again. Visiting school children gawked at them and their weapons while leaders of the youngsters attempted to get some groups inside the Capitol away from the hubbub.

Arrests Are Made

The arrests of the men occurred minutes later as they, in five automobiles, drove into a service station at 15th and L Streets across from Capitol Park. City police officers swarmed over the station, took away their guns and placed them in a paddy wagon.

A little used section of the State Government Code, prohibiting the disruption of the state legislature while it is in session, was used to charge a number of men.

Police officers said one man pulled out his gun but was disarmed quickly. He was accused of assault with a deadly weapon.

One man arrested was identified as Eldredge Cleaver, a reporter for Ramparts magazine, a militant "New Left" publication. His attorney, Lawrence K. Karlton of Sacramento, said Cleaver was not carrying a gun, only a camera, and was present as a reporter.

Attorney's Comment

"They arrested everyone who was black," said Karlton. "He was the wrong color."

One of the women, Barbara Auther, of Berkeley, a pre-law student at the University of California, denied the Black Panther organization was a racist group. She was not arrested.

She said members, however, carry weapons wherever they go because of "police brutality."

Mrs. Auther denied any of the members of the group had broken the law.

"We conducted ourselves as ladies and gentlemen," she told reporters in a sidewalk interview.

Mrs. Auther indicated the group was incensed over the slaying of a Negro burglary suspect in the Richmond area by a Contra Costa County deputy sheriff. She termed the slaying "murder."

Asked if she thought the demonstration would persuade any legislators to vote against AB 1591, she said:

"I think it wouldn't make any difference."

Purpose Of Bill

The bill to which the Black Panthers object would, except

in certain instances, prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in the use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Officer Goes Down

The only thing close to violence which actually occurred, instead of being threatened, was when the group stormed into the Assembly. At an outer swinging gate, an elderly deputy sergeant-at-arms, James Rooney, brother of Sacramento Police Chief Joseph Rooney, was knocked back when the Black Panthers moved through.

He fell into a chair. He got up unhurt but angry.

State police officers tightened security arrangements at yesterday afternoon's hearing on the Mulford bill, but it was a calm meeting.

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This remainder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish them in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpended cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a hand gun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

Police Arrest 24 Capitol Invaders, Get 11 Weapons

The police arrested 24 persons and seized 11 shotguns, rifles and pistols in rounding up the bay area Black Panthers who charged into the State Assembly chamber carrying weapons yesterday afternoon. Reginald W. Forte, 18, of Oakland, was

charged with conspiracy to commit a crime and assault with a dangerous weapon upon a police officer. Detectives Joseph Del Ponte and Donald Shierts reported Forte raised a loaded .38 caliber revolver nearly out of a holster in a move toward them until they grabbed the weapon and disarmed him.

Eldridge Cleaver, 31, of San Francisco was booked in the city jail for possible parole violation. The officers said he is on parole in San Francisco for two counts of assault with intent to commit murder, two counts of assault to rape and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon.

Others Charged

All the others were charged with conspiracy. They are:

Sherwin Forte, 19, of Oakland; John Bethea, 18, of Oakland; Bruce Cocherhan, 18, of Oakland; George E. Dowell, 23, of Richmond; Willie Thompson, 20, of Oakland; Warren Tucker, 19, of Oakland; John Sloan, 30, of Berkeley; Ernest Hatter, 18, of Oakland; Truman Harris, 18, of Berkeley; Mikel Hall, 18, of Oakland; Benny Yates, 19, of Oakland; Albert Commo, 21, of Oakland; Kenneth Carter, 19, of East Oakland; Emery Douglas, 23, of San Francisco; Torris Lee, 22, of Richmond; Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland; Mark Comfort, 33, of Oakland; Oleaner Harrison, 17, of Oakland; Bobby Hutton, 17, of Oakland; Lafayette Robinson, 17, of East Oakland; Ordell Butler, 17, of Oakland, and James Dowell, 17, of Richmond.

Seale and Comfort were released last night on \$2,200 bail. The five 17-year-olds were taken to the Juvenile Center.

The arrest reports stated all were part of the group which knocked two sergeants-at-arms to one side and forced their way into the State Assembly chambers.

Sets \$2,200 Bail

Municipal Judge Arthur E. Eissinger this morning set bail at \$2,200 on each of the adults except Cleaver, whom he said could be released on his own recognizance. However, Cleaver has a parole "hold" against him which means he will remain in custody until parole officials permit him to be released.

Attorneys Lawrence Karlton of Sacramento and Beverly Axelrod of San Francisco, pleaded unsuccessfully for reduction of bail for Comfort, who was released last night on \$2,200 bail.

Attorney S. Carter McMorris of Sacramento also asked the court unsuccessfully for a reduction in the bail for the other defendants.

Miss Axelrod, in pleading for Cleaver said he was arrested "by mistake" because he was with the Black Panther's on an assignment as a reporter for Ramparts magazine.

California Gun Law Provisions Are Reviewed

California has what is considered a good law regulating concealable weapons, such as pistols, but has left shotguns and rifles virtually free of regulation.

This reminder today was offered by the State Department of Fish and Game as one of the reactions to the incident yesterday when armed Negroes pushed into the Assembly.

Rifles and shotguns may be carried openly by anyone as long as he does not brandish them in a threatening manner.

Even a pistol may be carried openly in a belt holster on the outside of the clothing.

Major Provision

The main restrictive provision in the State Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in a motor vehicle or attached trailer on a public road.

The loaded gun is defined in the provision as one with unexpended cartridges or shells in the firing chamber of the weapon. A gun can be so possessed if it only has rounds or shells in the magazine.

There is another restriction against discharging a firearm within 150 yards of an occupied building without permission of the owner.

Sawed off rifles and shotguns and machine guns are prohibited by both state and federal law. Generally the sawed off weapons banned have overall lengths, stocks and all, of less than 26 inches.

There are many controls on handguns, such as revolvers and pistols.

A license is required in order to carry a concealed handgun, and an applicant must prove his good character and show that he has a reason to carry one.

Originally anyone over 18 was allowed to have a concealable weapon in his home or place of business, but now a minor has to have written permission from his parents or guardian.

Other Restrictions

If a person is an ex-felon, non-citizen or narcotics addict, he cannot buy a handgun.

And any person purchasing a hand gun has to wait five days before taking it from the store so the authorities will have time to check him out.

It, too, is a crime to sell a gun to anyone under 16 years of age. And a gun cannot be sold to minors between 16 and 18 without written consent of parents or guardian.

Police Arrest 24 Capitol Invaders, Get 11 Weapons

The police arrested 24 persons and seized 11 shotguns, rifles and pistols in rounding up the bay area Black Panthers who charged into the State Assembly chamber carrying weapons yesterday afternoon. Reginald W. Forte, 18, of Oakland, was

charged with conspiracy to commit a crime and assault with a dangerous weapon upon a police officer. Detectives Joseph Del Ponte and Donald Shierts reported Forte raised a loaded .38 caliber revolver nearly out of a holster in a move toward them until they grabbed the weapon and disarmed him.

Eldridge Cleaver, 31, of San Francisco was booked in the city jail for possible parole violation. The officers said he is on parole in San Francisco for two counts of assault with intent to commit murder, two counts of assault to rape and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon.

Others Charged

All the others were charged with conspiracy. They are:

Sherwin Forte, 19, of Oakland; John Bethea, 18, of Oakland; Bruce Cocherhan, 18, of Oakland; George E. Dowell, 28, of Richmond; Willie Thompson, 20, of Oakland; Warren Tucker, 19, of Oakland; John Sloan, 30, of Berkeley; Ernest Hatter, 18, of Oakland; Truman Harris, 18, of Berkeley; Mikel Hall, 18, of Oakland; Benny Yates, 19, of Oakland; Albert Commo, 21, of Oakland; Kenneth Carter, 19, of East Oakland; Emery Douglas, 23, of San Francisco; Torris Lee, 22, of Richmond; Bobby Seale, 30, of Oakland; Mark Comfort, 33, of Oakland; Oleaner Harrison, 17, of Oakland; Bobby Hutton, 17, of Oakland; Lafayette Robinson, 17, of East Oakland; Ordell Butler, 17, of Oakland, and James Dowell, 17, of Richmond.

Seale and Comfort were released last night on \$2,200 bail. The five 17-year-olds were taken to the Juvenile Center.

The arrest reports stated all were part of the group which knocked two sergeants-at-arms to one side and forced their way into the State Assembly chambers.

Sets \$2,200 Bail

Municipal Judge Arthur E. Eissinger this morning set bail at \$2,200 on each of the adults except Cleaver, whom he said could be released on his own recognizance. However, Cleaver has a parole "hold" against him which means he will remain in custody until parole officials permit him to be released.

Attorneys Lawrence Karlton of Sacramento and Beverly Axelrod of San Francisco pleaded unsuccessfully for reduction of bail for Comfort, who was released last night on \$2,200 bail.

Attorney S. Carter McMorris of Sacramento also asked the court unsuccessfully for a reduction in the bail for the other defendants.

Miss Axelrod, in pleading for Cleaver said he was arrested "by mistake" because he was with the Black Panthers on an assignment as a reporter for Ramparts magazine.

Assembly Unit Okays Gun Control Bills; Another Is Deferred After Intrusion

By Wilson K. Lythgoe

Concerned over the ease with which a person can arm his own army, the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee late last night acted to tighten rules and penalties of laws on larger military-type guns and ammunition. Members of the committee, headed by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle, R-Riverside County, were among those alarmed earlier in the day when armed Negroes shouldered their way into the Assembly carrying rifles and shotguns. The intruders said they were members of the Black Panther Party.

This incident and discovery and seizure of 77 tons of military arms in the home of William Thoresen in San Francisco overshadowed the hearing last night and another in the afternoon on firearms legislation.

Tense Atmosphere

The hearing amidst a charged atmosphere in the afternoon centered upon AB 1591 by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Alameda County, which the armed Negroes said they were protesting.

This proposal would prohibit, except in certain instances, the carrying of loaded firearms in public and prohibit instruction in use of firearms for unlawful purposes.

Mulford, himself, asked that the bill be put over, and said the Black Panther incident had caused him to consider amendments to broaden and toughen the bill.

Among other things, Mulford said he wanted to include an amendment to make it a felony to rush into the Assembly with a loaded weapon.

Special Attention

Assemblyman John T. Knox, D-Contra Costa County, noted that often when bills are put over that that is the last heard of them, but he said Mulford's bill would be worked on in conferences and in committee again to "stop the spread of this problem." He said Black Panther incidents had previously occurred in the bay area.

A Negro Assemblyman and member of the committee, John J. Miller, D-Oakland, decried what he termed to be a "circus atmosphere" and asked that the committee consider the bill in an objective manner "without reference to what happened this afternoon."

Mulford called it ridiculous to think that the legislation was aimed at any ethnic group, but despite an obvious attempt on his part and by other witnesses, the "Assembly incident" cropped up time and time again.

On Larger Weapons

The Assembly committee last night approved the main parts of its package of bills to tighten laws on larger caliber guns and ammunition. Twenty-five of these weapons, ranging from a 50 mm mortar to sidearms, were displayed for committeemen.

The legislation, boosted by the office of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and authored by Biddle, is based on findings and recommendations of a two-year study made by the committee.

But Charles O'Brien, deputy attorney general, said pistols, rifles and shotguns used as hunting weapons would not be changed by the measures.

He mentioned Minutemen in California as one group that the new legislation is aimed at, and Thoresen as an individual whom it could affect.

Return Arsenal

Under present law, he said, much of the arsenal taken from Thoresen may have to be returned. O'Brien said the present law is so weak that Thoresen was nearly arrested for possessing a fire hazard.

Assemblyman Floyd L. Wakefield, R-Los Angeles County, blamed gathering of arsenals on laxity of the federal government. He said this became evident after World War II when many military-type weapons were allowed in from abroad.

"It's just too bad, as a demonstration in the Assembly showed us," Wakefield said.

The approved bills are:

AB 1326 which, for the first time, proposes to outlaw private possession of heavy military weapons, including anti-tank guns, bombs, booby traps and explosives.

Imported Weapons

AB 1324 to require Californians who buy concealable guns out of state to notify their local police or sheriff's officers and provide them with the same information required if they had bought the handguns in California.

AB 1325 which would define hand rocket launchers as concealable firearms. Gas-operated pistols were amended out of the bill.

AB 1323 would ban possession of machine gun parts. The bill was amended so it would not apply to semi-automatic weapon parts.

Final Comments

Col. E. F. Sloan of Redwood City, representative of the National Rifle Association, said he supported the basic principles of the bills, and offered suggestions to make them more workable.

The only serious objection came from William Andrews, Berkeley attorney, who asked that gas-operated pistols not be defined as concealable firearms because they "are not a lethal weapon."

And Richard Spear, Oakland attorney and cannon collector, said he could live with the bill, AB 1326, after it was made plain he could keep his cannons under permit from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation.

Black Panthers Believe Arming Is Needed To Fight 'White Oppression'

By Don Ferrell

Who are the Black Panthers and what do they stand for?

A check into their sketchy and somewhat vague background shows that the Black Panther Party is a spin-off of the Lowndes County, Ala., Freedom Party, which uses the Black Panther as its emblem.

The growing movement has since spread into other states and cities, including New York City, Detroit, Tennessee and San Francisco.

Before storming the Assembly Chamber in Sacramento yesterday the group—which can accurately be described as anti-white and revolutionary — had gained some small notoriety.

Previous Appearances

Last February, for instance, about 20 of them escorted the widow of Malcolm X from San Francisco Airport to downtown San Francisco. Later that day they caused a little nervousness among San Francisco officials when they appeared at the office of Ramparts Magazine.

But their latest public incident until yesterday was last month when a dozen or so armed Black Panthers showed up in Martinez

complaining about what they termed the murder of a Negro suspected of burglary in North Richmond.

Their goals, among other things, include an almost obsessed belief that the Negro community is oppressed by whites and that policemen are in reality an army which oppresses Negro neighborhoods.

Other Convictions

They openly advocate arming the Negro community against policemen and other whites and oppose members of their race being sent to fight in the Vietnam war.

The Black Panthers also believe that all big businesses should be nationalized unless private enterprise makes jobs available for Negroes.

Most of those involved in yesterday's incident came from Oakland and it is estimated that about 40 Panthers live in the bay area.

Leader Participates

One of those in the group was Bobby George Seals, a leader in the Oakland Panther movement, who reportedly received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force in 1958 and served

a six-month term in military confinement for disrespect to an Air Force officer.

Until yesterday, none of the Black Panthers had been arrested because of carrying weapons because under California law it is not illegal to openly carry arms.

However, it is against the law to carry loaded guns in vehicles.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

AB 1591 (MULFORD)

One of the major pieces of legislation pertaining to the control of firearms enacted by the 1967 Session of the Legislature was authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford (R-Oakland), Chairman of the Republican Caucus.

Assembly Bill 1591 makes it unlawful for unauthorized persons to carry a loaded firearm in a public place, on a public street or in an unincorporated area where it is illegal to fire a gun.

This measure, which became law July 29, the day it was signed by Governor Reagan, does not work a hardship on the honest citizen or the legitimate sportsman. The intent of the bill is to stop armed bands from parading up and down city streets brandishing loaded firearms with the express purpose of intimidating law-abiding citizens.

With specified exceptions the bill makes it unlawful for anyone to bring a loaded firearm onto, or possess a loaded firearm within, any public school, the State Capitol, any legislative office, any hearing room in which a committee of the State Senate or Assembly is conducting a hearing, or any office of the Governor or other constitutional officer. The prohibition extends to any residence of the other constitutional officers, as well as the residence of any member of the Legislature.

Peace officers are authorized to examine any firearm carried by anyone on his person or in a vehicle while in areas in which such possession is prohibited. Refusal to allow a police officer to inspect a firearm is probable cause for arrest.

The new law explains what is deemed a "loaded firearm." In the section pertaining to a public place, a public street or an unincorporated area, a firearm shall be considered loaded when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm.

In the section of the new law concerning public schools, including the University of California and the State Colleges, the State Capitol, and the homes and meeting places of the constitutional officers and members of the Legislature, a firearm shall be deemed loaded whenever both the firearm and unexpended ammunition capable of being discharged from such firearm are in the immediate possession of the same person.

Nothing in the new law prohibits citizens from having a loaded firearm in their homes or places of business.

* * *

Oak Tribune
**Gun Curb
 Law Goes
 To Reagan**

By ED SALZMAN

Tribune Capital Bureau

SACRAMENTO — The Mulford gun-control act, aimed directly at the Eastbay's Black Panther organization, today headed for the desk of Gov. Ronald Reagan and could go into effect by the end of the week.

The State Senate approved the bill, strongest anti-gun measure enacted in California for many years, on a 29 to 7 vote late yesterday. And today the Assembly adopted technical Senate amendments, sending the bill to the governor. Reagan has indicated he will sign the measure.

Authored by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, the legislation was requested by the Oakland Police Department after Black Panthers started appearing on city streets carrying weapons.

A band of Panthers, protesting the bill, burst into the Assembly chamber with loaded guns. Result: The measure was strengthened and Mulford added an urgency clause putting the law into effect the moment Reagan signs it.

The bill prohibits anyone from carrying a loaded weapon in any place where it is already illegal to discharge a firearm. In addition, it would be a felony to carry a loaded gun in the State Capitol, any public school and in various public buildings.

Sen. Donald L. Grunsky, R-Watsonville, told the Senate that "there is absolutely no reason for any intelligent person to carry a loaded firearm unless he intends to use it."

He emphasized that the bill does not restrict the right of any law-abiding citizen to defend himself and does not

Gun Control Act Goes to Reagan

Continued from Page 1

work a hardship on any legitimate hunter.

Grunsky reported that some individuals carry weapons "to unconscionably intimidate society."

He described the Panther visit to the Assembly chamber and reported other incidents attributed to the militant Negro organization.

The bill was supported by Senators Nicholas C. Petris, D-Oakland, and Lewis D. Sherman, R-Berkeley. Sen. George Miller Jr., D-Martinez, voted against the measure.

Petris declared the bill is "probably 100 years too late . . . We have a very sordid record . . . The heroes of the West shot down people in cold blood . . . We still see these heroes on television."

The Oakland senator reported that 750,000 Americans have been killed by guns since 1900 — "more than we have lost in all our wars put together."

Petris called the proposal "a weak bill. We ought to start taking guns away from people."

Sen. James R. Mills, D-San Diego, challenged Petris.

"If we are to take away weapons because they kill people," he declared, "we ought to start with the automobile."

But the principal argument against the bill was presented by Sen. John G. Schmitz, R-Orange County, who charged that the legislature "is destroying the Second Amendment to the Constitution — the right to bear arms."

He described himself as "the legislature's only avowed member of the California Rifle and Pistol Assn. He is more frequently identified as the legislature's only avowed member of the John Birch Society.

"All restrictive gun legislation is discrimination against the law-abiding citizen," he said, "because the lawless violate the gun laws."

He asked why Black Panthers carry guns in public.

"To intimidate people," he said. "Unloaded weapons are pretty intimidating too."

Schmitz said the Mulford bill would be one step toward the establishment of totalitarian government because the right to bear arms is a cornerstone of Democracy.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

The Honorable Fred Maggiora
Councilman
City Hall
Oakland, California

Dear Fred:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

May 19, 1967

The Honorable Fred Maggiora
Councilman
City Hall
Oakland, California

Dear Fred:

Will you please express my sincere appreciation to
the Mayor and the City Council for the resolution
supporting my AB 1591.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

fd

NSK
NSA 2/5

CITY OF OAKLAND
CALIFORNIA
FRED MAGGIORA
COUNCILMAN

MAY 9 1967

May 4, 1967

VICE-MAYOR
1951-1955

The Honorable Don Mulford
Assemblyman
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, California

Dear Don:

I thought you might be interested
in this action which we passed unanimously today
for your Bill AB591.

Sincerely yours,



Fred Maggiora
Vice Mayor

FM/eg
Enc.

June 21, 1967

Mr. Frank P. Adams
781 Highland Avenue
Piedmont, California 94611.

Dear Frank:

I am enclosing the most recent copy of my gun bill which was approved by the Assembly with the close cooperation and assistance of the NRA. The bill in its amended form, I believe, satisfies the constitutional provisions and is a strong measure.

I have purposely refrained from responding to your letter until this bill was out of the Assembly. I do not agree with the conclusions that you set forth in your letter of May 4. There are no penalties in my measure for sportsmen nor are there any constitutional problems in our collective opinion. After you have read the bill, I would appreciate your comments.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Joe Sweet, Mr. J. H. Hume and Mr. Carl Wente.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek

Enclosure

cc: Joe G. Sweet II, D.D.S.
360 - 29th Street
Oakland, California

Mr. J. H. Hume
Basic Vegetable Products Inc.
120 Montgomery Street, S.F.

Mr. Carl Wente
Bank of America
300 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, California

California Republican Assembly



Telephone:
(415) 525-5766

PRESIDENT

FRANK P. ADAMS
Piedmont

OFFICE: 1422 SAN PABLO AVENUE, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA
MAIL ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 123, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94712

Please address reply to:

SECRETARY

CHARLES N. LAVIS
Kensington

2610 Russ Building
San Francisco, California 94104

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

Dick Darling
Riverside

May 4, 1967

MAY 8 1967

VICE PRESIDENTS

Robert Andrews
Fullerton

L. Thaxton Hanson
Northridge

Norman Jachens
Alameda

Vadm. Albert Jarrell
Ramona

Tirso del Junco, M.D.
Huntington Beach

James Moriarty
Livermore

Nick Muskey
Encino

George Schalter
Sun City

Mary Stanley
Fresno

Kay Valory
Lafayette

Hans Vogel
Tustin

Hon. Don Mulford
California Assemblyman
State Capitol - Room 3143
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Don:

Enclosed you will find a photocopy of the NRA position on gun legislation.

I strongly suspect that the recent Black Panther invasion of the Capitol was subtly designed to provoke such strict gun legislation that all sportsmen in the State will be severely penalized, and the spirit of our U. S. Constitution on the right of citizens to keep and bear arms will be negated.

I would like to be advised of the pending legislation in this subject. It seems to me that appropriate distinctions can be made between those who collect military-type weapons, and those who collect or use sporting arms and ammunition.

Maybe it's a question of definition - What constitutes a sporting weapon and what constitutes the kind of use it's related to. This comes not only under the Criminal Laws but under the Fish and Game Laws.

If I can be of any help in this thing, I would like to be, because it's a subject that I understand and am very deeply concerned.

Cordially yours,

Frank P. Adams

ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Myldred Clark
El Cerrito

TREASURER

William J. Ebert
101 Font Blvd.
San Francisco

ASSISTANT TREASURER

Edna Sincum
Orange

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Don Randall
Long Beach

FPA/lmcm

cc: Dr. Joe Sweet
Mr. J. H. Hume
Mr. Carl Wentz

NRA POSITION ON GUN LEGISLATION

Positive program announced at NRA Annual Meetings in Washington

THE National Rifle Association will support a positive program of firearms legislation in the current session of Congress akin in many ways to measures that it favored as far back as 1963.

That policy was announced at the close of the 96th NRA Annual Meetings in Washington, D. C., Mar. 31-Apr. 6, during which the program was discussed and approved.

The NRA policy makers' action confirmed the organization's opposition to the drastic controls proposed in the pending Dodd-Celler Bills (S. 1, H.R. 5384), which would impose on rifles and shotguns the same restrictions they would place on handguns and would group sporting arms with antitank guns and bazookas.

In its present form, the NRA program advocates 4 gun control principles, most of which the organization has supported in some form in recent years. As announced by NRA President Harold W. Glassen, these would:

1. Amend the National Firearms Act by banning so-called "destructive devices" such as antitank guns, bazookas, and rockets.

2. Strengthen state firearms regulation by providing Federal cooperation at the interstate level.

3. Increase penalties for crimes in which firearms are used.

4. Ban all handgun sales to minors and require sworn statements of eligibility to buy and own pistols from buyers seeking handguns by mail order.

The first 3 provisions embrace the 3-part program that the NRA endorsed during the 1966 session of Congress.

The fourth provision represents approval of measures such as Senator Roman Hruska (Nebr.) introduced at the last session (S. 3767) to regulate pistol traffic. The same general principle was present in the original Dodd Bill that the NRA endorsed in 1963, but Senator Dodd's drastic alterations of that Bill forced the NRA to oppose it.

Soon after the NRA decision, Rep. Cecil R. King (17th Dist., Calif.), an NRA Director and Life Member, introduced a House bill (H.R. 8645) to implement 2 parts of the NRA program. King's bill would make it a Federal of-

fense to ship firearms interstate into States whose laws forbid such shipments. It also would regulate interstate sales of handguns to screen out minors and criminals.

Specifically, the King bill would set fees and conditions under which manufacturers and dealers may sell and ship firearms; would make it a crime for them to ship in violation of any State law, or for any resident of a State to receive firearms in violation of his State's laws; and would further safeguard handgun transactions by requiring the buyer in interstate commerce to submit a sworn statement that he is not a minor or criminal, together with the name and address of his chief local law enforcement officer. The seller is required to transmit this information to the law officer and to withhold shipment of the firearm for at least 7 days after receiving notice that the statement has reached the law officer—thus allowing a week for a local checkup on the would-be buyer.

NRA President Glassen pointed out that the legislative proposals effectively refuted charges of NRA critics that the organization, largest sportsmen's association in the nation, blindly opposed all new gun laws.

"That never has been true and the stand taken at the NRA Meetings should demonstrate for once and for all that it is manifestly untrue," Glassen commented.

"The NRA throughout its long and distinguished history has always actively espoused or sincerely supported legislative measures which afford a practical, constitutional means of insuring the legitimate ownership and use of firearms to some 50,000,000 American gun owners while denying guns, as nearly as any laws can, to the 100,000 or so criminals who misuse them.

"The current program of the NRA has been long in the making. It has not been sudden, or abruptly influenced, or arrived at casually. In evolving this program, respectful consideration has been given to the views of key members of the Congress. The result represents the earnest and sincere efforts of dedicated leaders both in the NRA and among those in the Congress who are in accord with legitimate firearms ownership and use.

"As outlined, it will not interfere with the rights of law-abiding Americans to possess and enjoy firearms. It should in fact serve to insure that right against unwarranted and unworkable

legislation which has been introduced in both the Congress and in certain State legislatures.

"At the State level, it is notable that the legislatures of several major States, including Illinois, Ohio and Connecticut, have rejected unduly restrictive firearms legislation. It is sincerely to be hoped that others will recognize the wisdom and propriety of such a position."

The NRA program was developed principally by the NRA firearms legislation committee headed by John M. Schooley, of Denver, Colo., a past national president and veteran law officer, and consisting also of Woodson D. Scott, New York, vice chairman; Ben Avery, Phoenix, Ariz., Alvin Badeaux, Thibodaux, La., Eugene D. Bennett, San Francisco, C. R. Guterth, Washington, D. C., Leon C. Jackson, Dallas, Tex., Bruce G. Johnston, West Des Moines, Iowa, Robert J. Kukla, Chicago, Joe H. McCracken, III, Dallas, Robert M. Modisette, Jr., Pasadena, Calif., Judge Bartlett Rummel, Tacoma, Wash., Stuart H. Russell, Oklahoma City, Okla., Garth F. Steltenpohl, Salem, Oreg., and Jack J. Basil, secretary. The committee met last December and again this March and early April. Its recommendations were approved by the NRA Executive Committee and Board of Directors at the Meetings.—A.H.

Pending House bills that relate to policies covered in the 1967 NRA legislative program are as follows:

To control "destructive devices": H.R. 7457, by Rep. Cecil King (12th Dist., Calif.); H.R. 7467, by Rep. John Dingell (16th Dist., Mich.); H.R. 7174, by Rep. Frank Horton (36th Dist., N.Y.).

To give Federal support to local firearms enforcement: H.R. 2839, by Rep. Robert Sikes (1st Dist., Fla.); H.R. 7450 and H.R. 7466, by Rep. Dingell; also H.R. 867, by Rep. Robert Michel (18th Dist., Ill.) and H.R. 7173, by Rep. Horton, which refer to mail-order gun sales.

To increase penalties for use of firearms in crime: H.R. 360 and H.R. 6137, by Rep. Bob Casey (22nd Dist., Texas); H.R. 542, by Rep. Ed Edmondson (2nd Dist., Okla.); H.R. 1454, by Rep. Wendell Wyatt (1st Dist., Oreg.); H.R. 6067, by Rep. John Zwach (6th Dist., Minn.); and H.R. 7869 by Rep. Olin Teague (6th Dist., Texas).

To regulate interstate sales of handguns: H.R. 867, by Rep. Michel; H.R. 7173, by Rep. Horton. ■

June 21, 1967

Mr. M. E. Moore
General Secretary
Berkeley Young Men's
Christian Association
2001 Allston Way
Berkeley, California 94704

Dear Gus:

Thank you very much for your recent letter regarding abortions and my gun bill.

As you know, Governor Reagan has now signed the abortion bill.

Regarding my gun bill, I am enclosing a copy as amended, which has now passed the Assembly.

Thank you very much for writing to me.


Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek

Enclosure

cc: Suren H. Babington, M.D. President
Berkeley Young Men's Christian
Association



SUREN H. BABINGTON, M.D., President

M. E. "GUS" MOORE General Secretary

BERKELEY YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

2001 Allston Way Berkeley, California 94704 Phone 848-6800

May 4, 1967

MAY 8 1967

Hon Donald Mulford
Assemblyman
State Office Building
Sacramento, California

Dear Don:

We greatly appreciate your fine letter regarding the anticipated move of the fire station near Camp Gualala. We have shared your letter with members of our Camp Committee and Glenn Kantock of Cloverdale Redwood.

My wife and I have been concerned about two measures now being considered in our state legislature and hope you will use your vote to bring about changes we feel are necessary and long overdue.

I refer to the therapeutic abortion measure, which seems to us is a great improvement over the old law - and also to the measure regulating use of guns. We have an appalling situation when over 17,000 Americans were killed last year by guns in the hands of irresponsible persons and surely a tougher gun law is needed.

We shall be very much interested in the outcome of these two measures.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gus Moore".

June 21, 1967

Mrs. Hazel May
350 Scott Street
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Mrs. May:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning my gun control legislation, AB 1591. The measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967. I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em
Enclosure

350 S. Scott St
 S. Francisco
 May 1 - 67 Calif.

Assemblyman, Hon. Don Mulford.
 Sacramento Calif. Dear Sir I noticed the
 article in The S.F. Examiner yesterday
 about your bill 1591. I too feel the necessity
 of such a law, but would urge that you make
 a slight amendment, to make it illegal
 for either loaded or unloaded firearms to be
 carried in public. I do think however that every
 white person should have an effective weapon
 in their home to protect their families. Women
 living alone are in the greatest danger. In view
 of the present situation in Oakland, I feel that
 the danger to civilized society is very real.

Oakland is only one city. I know there are many
 such trouble spots in our nation & I am also sure
 that the Communists take advantage by sponsoring &
 intensifying every thing possible to their advantage.

Of course it is the ignorant races that play into
 their hands. If it were only themselves they
 injured, they would be no loss, but these beasts
 are trying to sink the whole country, turn it into
 a holocaust. I think its time that some one
 introduce a bill that will send these black

subsidies back to Africa. Sell them for a bale
 of hay, as that is worse than they. & about the
 I say or desecrating our women, and the whole
 human race. Since the infernal great society
 of Democrats (Especially the Bolshevik
 Brand) has turned them loose on us to do as they
 please, a white woman often can not walk
 down the street without some black devil trying
 to attract her attention, & hurling obscenities at her
 when she doesn't turn her head. I saw two black
 niggers get out of a car & go up to a pretty young
 girl one day & shake their fist at her & ridicule
 her because she scorned them. I thought they were
 going to kidnap her right off the street.

They talk about the white niggers & that they are
 being crushed, well they bring every thing down
 on their own head that has happened to them.

It seems to me that deportation is the only
 answer, unless we want to become a nation of
 black apes in the near future. Dr. Me Pined has
 warned us long enough of what the idiots of this
 nation will bring upon us. I wish I could take
 every American by the collar & shake them out of
 their indolent lethargy. I will be 66 next Sat the 6th
 of this month & I'm a Republican through & through.
 I'm back of our beloved Governor with all my
 heart. I predict that he will go down in history as

The most loved Hoover or that Calif has ever
had. What ever I can do for you Mr Mulford
or the Republican organization, please
dont hesitate to let me know. I may
not be much of a writer. Possibly there isnt
much I can do to help, but I'm back of you
up to the hilt & I do have solid opinions,
which I am willing to express freely & frankly.
You may use my letter in any way you wish.
I should be very happy if you would pass
this on to Mr Ladd. We need encouragement
from every quarter possible. I believe
I thank you sincerely for the wonderful
work you are doing. My Dearest affection,
for you & the whole Republican Party.
Hayd May.

REC'D APR 17 1967

APR 18 1967

Many of us think
this expresses much
better that which we
feel, and hope that some
laws can be enacted
in California to help
control the sale and
possession of guns.

Myrtle Trampton
144 Curran Way
Oakland, Ca 94611

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

Mr. C. E. Brown
Chief of Police
Richmond, California

Dear Chief Brown:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 19, 1967

Mr. C. E. Brown
Chief of Police
Richmond, California

Dear Chief Brown:

Thank you very much for your cooperation and valuable assistance in connection with my efforts to do something about the Black Panther group and other groups carrying loaded weapons in our streets. We are making progress.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

fd

APR 27 1967

OFFICE OF
C. E. BROWN
CHIEF OF POLICE



April 26, 1967

Honorable Don Mulford
State Assemblyman
Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

Enclosed is a report, prepared within this department,
on the Black Panther movement.

I also have in my possession a report on the Black Pan-
thers, prepared in the San Francisco office of the Federal
Bureau of Investigation and dated April 20, 1967. It is
marked confidential so I cannot send it to you, but I am
sure they would send you one should you request it of them.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

C. E. BROWN
Chief of Police

CEB:DH
Encls.

June 21, 1967

Mr. John K. Jamison
O'Neals
California

Dear John:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

May 24, 1967

Mr. John K. Jamison
O'Neals, California 93645

Dear John:

I certainly enjoyed hearing from you, and I appreciate your taking the time to send me the material on "The Sad Story of Shooting Vandals" as it relates to my gun control bill.

I have reason to believe that my bill will be approved and enacted into law. It has the support of the National Rifle Association and Governor Reagan has publicly stated that he will sign the bill when it reaches his desk.

The pace in Sacramento has picked up considerably during the past few days. Now that the tax bills have begun to move, I think we can expect an even faster pace.

With best personal wishes,

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

O Neals, Calif.

May 10 1967

MAY 12 1967

Dear Don -

I have been working on this gun problem for seven years, and I am pleased to see that you are taking some action.

The enclosures will give you some idea of the local problem we have in the recreation areas of our state.

You may be interested in the proposals I have made to Senator Way and Assemblyman Mobley.

I follow your career with pride and interest.

In the Bond -

John

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

Professor Michael Conant
School of Business Administration
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Dear Professor Conant:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

AB 1571

May 25, 1967

Professor Michael Conant
School of Business Administration
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Professor Conant:

Thank you very much for your welcome letter of May 15.
I have included the University of California in my
bill, a copy of which is enclosed.

Perhaps we can become better acquainted after adjourn-
ment.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

fd

enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

MAY 16 1967

May 15, 1967

Honorable Don Mulford
California State Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:

Since you are among the sponsors of legislation to control the carrying of firearms on public property, I wish to urge the application of such controls to the campuses of the University of California. I have not searched the existing statutes, but in any case, I hope all control bills applicable to public buildings and grounds generally will carry additional clauses specifically referring to the buildings and grounds of the University of California. Given the special status of the University in the state constitutional framework, I would think special mention of the University would be necessary in an arms control law designed for all public buildings.

As a Republican who is concerned with individual freedom, I do not support arms control except after serious consideration of its consequences. No sane person can support the bringing of firearms onto a University campus except by police and the military training units.

Thank you for your vigorous sponsorship of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael Conant".

Michael Conant
Professor
Business Law

MC:lw

A Savage Attack on Bus Driver

A San Francisco bus driver was savagely attacked and robbed by a group of juveniles on Potrero Hill yesterday afternoon.

The driver, John O. Pedroncini, was pushed off the bus, then stomped on his arms, hands and feet by youths who fled with his coin changer.

The beating occurred at 3:20 p.m. at 23rd street and Watchman way, where the No. 53-Southern Heights' line driver was preparing to begin a run.

SEAT

Pedroncini said a "doped-up" man in his early 30's boarded the bus through the back door and sprawled on a seat. The driver went back to ask the man to leave and they got into a scuffle.

Pedroncini -- who was 35 years old yesterday -- was jumped from behind by a youth, began scuffling with the youth and the older man and all three of them tumbled from the bus onto the street.

"As soon as we did, eight others jumped me," the driver told police.

'BALL'

"I put myself into a ball and waited till they were through stomping me," he said.

A passerby, 31-year-old Jerry Brown, arrived to help the driver -- and the youths fled, grabbing Pedroncini's coin -- changer (worth \$22) containing \$34.

"They were all kids about 17 to 19," the driver told police officer Richard Weick.

He drove two blocks to 23rd and Wisconsin streets and telephoned police, then went to Mission Emergency Hospital for treatment of bruises over most of his body.

Pedroncini, a bus driver for four years, said the 53 line was second only to the 51 (Silver) line in terms of the potential danger to drivers.

Pedroncini was philosophical about his birthday and the way it was commemorated.

"I was 35 today," he said. "How about that?"



AP Wirephoto

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIE BROWN TALKED WITH BLACK PANTHER MEMBER
A militant demonstration in Sacramento

Armed Protest

Black Panthers Disrupt Assembly

From Our Correspondent

Sacramento

Some 40 young Negroes, all armed with loaded rifles, shotguns and pistols, and all members of the militantly anti-white Black Panther party, stalked through the Capitol at noon yesterday.

A handful walked into the Assembly chamber while the House was in session, scuffled briefly with

were hustled outside into the arms of Capitol police.

Spokesmen said they were demonstrating against "racist Oakland police" and protesting pending legislation limiting their right to bear arms.

The young invaders, some wearing black or navy blue berets and others with bandoleers of ammunition, threw the capitol into a swivel as they entered the west door.

During the whole bizarre episode there was no overt violence, no shooting occurred and occupants of the eastern part of the building were unaware of what was going on.

Silent and grim-faced, the group walked upstairs to the

See Page 16, Col. 1

you want to buy a gun. Well, go right ahead. Nobody will ask you how old you are, you are a mental detective, if you have a criminal record, or if you know how to use firearms properly. If you can pay for a gun you can have one - a rifle, a bazooka, a pistol, an anti-tank blaster, any kind of gun your little heart desires.

If you can't get to a gun store or a pawn shop, fill out a coupon and get a gun through the mail. Lee Oswald did it and nothing has changed since then. You can do it, too.

If all this sounds unsettling, let me assure you it is. I am writing to you because you and you alone can put an end to this appalling situation. We need a federal law to prohibit the shipment of guns across state lines. We need state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

According to the Gallup Poll taken in January for NBC, approximately 75 per cent of the American people want tougher gun laws. We have no paid lobbyists, no organization to espouse our cause, no one to speak for us, so we must speak for ourselves. We ask your help, Mr. Lawmaker, in the name of the 17,000 Americans who died last year from gunshot wounds. Sincerely,

YOUR CONSTITUENT

Copyright 1967
Publishers Newspaper Syndicate

D. E. A. R. LAWMAKER: Do

June 21, 1967

Mrs. Myrtle Frampton
144 Duncan Way
Oakland, California

Dear Mrs. Frampton:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 31, 1967

Mrs. Myrtle Frampton
144 Duncan Way
Oakland, California

Dear Mrs. Frampton:

Thank you for sending me the Ann Landers column calling for tighter gun laws.

Please be assured that I am working for a stronger gun-control law. My bill, AB 1591, now before the Legislature, would prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded gun in a public place or on a public street.

Although this bill does not pertain to the sale of guns, it will serve a useful purpose.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

June 21, 1967

Mrs. Victor D. Rosen
1216 Sunnyhills Road
Oakland 10, California

Dear Mrs. Rosen:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 31, 1967

Mrs. Victor D. Rosen
1216 Sunnyhills Road
Oakland 10, California

Dear Mrs. Rosen:

Thank you for sending me the Ann Landers column calling for tighter gun laws.

Please be assured that I am working for a stronger gun-control law. My bill, AB 1591, now before the Legislature, would prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded gun in a public place or on a public street,

Although this bill does not pertain to the sale of guns, it will serve a useful purpose.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

ANN LANDERS

"The best letter."



Dear Readers: In all the years I have been writing this column I have never received such a barrage of vitriolic, abusive and downright nasty letters as was provoked by my plea for tighter gun laws. I printed some of the less venomous letters yesterday and promised that today I would print the best letter in support of my position. I am happy to say it was written by a teenager. Here it is:

DEAR ANN: I am a 17-year-old boy who agrees emphatically with your stand on the easy availability of guns.

You asked your readers to write to their senators and congressmen urging them to pass some decent gun laws. If you know anything about human nature, Ann Landers, you know that very few people will take the time and trouble to do it. They may agree with you but that's as far as they will go. I have a suggestion which I hope you will consider worthy.

Why don't you write a letter and print it in the paper and ask your readers to tear it out and mail it to their senator or congressman in Washington? This is to let them know we want a federal law prohibiting the shipment of guns across state lines. Instruct your readers to write the following message across the column:

"Please read this column and then forward it to the Speaker of The House in Our State Legislature." This is to let him know we also want state laws strictly controlling sale and registration of all kinds of guns.

If several thousand columns

Ann Landers will be glad to help you with your problems. Send them to her at Box 3346, Chicago, Ill., 60654, enclosing a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

hit the desks of our legislators (both national and state), we will surely get the kind of action we need to make this country a safer and saner place to live. Thank you.

R.S.F. OF CHICAGO

Dear Chicago Teen: Thank you for an excellent suggestion. Below is the letter which I hope will be torn out of thousands of newspapers and sent to the senators and congressmen in Washington. If you don't know the name of your senator or congressman, call your newspaper and don't forget to follow the boy's suggestion and jot down a request that he forward the column to the speaker of your state legislature.

DEAR LAWMAKER: Do

you want to buy a gun? Well, go right ahead. Nobody will ask you how old you are, if you are a mental defective, if you have a criminal record, or if you know how to use firearms properly. If you can pay for a gun you can have one—a rifle, a bazooka, a pistol, an anti-tank blaster, any kind of gun your little heart desires.

If you can't get to a gun store or a pawn shop, fill out a coupon and get a gun through the mail. Lee Oswald did it and nothing has changed since then. You can do it, too.

If all this sounds unsettling, let me assure you it is. I am writing to you because you and you alone can put an end to this appalling situation. We need a federal law to prohibit the shipment of guns across state lines. We need state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

According to the Gallup Poll taken in January for NBC, approximately 75 per cent of the American people want tougher gun laws. We have no paid lobbyists, no organization to espouse our cause, no one to speak for us, so we must speak for ourselves. We ask your help, Mr. Lawmaker, in the name of the 17,000 Americans who died last year from gunshot wounds.—Sincerely,

YOUR CONSTITUENT

Copyright 1967
Publishers Newspaper Syndicate

Dear Senator Mulford —
The attached clipping expresses my viewpoint so well that I hope you will read it and when the occasion arises act accordingly

APR 18 1967

Sincerely —
John F. Roden

14 April 1967

June 21, 1967

Mrs. A. Colen
29 LaSalle Avenue
Piedmont, California

Dear Mrs. Colen:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 31, 1967

Mrs. A. Colen
29 LaSalle Avenue
Piedmont, California 94611

Dear Mrs. Colen:

Thank you for sending me the Ann Landers column calling for tighter gun laws.

Please be assured that I am working for a stronger gun-control law. My bill, AB 1591, now before the Legislature, would prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded gun in a public place or on a public street.

Although this bill does not pertain to the sale of guns, it will serve a useful purpose.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

June 21, 1967

Clyde T. Wetmore, M.D.
70 Plaza Drive
Berkeley, California

Dear Doctor Wetmore:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

May 31, 1967

Clyde T. Wetmore, M.D.
70 Plaza Drive
Berkeley 5, California

Dear Doctor Wetmore:

Thank you for sending me the Ann Landers column calling for tighter gun laws.

Please be assured that I am working for a stronger gun-control law. My bill, AB 1591, now before the Legislature, would prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded gun in a public place or on a public street.

Although this bill does not pertain to the sale of guns, it will serve a useful purpose.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

APR 19 1967

CLYDE T. WETMORE, M.D.
~~3031 TELEGRAPH AVENUE~~
BERKELEY 5, CALIFORNIA
~~PHONE WALL 5-2766~~
76 Plaza Dr.


Apr. 18, '67

Don Mulford,
Assemblyman
Sacramento, Calif.

Dear Sir:

The enclosed clipping by one of our columnists
is heartily endorsed by your constituent.

Yours truly

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Clyde Wetmore". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name "Clyde Wetmore".

Dear Lawmaker: Do you want to buy a gun? Well, go right ahead. Nobody will ask you how old you are, if you are a mental defective, if you have a criminal record, or if you know how to use firearms properly. If you can pay for a gun you can have one — a rifle, a bazooka, a pistol, an anti-tank blaster, any kind of gun your little heart desires.

If you can't get to a gun store or a pawn shop, fill out a coupon and get a gun through the mail. Lee Oswald did it and nothing has changed since then. You can do it, too.

If all this sounds unsettling, let me assure you it is. I am writing to you because you and you alone can put an end to this appalling situation. We need a federal law to prohibit the shipment of guns across state lines. We need state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

According to the Gallup Poll taken in January for NBC, approximately 75 per cent of the American people want tougher gun laws. We have no paid lobbyists, no organization to espouse our cause, no one to speak for us, so we must speak for ourselves. We ask your help, Mr. Lawmaker, in the name of the 17,000 Americans who died last year from gunshot wounds.

—Sincerely,
Your Constituent

June 21, 1967

Mrs. N. R. Mainwaring
424 Avon Street, #3
Oakland, California

Dear Mrs. Mainwaring:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM: bmk
Enclosure

May 31, 1967

Mrs. N. R. Mainwaring
424 Avon Street #3
Oakland, California 94618

Dear Mrs. Mainwaring:

Thank you for sending me the Ann Landers column calling for tighter gun laws.

Please be assured that I am working for a stronger gun-control law. My bill, AB 1591, now before the Legislature, would prohibit unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded gun in a public place or on a public street.

Although this bill does not pertain to the sale of guns, it will serve a useful purpose.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

June 22, 1967

Mrs. Walter L. Maxson
Carmel Valley Manor
P. O. Box 6087
Carmel, California

Dear Mrs. Maxson:

Thank you for your recent communication regarding my gun bill, AB 1591. I am enclosing a copy of it for your information.

Thank you very much for writing to me.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

June 22, 1967

Mr. Walter H. Clark
917 Paru Street
Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Clark:

I purposely refrained from replying to your very welcome letter of May 6, until I could send you a copy of my bill AB 1591, as amended, which was approved by the Assembly.

To specifically reply to your question, there is no law to deal with demonstrations, as you describe. This was the very reason I introduced the legislation and, at the request of the Oakland Police Department.

I hope, after you have had an opportunity to review this bill, you may see that it will serve a useful purpose when signed into law by Governor Reagan.

Thank you very much for your letter.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

WALTER H. CLARK
"Personalized Insurance Service Since 1929"

917 Paru St.
Alameda, California
522-5888

May 6, 1967


Assemblyman Don Mulford,
State Capital Building,
Sacramento, Calif.

MAY 8 1967

Dear Mr. Mulford:

I should like to express my extreme horror at the Invasion of our State Capital Chambers by the "Black Panther for Self Defense" gang. This is an outrage that people have to put up with such ilk as they. What is the matter with our laws to deal with demonstrations such as this? This could very well lead to something very much more serious. And many others are very much worried at this growing disrespect for Law and Order. We want to see that your Firearms bill is passed with the tightest control that is possible. This has to be or else one of these days we will be seeing ourselves looking down a gun barrel, only from the "Business End". Please work for the passage of your bill harder than ever.

WHC/mc

Yours very truly,

Walter H. Clark.

June 22, 1967

Mr. Larry W. Lamoreaux
5453 Manila Avenue
Oakland, California 94618

Dear Mr. Lamoreaux:

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging your very welcome letter of May 3 until I could send you the bill as approved by the Assembly, in its amended form.

One of the strong points of my bill is that it does allow you to protect your home and it also protects your constitutional right to bear arms.

I believe after you have read it you will agree that it is a strong bill directed at those who walk upon our streets, in our schools, universities and state colleges with loaded weapons. There is no excuse for this type of action but I do agree that we must be able, as law abiding citizens, to protect ourselves and I believe my legislation does this.

Thank you very much for your communication.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Oakland, Calif
May 3, 1967

MAY 3 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
Assembly of the State of California
Sacramento, California

Honorable Sir:

In the Oakland Tribune of May 3, 1967 I read of a remarkable demonstration in opposition to your proposed legislation to outlaw the carrying of loaded firearms in public. This outrageous display is, at least to me, convincing evidence of the need for such legislation and I would like to offer you my encouragement and support. I am deeply concerned, however, that the emotional impact of the situation in the Assembly on Tuesday could lead to hastily formulated and unnecessarily repressive firearms control legislation which could greatly inconvenience the law abiding citizen without effectively combatting the criminal misuse of firearms.

I heartily endorse the legislation by W. Craig Biddle as approved by the Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee. I am concerned at the comment by Assemblyman Robert W. Crown of Alameda (as quoted in the Tribune): "I would be much happier if it did require some sort of registration of weapons that are now in the State." It is my belief that firearms licensing and registration laws are not effective deterrents to crime. Such laws certainly affect the law-abiding citizen but cannot control the possession or misuse of firearms by those who operate outside the law. It is the criminal misuse of firearms which constitutes a threat to the public safety, not the firearms themselves or the possession of firearms by law-abiding citizens. Against such criminal or irresponsible misuse our laws should be directed.

I say again that I believe your legislation and that of Assemblyman Biddle to be well formulated and necessary at this time. As you, in the Assembly, were dramatically shown the need for strengthened laws, I at home, was dramatically shown the need for improved home defense when on Mar 23, 1967 my wife was assaulted on the street in front of my house. I urgently request you to protect my right to possess firearms without unnecessary restriction, as long as I remain a law-abiding citizen, for the protection of my home and family and for responsible use at the target range and in the field.

Yours respectfully,

Larry W. Lamoreux
5453 Manila Ave.
Oakland, Calif. 94618

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

June 21, 1967

Mr. George R. White
3036 Fulton Street
Berkeley, California

Dear Mr. White:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

REQUESTS FOR BILLS

*Mailed
4-17-07
fd*

AB 1591 (firearms)

2 copies to:

Mr. George R. White
3036 Fulton Street
Berkeley, California 94705

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Reid
6411 Colton Boulevard
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Reid:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:hmk
Enclosure

April 26, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Reid
6411 Colton Boulevard
Oakland, California 94611

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Reid:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning stronger gun laws.

I certainly agree with you that meaningful legislation is needed in this area.

I am sure you are aware that it is difficult to write legislation controlling firearms since the right to bear arms is guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

During the current Session of the Legislature, I have introduced legislation that would prohibit carrying loaded firearms on one's person on public streets or in a public place within the city limits. The bill is AB 1591. It will be heard by the Committee on Criminal Procedure. The hearing date has not been set.

Thank you for your interest in this subject.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

April 13, 1967

Dear Sir:

It has recently been brought to my attention that 17,600 Americans died of gunshot wounds last year. According to the Gallup Poll taken in January by the National Broadcasting Company, approximately 75 per cent of the American people want tougher gun laws. We have no paid lobbyists, no organization to espouse our cause, no one to speak for us, so we must speak for ourselves. We ask your help, Mr. Lawmaker.

If you can pay for a gun you can have one; those who are mentally defective or have a criminal record are not barred from the purchase of a gun. It is even possible to order a gun through the mail. I am writing to you because you and you alone can put an end to this appalling situation. We need a federal law to prohibit the shipment of guns across state lines. We need state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

Am requesting that you look into this situation and act upon this recommendation,

Sincerely,

Your Constituent,

R.F.
Janet D. Reid

6411 Colton Blvd.
Oakland, California 94611

June 21, 1967

Miss Cornelia Van Ness Cress
P. O. Box 9223, Mills College
Oakland, California

Dear Miss Cress:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,


DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

413 1591

467 334

November 1, 1966



Miss Cornelia Van Ness Cress .
P.O. Box 9223, Mills College
Oakland, California 94613

Dear Miss Cress: ✓

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Federal legislation. I am sure you are very much aware that I, as a State legislator, have no influence whatsoever in connection with Federal legislation.

I appreciate your interest in this question of firearms and I can tell you when the 1967 General Session of the Legislature convenes it will be one of the subjects to come under review.

Thank you for giving me the benefit of your thinking in connection with this important subject.

Sincerely,

DON MULFORD

ba

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

REC'D AUG 30 1966

CORNELIA VAN NESS CRESS
P. O. BOX 9228, MILLS COLLEGE
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94613

AUGUST 28, 1966

HONORABLE DON MULFORD, ASSEMBLYMAN
STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

DEAR SIR:


I ASSUME YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT R. CASEY'S FINE FIREARMS' BILL HR 5642. IT PROVIDES THAT "WHOEVER USES OR CARRIES ANY FIREARM DURING COMMISSION OF ROBBERY, ASSAULT, MURDER, RAPE, BURGLARY, KIDNAPPING, OR HOMICIDE (OTHER THAN INVOLUNTARY MANSALUGHTER) SHALL BE SENTENCED TO 25 YEARS IN PRISON. IN ITS FAVOR ASIDE FROM THIS, IT :

1. IT ATTACKS PROPER TARGET, THE CRIMINAL USE OF FIREARM.
2. DODD'S BILL S 1592 favors ambitions of dictator BY RESTRICTING LAW ABIDING CITIZEN IN RIGHTS OF SELF DEFENSE AND MAKES NO ATTEMPT TO PREVENT CRIMINAL USE OF DEADLY WEAPONS.
3. WE BELIEVE THE TEXAS TOWER TRIGGER SPREE WAS A FRAME UP TO SUPPLEMENT DODD'S SILENCE DURING TRIAL AND GIVE JOHNSON ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO AGAIN HOODWINK THE PATHETIC PEOPLE BY SCREAMING FOR REGISTRATION OF FIREAMRS. HOW RIDICULOUS CAN ONE BE IN THIS BLOODY BATTLE OF DECEIT!

THE POINT BEING, IS BETTER STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED TO PROTECT THE LAW ABIDING CITIZEN AND HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND IF SO WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN THE LEGISLATION? WE KNOW YOU STAND FOR FAIR PROTECTION.

OUR OAKLAND POLICE IS IN DANGER IN THIS 1313 CITY GOVERNMENT AND THE ESTABLISHED RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD RETURNED. I AM ENCLOSEING LETTERS WE HAVE SENT AROUND * THE POLICE IS IN NEED OF HELP.

SINCERELY,



June 21, 1967

Mr. Howard H. Robinson
1146 McKinley
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Robinson:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

April 26, 1967

Mr. Howard H. Robinson
1146 McKinley
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Thank you for your recent letter. I certainly appreciate your support.

I am afraid, however, that you are completely uninformed about the intent of the bills which I enclose. If you can tell me why any citizen in the State of California should not be prevented from carrying bazookas, hand grenades, or comparable weapons, I will be interested in hearing from you. May I suggest you examine the two bills carefully before you come to conclusions.

The Oakland Police Department asked me to introduce my bill to do something about the armed bands of citizens who are increasing their activities in our community. Are you aware the police can do nothing about these guerrilla bands intimidating citizens in our community with loaded rifles and shotguns? This is a serious problem.

I don't know how many people you have talked to about a "race riot getting out of hand." As you know, I have ridden with the Oakland Police Department on 35 different nights. I have every confidence in the Oakland Police Department, the Sheriff's Department, the National Guard and the Highway Patrol to maintain law and order. No one is going to pass any legislation which would prevent you from having a weapon in your home, but I do not believe you can justify carrying a loaded rifle or shotgun in the streets of our cities.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mr. Howard Robinson - 4/26/67 - 2

I served in the Infantry for six years in World War II and I am well trained in the handling of arms, but I have serious reservations about "citizen armies."

May I suggest that we are close to the situation and I believe after you have examined the enclosed bills you will agree with me. I will appreciate your thoughts about this legislation after you have analyzed the bills.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosures

4-10-7

as 1325

Don Mulford,

APR 11 1967

I supported you financially
& by vote in the last election.
I also supported Governor Reagan
voted straight Republican.

I also helped convince over
half of the men I work with to
vote Republican some for the first
time. One of the points I used to ^{convince} ~~convince~~
was the past determination by liberals
to vote in restrictive gun legislation.
We feel there is enough gun laws to
fail parents carrying guns loaded without
gun laws that might affect the law-
abiding. Many people in Oakland
are afraid of a race riot that might
get completely out of hand. In a
situation like that a loaded pistol
might be my only protection for
me & my loved ones. We trust
& like police we believe in law
& order; but we will protect our

loved ones regard class of laws.
For one of the first laws, a law abiding
citizen believes in, is self preservation.
Many conservatives were swept
into office in '66. One of the most
telling points in this sweep is
the desire for law & order. Laws
that release the criminals & judges
who place mercy above justice instead
of on a par with justice; these are
your opponents. Governor Reagan
has the right approach for
conservative, intelligent judges &
eventually the criminals will be
behind bars & the law abiding protected.

Sincerely a Conservative
Republican,

Howard H. Johnson
1146 The Kinley
Oakland, Calif.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

2150 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
836-3050

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
95814
443-7554

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION
RULES EX OFFICIO

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN

MINORITY CAUCUS

April 24, 1967

Mr. Howard H. Robinson
1146 McKinley
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Thank you for your recent letter. I certainly appreciate your support.

I am afraid, however, that you are completely uninformed about the intent of the bills which I enclose. If you can tell me why any citizen in the State of California should not be prevented from carrying bazookas, hand grenades, or comparable weapons, I will be interested in hearing from you. May I suggest you examine the two bills carefully before you come to conclusions.

The Oakland Police Department asked me to introduce my bill to do something about the armed bands of ~~Black Panthers~~ who are increasing their activities in our community. Are you aware the police can do nothing about these guerrilla bands intimidating citizens in our community with loaded rifles and shotguns? This is a serious ~~and personal~~ problem.

I don't know how many people you have talked to about a "race riot getting out of hand". As you know, I have ridden with the Oakland Police Department on 35 different nights. I have every confidence in the Oakland Police Department. The Sheriff's Department, the National Guard and the Highway Patrol do maintain law and order. No one is going to pass any legislation which would prevent you from having a weapon in your home, but I do not believe you can justify carrying a loaded rifle or shotgun in the streets of our cities, ~~for any reason.~~

to
100

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mr. Howard Robinson - 4/24/67 - 2

I served in the Infantry for six years in World War II and I am well trained in the handling of arms, but I have serious reservations about "citizen armies", ~~being able to function safely without possibly wounding or killing innocent citizens.~~

May I suggest that we are close to the situation and I believe after you have examined the enclosed bills you will agree with me. I will appreciate your thoughts about this legislation after you have analyzed the bills.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosures

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

Mr. Robert C. Lamborn
Attorney at Law
270 Grand Avenue at Lenox
Oakland, California

Dear Bob:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.

I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

April 27, 1967

Mr. Robert C. Lamborn
Attorney at Law
270 Grand Avenue at Lenox
Oakland, California 94610

Dear Bob:

Thank you for writing to me concerning Assembly Bill 1591 which I introduced on April 5.

The Oakland Police Department asked me to introduce this bill to do something about the armed bands of citizens who are increasing their activities in our community. Are you aware the police can do nothing about these guerrilla bands intimidating citizens in our community with loaded rifles and shotguns? This is a serious problem.

No one is going to pass legislation which would prevent a person from having a weapon in his home, but I do not believe you can justify carrying a loaded rifle or shotgun on the streets of our cities.

I am enclosing a copy of AB 1591 and would appreciate your thoughts about this legislation after you have had a chance to analyze it.

It was good to hear from you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosure FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

REC'D APR 20 1967

ROBERT C. LAMBORN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
270 GRAND AVENUE AT LENOX
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94610

APR 21 1967

4-19-67

Dear Dan -

I want to express my
opposition to what I understand
is your proposed bill regarding
carrying a loaded pistol.

You cannot legislate
people from killing one another
& the kind we are all worried
about aren't going to be
much concerned about
gun laws. Otherwise - keeps
up the good work -



MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 21, 1967

Mrs. Mary B. Ward
171 Montecito Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mrs. Ward:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Assembly Bill 1591, which I authored, was passed in the Assembly on June 8, 1967.

I enclose an amended copy.

The measure prohibits unauthorized persons from carrying loaded weapons on a public street or in a public place. It does not discriminate against the legitimate sportsman or the private citizen who keeps a loaded weapon in his home. It does not violate the Constitutional rights of citizens to protect themselves. The intent of the measure is to discourage armed gangs from roaming our streets and intimidating citizens with loaded weapons.


I appreciate hearing from you on legislative matters of concern to you.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

DM:bnk
Enclosure

MAY 2 1967



Oakland, Calif
171 Montecito Ave
April

Dear Assemblyman Mulford: I regret very much having written my letter concerning gun control, to you before I had any information about your bill, which I oppose.

The information coming out of Washington D.C about gun control and registration is frightening and this is what I had in mind when I wrote to

I can't blame you for being irritated, and wondering what I was doing.



Will you ask the committee to
consider fluoridation, if I hope
you help bill it in committee
Investigate how many are
prison and stay in human
body.

Sorry to have disturbed you
Yours truly
Mary B. Ward

April 26, 1967

Mrs. Mary B. Ward
171 Montecito Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mrs. Ward:

Thank you for your recent letter. I certainly appreciate your support.

I am afraid, however, that you are completely uninformed about the intent of the bills which I enclose. If you can tell me why any citizen in the State of California should not be prevented from carrying bazookas, hand grenades, or comparable weapons, I will be interested in hearing from you. May I suggest you examine the two bills carefully before you come to conclusions.

The Oakland Police Department asked me to introduce my bill to do something about the armed bands of citizens who are increasing their activities in our community. Are you aware the police can do nothing about these guerrilla bands intimidating citizens in our community with loaded rifles and shotguns? This is a serious problem .

No one is going to pass legislation which would prevent you from having a weapon in your home, but I do not believe you can justify carrying a loaded rifle or shotgun on the streets of our cities for any reason. I served in the Infantry for six years in World War II and I am well trained in the handling of arms, but I have serious reservations about "citizen armies."

May I suggest that we are close to the situation and I believe after you have examined the enclosed bills you will

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mrs. Mary B. Ward - 4/26/67 - 2

agree with me. I will appreciate your thoughts about this legislation after you have analyzed the bills.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosures

cc 1325

Oakland, Calif 16
171 Monte Carlo Ave

April 4 - 1967

Mr Donald Mulford
Sacramento - Calif

APR 5 1967

Dear Assemblyman Mulford:

Thank you for representing us so well. I am glad my rescue precincts did so well for you.

Your meeting in Padua was very enlightening. However, I would ask you to vote "No" on gun control. You know the under world and communists would still have their guns. Vote "No" Only the good citizen would be defenseless.
Yours truly
Mary B. Ward

2150 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
836-3050

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
95814
445-7584

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION
RULES EX OFFICIO

Assembly California Legislature

DON MULFORD

MEMBER CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SIXTEENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

CHAIRMAN
MINORITY CAUCUS

April 24, 1967

Mrs. Mary B. Ward
171 Montecito Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mrs. Ward:

Thank you for your recent letter. I certainly appreciate your support.

I am afraid, however, that you are completely uninformed about the intent of the bills which I enclose. If you can tell me why any citizen in the State of California should not be prevented from carrying bazookas, hand grenades, or comparable weapons, I will be interested in hearing from you. May I suggest you examine the two bills carefully before you come to conclusions.

The Oakland Police Department asked me to introduce my bill to do something about the armed bands of ~~Black Panthers~~ who are increasing their activities in our community. Are you aware the police can do nothing about these guerrilla bands intimidating citizens in our community with loaded rifles and shotguns. This is a serious ~~and personal~~ problem.

No one is going to pass legislation which would prevent you from having a weapon in your home, but I do not believe you can justify carrying a loaded rifle or shotgun on the streets of our cities for any reason. I served in the Infantry for six years in World War II and I am well trained in the handling of arms, but I have serious reservations about "citizen armies", ~~being able to function safely without possibly wounding or killing innocent citizens.~~

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mrs. Mary B. Ward - 4/24/67 - 2

May I suggest that we are close to the situation and I believe after you have examined the enclosed bills you will agree with me. I will appreciate your thoughts about this legislation after you have analyzed the bills.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosures

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

August 10, 1967

Mr. Harry L. Shockley
2700 Adler Street
Bakersfield, California 93301

Dear Mr. Shockley:

I regret that a backlog of correspondence has prevented me from answering your letter concerning AB 1591, my gun control bill, until now.

In answer to your question concerning the carrying of a loaded hand gun in your automobile, I would like to point out that most people who carry a hand gun in their car keep it in the glove compartment. If they do not have a permit to carry the gun, they are in violation of the existing law.

Thank you for writing to me. I am enclosing a copy of the bill for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

JUN 26 1967

Bakersfield, Calif.
June 23 1967

Assemblyman
Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, Calif.

Dear Sir:

The Firearms bill that you are sponsoring has me, as an individual confused, will you please have some one write me and clarify.


Will this bill prohibit me from carrying a loaded hand gun in my car for the protection of my self and wife from the attacks of Thugs, Punks, Rioters, who would not hesitate to mistreat, or beat our brains out as they did/ in the Watts affair ?
to some

I keep a loaded hand gun in my home for the protection of my family and home, When I purchased it it was registered as required by law with the State of California.

I am not a member of any special group on fire-arms control, But a Veteran of Two Wars with over Ten years of service who is well versed in the care and use of all types of weapons. My concern is that I hope this law does not ~~make~~ me subject to arrest and criminal charge when all I want to do is to travel in safety thruout any area of our State.

I am a totaly disabled Veteran from wars that solved nothing, but I do want to keep myself and family safe and secure.

Thank You



Harry L. Shockley
2700. Alder St
Bakersfield, Calif. 93301

August 10, 1967

Mr. V. H. Wheeler
2050 Fourth Street
San Rafael, California

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

I regret that a backlog of correspondence has prevented me from answering your letter concerning AB 1591, my gun control bill, until now.

Section 171e of the bill is applicable only when the Capitol, homes, offices, and meeting places of the constitutional officers and legislators are concerned.

This bill is not "blanket legislation." I have made a particular effort to protect the rights of honest citizens.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek

JUN 23 1967

V. H. WHEELER, Agent

2050 FOURTH STREET

SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

Telephone: GL 3-2616

June 22 1967

Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, Calif

Dear Mr Mulford;

Thank you for your letter of June 19.

It is probably quite true that I do not understand all there is to know about legislative process, that is not my business, what I know is what I read and the interpretation given it.


I am speaking of section 171e of your bill which defines a loaded weapon. My interpretation of this section is that if I have a firearm in my possession while I also have ammunition for it, I then would be guilty of a misdemeanor. As for example, a side arm, not loaded, but with ammunition for it in a gun belt, where the ammunition is usually carried. That if I was on my way to a range or any other place for some target practice, when I have a firearm AND ammunition with me, that would be a violation.

Don't misunderstand me, I am completely in accord with restricting the possession of the so-called destructive weapons, and the invasion of public places for the purpose of intimidation, but I am concerned about blanket legislation penalizing the sincere innocent owners and users of firearms for sporting purposes.

I mailed you a letter yesterday which was a little drastic, which perhaps did not convey my entire thinking on the subject. It is extremely difficult to do this in writing, and it is too bad people can not sit down and talk about it, which I would be very happy to do any time you are in the bay area and have the time.

Thanking you again, I will remain

Sincerely



Representing NEW YORK UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY of



THE FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

August 10, 1967

Mr. James Aalfs
4545 Elinora Avenue
Oakland, California 94619

Dear Mr. Aalfs:

I regret that a backlog of correspondence has prevented me from answering your recent letter concerning AB 1591, my gun control bill, until now.

The intent of this bill is to prevent armed gangs from parading up and down our city streets. I have made a particular effort to protect the rights of honest citizens.

Thank you for taking the time to write to me. I am enclosing a copy of my bill for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

4/22/07
**Senate Unit
Toughens
Gun Bill**

Tribune Capital Bureau
SACRAMENTO — The Senate judiciary committee today stiffened the anti-gun legislation by Assemblyman Don Mulford, R-Oakland, and sent the bill to the Senate floor.

The Assembly-approved emergency measure was prompted in large part by the activities of the Eastbay's Black Panther organization.

Before giving the bill a do-pass recommendation by a unanimous vote, the committee placed 15 tightening amendments into the measure. One of them would make it a felony to carry a loaded weapon into the home of a legislator.

The bill makes it a crime to carry a loaded weapon in most public places.

JUN 26 1967

Mr Don Mulford assemblyman,
State Capital, Sacramento Calif
Honorable 95801

Oakland Calif
6/23/67

Mr Mulford,

I am inclosing a clipping, Regarding proposed
Gun laws, as it states, In this small item,
I do not approve, of simply making law
On account of ^{what} these Black father took,
that would affect the entire States population,
However this small item is very vague in
just what it means, It can mean infringement
on the rights of all good honest, tax paying citizens
I agree, that and what the Black father did
wasnt only dangerous, But an unlawful and a
Crazy stunt to pull off. They should of been
disarmed and thrown in jail, by the police
and handed a good stiff sentence of 25 years ^{more}
18th and 19th century, and as the gun laws and if
in face, can handle took the Black father.
I had my own guns since I was 5 yrs old
and am an expert markman with ~~no~~ must
any gun. I also agree, that this Thorsen out fit have
no business with that arsenal, or any body else.
A Federal Law covers that.

Honorable Mr. Mulford, I don't want to say much more until I would know the full scope or contents of the proposed law, I know you are not from my district. But consider you fine legislator and an Honorable man. I am now 67 yroed property owner and tax payer, I have done jury duty, when ever called upon, not only in Oakland, But in other states, we have lived in Oakland 25 years next September. I do not approve or favor legislation that takes away or inprings upon the rights of honest and law abiding citizens, which are after all the blood of a nation and state on account of few doing no good, none tax paying, none voters people, white or black, a law violator, of our law is no good, to no one.

I would like to hear from you and learn more about, what's proposed.

I thank you,

Sincerely
James Aalfs

Please excuse my
writing, hereafter I
shall type it out.
Thank you

James Aalfs
4545 Elinora Avenue
Oakland 15, California 94619

August 10, 1967

Mr. Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr.
P. O. Box 850
Salinas, California

Dear Mr. D'Arrigo:

I regret that a backlog of correspondence has prevented me from answering your letter concerning AB 1591, my gun control bill, until now.

In your last letter you asked why AB 1591 provides two basic penalties for violators. This provision is called the "alternative sentence." It simply gives judges leeway in passing sentences. To illustrate, if a violation is minor, then the judge could levy a fine. However, if the case was serious, the judge could sentence a convicted person to a term in the State prison.

Thank you for writing.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure (AB 1591)

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, JR.

P. O. BOX 850
SALINAS, CALIFORNIA

JUN 22 1967

June 21, 1967

The Honorable Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California, 95814

Dear Mr. Mulford:

Many thanks for yours of June 20 together with A. B. 1591

This is an excellent piece of legislation and it is aimed where it should be aimed - at the perpetrators of criminal acts. I only wish the other proposed gun legislations were as sensible. Unfortunately they are not, and their stated goals will not become reality while the rest of us will be saddled with highly restrictive laws that have little or no effect on crime or the criminal.

The fanatic persistence of the supporters of such ill-advised legislation leaves me wondering what it is all about. Their hatred seems to be directed at the inanimate instrument rather than the criminal act itself. They are all too often prone to place the blame on society itself for its alleged failure to provide all the pleasures of life to the person turned criminal. They were "deprived" they say. There seems to be more sympathy for the criminal than for his victim. They have yet to explain what it is that makes those from well to do homes turn to crime, but undoubtedly guns will be in for its share of the blame.


There is one question I would like to ask concerning A. B. 1591. I notice that there are basically two penalties that can be assessed to violators. One provides for a fine and/or imprisonment in the County Jail. The other provides for up to five years in the State Prison. There must be

see comment
KOR
answer

a reason but it escapes me. Perhaps you could give me the reason.

Again, I wish to thank you for your efforts toward good legislation.

Sincerely yours,



Stephen D'Arrigo, Sr.

SD,JR:lg

AB 1591

August 6, 1967

Mrs. Helga Hulse
7323 Pheasant Road
Fair Oaks, California

Dear Mrs. Hulse:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning gun-control laws.

I would suggest that after the legislature adjourns its 1967 session in September you go to your local law library and ask for the California statutes concerning gun-control laws.

Current laws on this subject will be outdated by the new laws passed at this session of the legislature.

I am enclosing a copy of my gun-control bill, AB 1591 for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

6-9-67
House of Hulse
7323 Pheasant Road
Fair Oaks, Calif. 95628

JUN 15 1967

To Whom it May Concern:

How might I obtain the most recent publication concerning laws governing the possession of weapons by private individuals. I have read in today's Chronicle that the Sacramento Assembly passed a law making it a crime to carry a loaded gun in a city. How does the hunter carry a gun in his auto, etc., are questions which I need clarified---and many more.

Your assistance in mailing me the information requested shall be gratefully received as I continue to remain,

Sincerely yours,

Helga Hulse

Helga Hulse (housewife)

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

ALL 13 355

26430 Weston Rd.

Los Altos Hills, Calif.
94022

August 8, 1967


Assemblyman Milford

Dear Sir:

Recently you introduced a gun-restrictive bill into the Assembly which was later passed and signed by the Governor.

Could you supply me with a copy of the bill as it finally was enacted into law?

Thank you,



Albert F. Smith

sent
8/10/67
EK

August 2, 1967

Mr. Gilbert W. Colby
1 Plaza Drive
Berkeley, California 94705

Dear Mr. Colby:

In response to your request of July 30, I enclose two copies of my gun control bill, AB 1591, which was signed by the Governor on July 28.

I appreciate your interest in this legislation. Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

em

Enclosures

AUG 1 1967

GILBERT W. COLBY
1 PLAZA DRIVE
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94705

July 30, 1967.

Mr. D. Mulford, Assemblyman,
Sacramento, California.

Honorable Mr. Mulford,

I understand that our Governor has signed the gun law that you introduced into our legislature recently.

As I and some other friends plan to go hunting doves on September 1st when the season opens, and desire to fully comply with all laws will you kindly have 2 copies of this law in full sent to me. I have seen different versions of this act as to what is required and there apparently are some different interpretations. While I may interpret the law differently than others and innocently violate the law-at least I can prove my intent if I have seen and thoroughly read and studied the exact wording of the legislation.

Thank you for your trouble. If there is any cost for this service please let me know and I will remit.

Sincerely,



ROBERT MURRAY
9322 56TH. AVENUE SOUTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98118

July 31, 1967

The Honorable Don Milford, Rep.
Member, California State Assembly
Legislature of the State of California
Sacramento, California 95801

Dear Assemblyman Milford:

In Saturday July 29, 1967 issue of the Seattle Times was an article on the signing into law by Governor Ronald Reagan, your and his Strict Gun Control Law, effective at once on July 28, 1967.

I wish to thank you and Governor Reagan for such a new gun law.

If you will please send me a copy of the Gun Control Law for my reading and study, I will be most grateful.

The article in the Seattle Times said that you assured that this law would not restrict the legitimate hunters. I am sure that such will not restrict any legally licensed person to carry a weapon "into the bush" away from urban areas, such as; a Rifle and/or a Pistol which the latter is carried as a sidearm in a belt holster. When I lived in the Sierras, I used to take a 22 caliber rifle with me to shoot varmints and small game. When I entered civilization, all rounds were removed from the magazine and chamber and the piece emptied. This was my policy years ago and I practiced a "safe gun law" then.

Now I am expecting to return as a resident of California. I believe that I can still go into the mountains or desert areas that is public land, except for areas closed to the public, National Parks, Game Refuges and Private Land (except by permission of the owner to enter) State Parks too, all located within California.

Also I am certain that this new California Strict Gun Control Law is not as restrictive as New York State's "Sullivan Law" or New Jersey's Firearms Law. As far as I know, in New York State, a rifle for hunting can be had only by being screened for a Firearm License. In New Jersey, I believe only a Bow and Arrow can be had for hunting. No rifles may be had. Now I could be wrong as I never investigated these East Coast Laws when I was back there in these two states in June of this year. But by "word of mouth" from individuals, I seemed to get such hearsay information.

I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

Robert Murray

8/10/67
EX
sent 1cc
DB 1/7/1
Enrolled

JUN 28 1967

Wilton, California
June 26, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford.

✓ Thank you for your letter of June 23 in which you enclosed the latest amended copy of your AB 1591.


I find nothing objectionable in this bill as it now stands, and there can be no doubt that it is aimed at the class of citizens and the type of mentality where strict control is necessary. Your intelligent and objective approach to this problem is a refreshing change from the viewpoint of those who view all firearms, (and their owners) as malum in se.

There is no doubt in my own mind, that in the near future it will become necessary to extend the provisions of Section 2. to the courts, judges chambers and all official public meetings, although such incidents may well be covered in most instances by Section 1.

Like all legislation, the bill has a number of loopholes, but any attempt to plug such loopholes would result in such restrictive legislation that it would be unacceptable to most of us.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,


Merle D. Gow

To file

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 23, 1967

Mr. Merle Gow
Wilton, California

Dear Mr. Gow:

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging your letter of May 4 in order that I could send you a copy of my gun bill, AB 1591 as amended, which was approved by the Assembly. It is now on the Senate side and has been amended several times in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I believe after you have read it you will agree that it is a strong bill directed at those who walk upon our streets, in our schools, universities and state colleges with loaded weapons. There is no excuse for this type of action but I do agree that we must be able, as law abiding citizens, to protect ourselves and I believe my legislation does this.

Thank you for writing to me.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Bel
MR. MULFORD:

(he calls you Don on
second page.)

MR. MULFORD:

THIS LETTER TO MERLE GOW

READS:

DEAR MR. GOW

I HAVE PURPOSELY REFRAINED FROM
ANSWERING YOUR LETTER AND I HAVE
ACKNOWLEDGED ANOTHER LETTER.)

I AM FORWARDING A COPY OF THE
BILL AS AMENDED, WHICH WAS APPROVED
BY THE LEGISLATURE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR
COMMUNICATION.

CORDIALLY YOURS.

Don Mulford

Wilton, California
May 4, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your letter and the copy of AB 1591.

While I am in full agreement with what I believe to be the intent of AB 1591, yet in all candor, I must admit that due to certain ambiguities in drafting, it leaves me no alternative except to oppose it.

First, in regard to Section 1, 405.5, while there appears to be no ambiguity in this section, in my own opinion, it does not go quite far enough. Any riot involving the use of firearms should be a felony, and I would like to see our statutes changed to make it such.

"Inciting to riot" according to Rollin M. Perkins in his textbook on Criminal Law, "Is the employment of words or other means intended and calculated to provoke a riot. Signs, actions and movements may be just as effective for this purpose as the use of inflammatory language. It is a common-law misdemeanor and if a riot results the inciter is guilty of the riot itself, even if not present when it occurs."

I agree wholeheartedly with Perkins, and in the instance of the section of your bill which is under discussion, it would be my humble opinion that such an instructor should become a party to the offense as an accessory, and/or a defendant to the charge of conspiracy to riot.

In Section 2, 12031, there forseably could be some legal question as to what would constitute legal authority. Then too, it is not too difficult to envision circumstances arising which would make it desireable or necessary for a person to go into a public street or a public place while in possession of a loaded weapon. For example, I awaken to the screams of my daughter, grab my weapon, enter her room to find her being assaulted by a rapist, he flees and I pursue him. under these circumstances, I have the moral authority, but do I have the legal authority to carry my loaded weapon into the street?

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

It is easy to brush this objection aside with the thought that no legal action would be taken against me under such circumstances, but--- once it is on the books, intentions, motives and moral right, do not alter the facts nor the opinions of certain law enforcement bodies and courts of law. Look at what has happened numerous times in New York State, under their notorious Sullivan Law. Lets have the law spell out exactly what it means.

This same section carries another puzzler. Where it states "while on a public street or in a public place within any city", does it mean "on any public street", or does it mean "on any public street within any city"? And does the word "city" include all incorporated cities? As written, there is no doubt it would include any and all incorporated cities, but is that what you intended it to include.

There is no longer any truth in the statement, "It couldn't happen here." Anything could happen here, and it is not too difficult to foresee a complete breakdown of law and order in certain areas, in which the public would be forced to protect itself from Guerilla type bands. Suppose for instance, the group which invaded the capitol yesterday, had been real terrorists in every sense of the word. In such an event, (and you know as well as I do, that it is well within the bounds of probability) would it not be incumbent upon those of us who have arms and are trained and skilled in the use of those arms, to help defend our homes, our officials and our institutions?

I am not an alarmist, I'm not a Minute Man or a Black Panther, but I am a realist.

Don, I firmly believe that certain legislation is needed in the field of all types of weapons in their relation to crime, but I also firmly believe that hasty legislation, piecemeal legislation and legislation which harasses millions of our citizens who are decent and law abiding, is beguiling the people into a false sense of security.

I would like to see this entire field explored and studied by a group of individuals who could approach it with an open mind and come up with recommendations which would serve to curb crime and hamper the criminal rather than the people who are the backbone of our society.

Respectfully yours,


Merle D. Gow

Harrison Mitchell

ABC FLA. 7

4151 Project 8
LA 90027

AB 1591

on Senators about it

for it.

Mailed AB 1591 on June 12, 1967.
fl.

return to Allen.

CD JUL 20 1967

Don mulford

JUL 21 1967

Dear Sir -

Will you please send me
another copy of your gun bill
R-B 1591?

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,
Dewey A. Smart

sent 7/21/67
em

June 29, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Graber
5042 Harvey Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Graber:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning
AB 1591, my gun-control bill and the Bay Area
Rapid Transit District.

I appreciate your kind comments about my gun-
control bill.

Please be assured that I feel strongly against
any attempt to force East Bay motorists to
subsidize the Davis Street Subway Station in
San Francisco. I am particularly opposed to
SB 775, which calls for increasing the toll for
the Bay Bridge to help finance the Davis Street
Station, particularly since Berkeley is paying
for its own subway improvements.

I appreciate having the benefit of your thinking
and for taking the time to write to me about this
matter.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek

JUN 14 1967

5542 Harvey Avenue
Oakland, California

June 12, 1967

Don Mulford
Assemblyman

Dear Sir:

First, we wish to congratulate and thank you, for the Gun Law. We know and realize that you put much hard work on the bill.

Also, we wish to say, at this time, that this BART business is getting to be a sickening affair. It appears to have been badly managed from the very beginning. Also, we do not want the tolls raised on the bridges, nor do we want money taken from our highway funds.

We see no reason why the motorist should finance this BART. Our taxes are high on a gallon of gas. Also, we want the

- 2 -

Highway funds spent on Highways.
It has taken many years to achieve
these highways, and yet we need
many more.

The average motorist is paying
property taxes and State taxes,
of all forms, now we are expected
to pay again. Well, we have just
about had it.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mrs. Edward Graber

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MAY 8 1987

5544 Kales Avenue
Oakland Calif.
94619

Mr. Don Mulford
Assemblyman 10th. Dist.

Dear Mr. Mulford

I am very appreciative of all that you are doing and trying to do for the people of this State.

I am retired on a limited income and I hope that you are in favor of Amendment SCA 45 that was proposed by your colleague Senator Dolwig.

I am very much disturbed over the affair that took place with the Black Panther Gang by invading our Capitol with loaded guns. I would like to know why the arms were not confiscated rather than returned to them according to the article in the Oakland Tribune.

Very truly yours

H. V. Zellen

June 29, 1967

Mr. Harry P. Sherinian, Jr.
9060 McGurkin Road
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Sherinian:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning AB 1591,
my gun-control bill.

This measure, which will soon become law, does not
discriminate against the honest citizen or businessman
such as yourself. The intent of the bill is to prohibit
unauthorized persons from carrying a loaded weapon in a
public place or on a public street.

Anyone who has a lawful permit to carry a weapon is
specifically exempted in the bill. A man in your
circumstances, whose place of business has been robbed
twice in the past fifteen months, should have no trouble
getting a permit to carry a loaded weapon. Gun permits
may be obtained at the Oakland Police Department.

I appreciate your taking the time to write to me about
my gun bill. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

June 14, 1967

Assemblymen Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford,

I am writing you in regards to your Assembly Bill 1591. I am a merchant in the retail trade in the city of Oakland. My place of business has been robbed twice in the past 15 months. At the present time I have purchased a gun and carry it at such times as leaving my store at night or when I make deposits of the days receipts. I might add at this point that I do not like carrying this deadly weapon and realize the responsibility that goes with carrying it.

It is my opinion that a bill like 1591 will do a wonderful job of disarming law abiding citizens like myself and will not have any effect on the criminal element of our society. Until the City, County and State government decided that they are going to be a little sterner with these criminals when they are apprehended and give better protection to citizens like myself; I feel that I must take certain measures to protect myself and my family.

I feel that a bill like 1591 will make a criminal out of me because I see no other meethod of protecting myself from the high amount of lawlessness that this county is going thru. I urge your reconsideration of this bill.

I remain yours,

(A Taxpayer, Father, Retail Merchant, Home Owner, Voter,
Interested Party, Good Citizen and Troubled Citizen)



Harry P. Sherinian Jr.
9060 McGurrian Road
Oakland, California

June 29, 1967

Mr. H. V. Fullen
5544 Kales Avenue
Oakland, California 94619

Dear Mr. Fullen:

I regret that a backlog of correspondence has prevented me from answering your recent letter until now.

I thought you would like to know that SCA 45 relating to property tax exemptions was referred to the Senate Committee on Rules to be assigned to an appropriate interim committee on June 1.

The guns taken from the Black Panthers after they violated the Chambers of the Assembly have not been returned to their owners. In fact, the weapons are being held for evidence and could not be returned until the cases are disposed of-- and only then by a court order.

I appreciate your taking the time to write to me. I am enclosing a copy of my gun control bill for your information.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON LUFORD

Date _____

To

Re:

letter

SCA 45

On June 1 it was referred to Senate Committee on Rules to be assigned to an appropriate interim committee.

fd

June 29, 1967

Mr. Elton H. Rule
Vice President and General Manager
KABC-TV
4151 Prospect
Los Angeles, California

Dear Elton:

Thank you for supporting my gun bill, AB 1591, with
the excellent editorial of June 21, 22 and 23, 1967.

I want you to know this was of great help to the bill.
I have every hope that it will soon be on the Governor's
desk.

With warm personal regards,

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

ek

EDITORIAL #5467

"LOADED GUNS"

EDITORIAL

Assembly Bill 1591 would prohibit the carrying of loaded guns in public places. The legislation is far reaching. Public places include not only public buildings, -- but public streets and roads, business districts and many other places.

If passed, -- and the bill already has the approval of the Committee on Criminal Procedure, -- the law would be a forward step toward gun controls. The law is aimed at such episodes as the recent invasion of the state capitol building by an Oakland group, -- all of whom carried loaded guns.

It has been obvious for several years that new laws are needed to regulate the sale and misuse of guns. A loaded gun in a public place is a weapon. The presence of a weapon infers its possible use. Except in the hands of trained law enforcement officers, -- we can see no reason for individuals or groups carrying weapons in public places.

We support Assembly Bill 1591. It is logical and reasonable. It's civilized. Your state legislators need your support on this issue. Write your State Senator and Assemblyman today. Let them know you support AB 1591.

The above editorial was telecast a total of eight times, -- on June 21, 22 and 23, 1967.

FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

KABC-TV regularly presents editorials on topics of vital interest to its viewers. Clearly labeled as opinion, these television editorials are delivered by KABC-TV Vice President and General Manager, Elton H. Rule. Your comments concerning the attached editorial will be greatly appreciated.

Harrison Mitchell,
Editorial Director

4151 Prospect 667-3311
RA

June 22, 1967

Mr. John W. Bader
4421 Gilbert, Apartment 215
Oakland, California 94611

Dear Mr. Bader:

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging the copy of your letter to Governor Reagan until I could send you my bill that was approved by the Assembly, as amended.

This legislation was specifically designed with the help of the National Rifle Association to protect our constitutional right to bear arms and yet to assist the law enforcement people who asked for this bill to do something about the armed bands of citizens who are walking our public streets and in public places with loaded weapons.

After you have read the bill and analyzed it, I hope you will agree that it is good legislation and yet does not effect your right to protect yourself.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

COPYW. P. GILBERT, APT 215
O. LAND, CALIF. 94611
May 3, 1967

The Hon. Ronald Reagan
Governor of the State of California
Sacramento, California

MAY 8, 1967

Subject: Restrictive Legislation Against Firearms

Dear Governor Reagan:

I am greatly alarmed by present efforts to enact further legislation to restrict the possession and use of firearms by the general public, and I urgently request your intercession in any way possible to deter the misguided sponsors from their attempts to infringe upon one of our most essential rights.

We, the overwhelming mass of the people of California, who mostly remain silent amid the furor of protests and threats heard daily, have no need to fear any concerted, coercive use of arms against us by lawless elements so long as we freely maintain arms of our own.

The collective firepower of our law-abiding citizenry is so vastly superior that, I submit to you, it will never even be challenged, either by common criminals, race rioters, or any other organized lawless elements who might seek to impose their will upon us, while we still have it.

Many of our city streets are so hazardous that law-abiding citizens fear to venture forth upon them at night. We do not generally carry arms for self defense in this environment.

Yet the interiors of our homes, though much more remote from the surveillance of police patrols, are far more secure — because the danger to a predator intruding from the streets, from a householder who may only possibly oppose him with a weapon, is usually too great a risk to defy.

We are all conscious of the appeal, "Support your Local Police", but how conscious is our Government of the silent support that a traditionally armed citizenry has always afforded our police?

Supposing that the invasion of the State Legislature yesterday influenced that body to severely curtail the possession and use of firearms by our citizens. Further, suppose that the same elements who staged that invasion, and their ilk who from time to time engage in altercations with our city police forces, next were to oppose our police forces with guns taken up in defiance of the restrictions. Who would prevail? How many armed law officers do we have, to stand alone protecting our society?

How many armed men took over Russia; and Cuba!

I submit to you that we would do best to

train our school children, dutifully in the use of firearms, and make them conscious of the fact that one of their civic responsibilities must be to respond to any call that might be issued to them for support of our law enforcement agencies in times of crisis.

Just as our national armed forces stand as an invincible deterrent to attack from enemies without, an armed and capable citizenry will remain impregnable from those within.

Our Fish and Game code already restricts us unduly, requiring that guns be carried unloaded in automobiles. By way of example, let me explain that the State of Utah enacted a similar statute a few years ago. Prior to that, I customarily carried a loaded pistol in my car when traveling in remote areas. Later, I was sternly instructed by a district court judge to desist from carrying the gun in the car, loaded. The following morning after I was so advised, the Salt Lake newspapers related the fact that a local resident who had departed from town by car the previous day with about \$200. in his pocket was found by a lonely stretch of highway, 200 miles south, with 5 bullets in him. He didn't have a loaded gun in his car, but the unknown party who acquired his \$200., obviously did.

Very truly yours,

John H. Bader

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 22, 1967

Mr. Dewey L. Smart
1150 Duchow Way
Folsom, California

Dear Mr. Smart:

I am enclosing a copy of my gun bill AB 1591, as amended and passed by the Assembly.

I feel that after you have read this bill and realize that the National Rifle Association helped me write it that you may change your mind about it. It is necessary and was requested specifically by the police officers of my community.

Thank you for writing to me.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

5 may 67

Mr. Don Mulford
Dear Sir -

MAY 8, 1967

I am writing to you in regards to your bill # 1591 "Loaded firearms in public places." I wish to say that I vigorously protest the enactment of such a bill and I am asking you to reconsider & then withdraw the bill in the interest of justice and the safety of the law abiding citizen and our own peace officers.

I say this not only as a citizen but as an ex-deputy sheriff, policeman & now Correctional Officer of the State of Calif.

By enacting such a law you are depriving the citizen, equal protection from the hoodlum and criminal. For by taking

2/

his guns away from him when he has to be out at nite and perhaps alone on deserted streets where no law officer is available, you put him at the mercy of the armed hoodlum. The criminal will arm himself in spite of a law against it.

You surely realize this.

Several times myself, when I have been off duty and had my family along, we have been attacked by hoodlums both in day lite and at nite on downtown streets. I was very happy to have had my 38 pistol along at the time. It prevented my family & I from being hurt or possibly killed, I am sure.

As a peace officer and a citizen I ask you - please think of the consequences if you take our guns away in public.

3/

places. We will all be at the
mercy of the criminal, even
you will be, when you walk
dark lonely streets of any city.

If you were to take a
poll I am sure you would find
peace officers and plain old citizens
alike will ask you the same
favor. You are playing with
our lives.

Very truly yours,

Dewey L. Smart
11507 Duchow Way
Folsom, California

June 22, 1967

Mr. Arthur E. de la Barra
1040 Adelante Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90042

Dear Mr. de la Barra:

I have purposely refrained from answering your letter of May 3 until my gun bill, AB 1591 as amended, was passed by the Assembly. I am enclosing a copy of it and I feel that after you have read it that you will agree with me that it is a good bill.

The National Rifle Association helped me write it, keeping in mind that the constitutional protection of citizens to bear arms is very definitely protected in this measure. Let me assure you also that there are no racial overtones to this measure.

There are many groups that have been active in California with loaded weapons in public places and this bill is directed against all of them. It was requested by the Peace Officers Association and district attorneys of our community who feel they need this as a tool to assist them in their work.

Thank you for writing to me.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Arthur E. de la Barra
1040 Adelante Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90042

MAY 8 1967

May 3, 1967

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Assembly
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Mulford:

I have noticed that you are sponsoring legislation which would forbid the carrying of a loaded weapon within an incorporated area.

I am sure that this proposed legislation is well intended as a possible deterrent to crime. However, this will probably not be the case, since a criminal committing a crime such as armed robbery would not be at all concerned by the fact that it is illegal for him to be carrying a loaded weapon. Legislation such as the proposed would only make criminals more bold to assault merchants going from their place of business to their homes, knowing full well that a law-abiding merchant is not armed because he does not want to violate the law and expose himself to arrest.

I believe that constructive legislation would be legislation that would prevent the purchase of arms of any kind by mail as well as a waiting period for the purchase of rifles and shotguns as presently exists for hand guns.

I would like to add that I do not favor any legislation that would prevent citizens from owning hand guns, rifles or shotguns, but I do favor restrictions on the ownership of all automatic weapons as well as any other weapons that would fire ammunition larger than .45 caliber.

The incident on May 2, 1967 in which armed men walked on the grounds of the State Capitol is regrettable. However, I do not believe that the proposed legislation is the answer to such an incident, for in my opinion, it had racial overtones. I believe that it was a way of dramatizing one of their many protests.

Sincerely,

Arthur E. de la Barra

Arthur E. de la Barra

AED/pd

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 22, 1967

Mr. R. L. Eaton
2101 Telegraph Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. Eaton:

Thank you very much for your recent communication regarding my gun bill and the Black Panthers.

I appreciate your good thoughts.

I am enclosing a copy of AB 1591 as amended, which was finally passed out of the Assembly. I hope you will enjoy reading it. Let me also point out that the National Rifle Association helped me amend it to make it a good bill that protects the constitutional rights of citizens to bear arms.

Thank you for your letter.

Cordially yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MAY 8. 1967

Oakland, California.
May 3, 1967.

Assemblyman Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, California.

Dear Assemblyman;

After what I've seen in the papers the last two days I can't help writing you and stating my opinion on the subjects in hopes that my words will in some way influence you to some form of action that will in no uncertain terms bring an end to such actions as was seen in the Assembly Chamber by the BLACK PANTHERS.

Years ago they would have been tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail and admonished never to return, that of course is out of the question now, but I do think that legislation can be made to control these people and to keep them under control, or to require that they leave the state as undesirables.

On a Bill now before the Senate and I doubt that it has been voted on as of this time (8:00 P.M.) and I refer to the very controversial SB 462 the abortion bill.

If this Bill is passed I feel that due to its very liberal composition it should be followed by a Bill in the Assembly that would require all HOSPITALS, DOCTORS, NURSES and anyone who would take part in performing an abortion, to be specially licensed to perform to duties required of them in such action. Also that the person getting the abortion be required to secure a permit to receive such surgery. The cost of these licenses and permits should be on such a level that it would be a means to deter their actions.

Please sir, consider these ideas, and see if you can find some points in them that would bear merit, I sincerely hope so.

Respectfully


R.L. Eaton
2101 Telegraph Ave.
Oakland, Calif.

June 22, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Graber
5542 Harvey Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Graber:

I have purposely refrained from acknowledging your very nice letter until now in order that I could send you a copy of my gun bill, AB 1591 as amended, which was approved by the Assembly.

I feel that you will enjoy reading it and recognize that this bill was assisted by the National Rifle Association, keeping in mind the constitutional right of people to bear arms.

Thank you for writing to me.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MAY 8 1967

5542 Harvey Avenue
Oakland, California

May 3, 1967

Don Mulford
State Assemblyman

Dear Sir:

In regards to the Armed March
at the State Capitol, May 2nd 1967.

This is shocking, disgusting and
disgraceful. What, in Heaven's name, is
this country coming to? No, the people
do not under any circumstances, ever
want a recurrence, of that incident.
Why were these people permitted to get
as far as they did? It doesn't make
any difference, as to what color people
might be, let us take immediate steps
to prevent this. We do not understand
why these people are allowed on the
city streets of Oakland, or any other
town. We are aware of ones Constitu-
tional rights, but people who arm
themselves, and create a party group,
constitute a grave danger, and we

- 2 -

feel, that they are damaging the rights of all the people. This must end now, for it will open the door for wholesale warfare, riots, and so forth.

We feel that it is high time, the entire State cleaned up these dirty situations, We must start right at our young generation, who with their ridiculous hair and manners of dress, is disgusting. Our colleges and the surrounding areas, are a disgrace.

San Francisco and other areas with the lousy hippies! San Francisco is fourth ranked in venereal disease, just the thought is sickening. Let us put an end to all this, if we don't it will grow and grow worse each day.

They should the people pay and pay! Our law enforcement officers must be taken off their regular duties, and grouped in small areas,

- 3 -

due to situations, such as May 2nd.
We must feed and care for
these people, while they are in
custody. Court hearings, all
these things, certainly are a
terrific expense to the whole of
our State.

We urge you, along with all
others, the members of our City,
County, and State officials, to
put an end to this.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mr. Edward Graber

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

June 22, 1967

Mr. Bruce Bates
1491 Kendall Drive
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Mr. Bates:

I apologize for the delay in acknowledging your letter, but only now are we able to send you a copy of my gun bill, AB 1591, because it has undergone substantial amendments.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely yours,

DON MULFORD

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

May 3, 1967

1291 Kendall Dr.
San Bernardino, Cal.
92407

MAY 8 1967

Don Mulford
State Assembly
Assemblyman 16th. Dist.
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Sir:

I saw recently, in the newspapers, as where it reported that you had proposed gun control laws in your position.

In college this summer we will be debating a related subject of regulations of criminal investigation procedures. I feel the gun control question may play an important part in our discussion in this field.

If it is possible I would be very thankful if you could present to us your views, through writing, on this idea and your proposed bill. If you have any printed matter related to the crime problem I would appreciate this also.

Thank you very much,
Sincerely yours,

Bruce Bates

Bruce Bates

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

November 21, 1967

Mr. Joe Crosby, State Chairman
United Republicans of California
State Headquarters Office
6330 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California 90042

Dear Joe:

Since my letter of November 8 to you concerning AB 1591,
my gun control bill, I have received the enclosed letter
from W. P. Beall, Chief of Police of the City of Berkeley.

In view of the UROC Resolution, I thought you might be
interested in apprising your membership of Chief Beall's
experience under the new law.

Warm personal regards.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

mvk

Enclosure

APR 15 1971 - AB 1591
1674-200

November 8, 1967

Mr. Joe Crosby, State Chairman
United Republicans of California
State Headquarters Office
6330 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California 90042

Dear Joe:

I appreciate your taking the time to send me the UROC Resolution concerning my gun control bill.

I want you to know that I introduced AB 1591 on behalf of law enforcement officials in the Bay Area. In fact, they, along with the National Rifle Association, the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure and the Senate Judiciary Committee helped draft the legislation.

The intent of the new law is to give police authority to stop armed bands from parading up and down our city streets intimidating honest, law-abiding citizens.

I am sure you are aware that heretofore, police have been powerless to stop armed individuals unless they pointed their weapons in a threatening manner or fired them in a prohibited area.

My bill comes under the heading of preventative legislation because it permits police to inspect firearms before they can be used in a public place, on a public street, in a public school, or in an unincorporated area where it is illegal to discharge a firearm.

I would like to point out that nothing in my bill prevents anyone from having a loaded firearm in his home or place of business. I would also like to note that if a person has a legitimate reason to carry a loaded gun, he should have a permit to do so. Individuals who have a permit are specifically exempted under the provisions of AB 1591.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

MR. JOE CROSBY
NOVEMBER 8, 1967
PAGE 2

Joe, I think this is a reasonable bill. It gives the law enforcement body a tool they have needed for a long time.

It was good hearing from you again.

With warm personal regards.

Cordially,


DON MULFORD

mvk

Enclosure

17-10

PLEASE ADDRESS
REPLY TO:



NOV 6 1967

UNITED REPUBLICANS of California

HONORARY CHAIRMAN
Bruce V. Reagan
Pasadena
IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
Fred Nagel
Susansville

STATE HEADQUARTERS OFFICE
6330 No. Figueroa St.
Los Angeles, California 90042
(213) 256-3121

November 2, 1967

STATE OFFICERS
CHAIRMAN
Joseph M. Crosby
South Pasadena
VICE CHAIRMEN
(Northern)
Kenneth Steadman
Fremont
(Central)
Walter Hintzen
Santa Barbara
(Southern)
Michael Van Horn
Malibu
SECRETARY
Mrs. June Wallin
Ontario
TREASURER
Ed O'Callahan
La Habra
SERGEANT-AT-ARMS
John McCarney
Santa Ana

Hon. Don Mulford
State Capitol
Sacramento, Calif.

Dear Don:

On October 24, 1967 by majority vote of UROC Units throughout the state, the following resolution became UROC Policy:

WHEREAS the right to bear arms is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and

WHEREAS guns are needed not only for hunting, but for self-defense, which is an absolute right of the free man who has injured no one else, and

WHEREAS experience has shown that gun control laws are respected only by peaceful and law-abiding citizens and do nothing whatever to curb crime and riots, and

WHEREAS urban riots in this country have reached the point of armed revolution threatening the life and prosperity of millions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that UNITED REPUBLICANS OF CALIFORNIA oppose any further state or federal legislation restricting the right to bear arms, and strongly protest Assembly Bill 1591, passed by the California legislature in July 1967, which makes unlawful the carrying of a loaded gun in any public street or highway by any private citizen who cannot prove himself to be in "immediate danger" of harm.

This is to inform you of this action.

Sincerely,


Joe Crosby
State Chairman

AREA GOVERNORS
Max Koenig
Oroville
Sam Van Dyken
Ripon
Eric Lane
Corte Madera
Richard Burgard
Castro Valley
Harlan Smith
San Francisco
Henry Chace
Los Altos
Clement A. Tavares, M.D.
Fresno
Paul Magnani
Oak View
Mrs. Marie Porter
Bakersfield
Tom Sullivan
Pasadena
Mrs. Virginia Carson
Los Angeles
David Hamm
Long Beach
George Halvorsen
West Los Angeles
Ed O'Callahan
La Habra
Al Hudson
Escondido
David Nidy
Barstow

STATE OFFICIALS
GENERAL COUNSEL
John Kerns Bennett
Sacramento
PARLIAMENTARIAN
Charles Kopp
South Pasadena
CHAPLAIN
Hon. E. Richard Barnes
San Diego

JC:jc FIREARMSPOLICY.ORG/RESOURCES

"OPEN THE DOORS AND LET THE PEOPLE IN"

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

October 3, 1967

Mr. Robert W. Secor
386 Simon Way
Oxnard, California 93030

Dear Mr. Secor:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning Assemblyman Don Mulford's gun-control bill. Assemblyman Mulford, who is hospitalized with pneumonia, asked me to answer your letter.

He would like you to know that he introduced the bill on behalf of law enforcement officials in the Bay Area. In fact, they, along with the National Rifle Association, helped to draft the measure.

The intent of the new law is to give police the authority to stop armed bands from parading up and down our city streets intimidating honest, law-abiding citizens.

As a former law enforcement officer, I am sure you are aware of the fact that heretofore police have been powerless to stop armed individuals unless they point their weapons in a threatening manner or fire them in a prohibited area.

Assemblyman Mulford's bill comes under the heading of "preventative legislation," because it permits police to inspect firearms before they can be used in a public place, on a public street, or in an unincorporated area where it is illegal to discharge a firearm.

The bill also makes it unlawful, with specified exceptions, for anyone to bring a loaded firearm into a school, the Capitol, or the homes and meeting places of the State's constitutional officers and legislators.

AB 1591

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Mr. Robert W. [unclear]

October 3, 1967

Page 2

I would like to point out that nothing in this bill prevents anyone from having a loaded firearm in his home or place of business.

In closing, I would also like to note that if a person has a legitimate reason to carry a loaded gun, he should have a permit to do so. Individuals who have a permit are specifically exempted under the provisions of the new law.

The Assemblyman asked me to send you a copy of the bill.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

mvk

Enclosure

aw.

ROBERT W. SEC R
386 SIMON WAY
OXNARD, CA-93030

Dear Sir:-

I understand you are the sponsor of the new California gun law, so I am writing to you to give my opinion in that I do not think it makes common horse sense. I realize you are trying to do what you think is the right thing to combat crime but I think you are ^{not} going about it right. you are punishing the honest law abiding person instead of the one who needs it.

Mr. Mulford I am 46 years old and have lived in Ventura County since I was approx 7 year old. I grew up in the city of Ventura and went to school there until I went into the service from there and returned there, I spent approx a year & a half in the Ventura city police dept

JT

and advanced to the Ventura Co Sheriff's office where I spent approx three years and a few months, I had to quit because of wages & hours (24 hours a day - 6 days a week) during the time I was in law enforcement I sent a big number of men & some women to State prison & County jails for attempted murder, rape, armed robbery etc, I still live in the same house I lived in at that time, I see people all the time that I have put in jail at one time or another. I mention all this to give you a brief resume about me a law abiding person, and there are thousands like me in this state. I feel that in your gun law your made the provision that it

114

would not affect a retired police officer from carrying a loaded gun because he would need it for self protection as he has sent men to prison and they might want revenge, OK how about men like myself who have sent men to prison?

Mr Mulford you have to understand that the honest man is going to obey this law but the criminal is not, I would even venture to say the criminal is laughing at you because he and all other young toughs are not going to obey it anyway but they will now be glad to know they can do just about anything they want and the citizens of this state are not going to be able to defend themselves, you and other people

91

answer to this is we need more higher educated police, I say no what we really need is a supreme court and law makers that use a little common horse sense, we have a law that makes a person convicted of a felony ineligible for parole for 5 years (mandatory) if he uses a loaded deadly weapon in the commission of it (Calif penal code) I know because I was the officer who handled a armed robbery case under those circumstances, I say if you have to make laws think of both sides and there effects before you pass laws and see that they punish a person for committing a crime, this will help stop crime.

Your know me mulford

V

we are told that during the recent riots we should not blame all the negroes for what a few do and yet you set a good example by blaming all the ~~gun~~ gun owners for what a few do, do you want all people to do what your higher ups say or do?

new york has one of the most strictest set of gun laws in the U.S.A. the young punks how it and so do the criminals, I am enclosing a article I just cut from the pages about new york and what will start happening here, when it does dont waste time wondering why people will get and watch people being mugged, robbed, beat up

VI

raped, etc. because it will be in great part ~~due~~ due to gun laws and any law that doesn't punish the right people (the law breakers).

In Ventura the other day it happened, a couple of toughs during daylight in a residential area beat up a man who was with his son in a car and got away with it because they know they can get away with breaking the laws now instead of being punished, because of the fact it was a misdemeanor and the police didn't see it, also they could not make an arrest because the men were gone and if a broadcast were put out to pick up the people on descriptions they would

VII

have to arrest the people to bring them in to be identified, this is not the police officers fault, I say it is due to the recent court decisions where a man doesn't have to say anything and can't be questioned with out a attorney present.

You young people have lost respect for the police, because of their now having the same rights, but do not get the same punishment.

I don't feel that if you change this gun law I mentioned that you started will affect your political life, in fact if you completely kill it except for what it was supposed to be, as I and others read in the paper that it was to be, about carrying loaded

VII

guns in certain public places
such as schools, theaters,
legislative buildings and places
of public assembly, then I think
it would be doing a service
to the law abiding public and
it would help you.

If you have the time I
would appreciate a answer
if you would give it, please
consider this proposal deeply
near Mulford

Respectfully submitted

Robert W. Lee

P.S.
gun registrations would be
just as wrong only the honest
people would abide by it
R.W.L.



September 22, 1967

Mr. Robert Rudolph
1271 Campus Drive
Berkeley, California 94708

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

I apologize for not answering your recent letter concerning my gun control bill until now. Your letter was misfiled and I have just now discovered it.

I am enclosing a brief analysis of the new law. Your question pertaining to what constitutes a loaded firearm is explained on page 2 of the analysis.

I appreciate your interest in this subject.

If I can be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

t
Enclosure

AB-1591

REC'D AUG 15 1967

Aug. 14, 1967

Dear Sir:

In regard to your firearms bill - AB 1591, - would you please explain what constitutes a loaded firearm? Is it the same interpretation as that of the Department of Fish and Game, which states that there is to be no cartridge in the chamber?
Please explain and thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Rudolph
1271 Campus Dr
Berkeley, Calif. 94708

P.S. we have already sent for the bill, but want your explanation. Thank you,
Mrs. R.

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON MULFORD

Date Oct. 3, 1967

(Message from: Harriet, Oakland Office)

To Clyde Walthall

Re: AB 1591

Please send all pertinent legislation on AB 1591 (also information on other gun legislation in addition to Mr. Mulford's bill)

to

Rev. William P. Miller
Lake Park Methodist Church
281 Santa Clara
Oakland, California 94610

Helen

*Sent
10/4/67
muc*

4933 Voltaire St.
San Diego, Calif. 92107

8-10-67

Assemblyman Don Mulford
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, Calif. 94612

Dear Assemblyman,

I would appreciate it very much if you will send me
ten (10) copies of your recent successful AB 1591 pertaining
to guns.

Yours truly,

Milt Plummer

Milt Plummer
4933 Voltaire St.
San Diego, Calif. 92107

*sent 10 cc's
8/24/67
mlt*

*File
Firearms*

September 11, 1967



The Honorable George Murphy
Legislative Counsel
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear George:

I would appreciate your interpretation of whether or not, under AB 1591, a retired federal peace officer is allowed to carry a concealed weapon.

Does any State law allow a retired federal peace officer to carry a concealed weapon?

Does a retired federal peace officer violate any State law if he goes into a session of the Legislature (either House) wearing a concealed weapon?

Cordially,

DON MULFORD

hh

SEP 25 1967

BERNARD CZESLA
CHIEF DEPUTY

TERRY L. BAUM
J. GOULD
OWEN K. KUNS
RAY H. WHITAKER
KENT L. DECHAMBEAU
STANLEY M. LOURIMORE
EDWARD K. PURCELL
PRINCIPAL DEPUTIES

EDWARD F. NOWAK
DEPUTY IN CHARGE
LOS ANGELES OFFICE

3021 STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO 95814

110 STATE BUILDING
LOS ANGELES 90012

Legislative Counsel of California

GEORGE H. MURPHY

Sacramento, California

September 22, 1967

GERALD ROSS ADAMS
CARL M. ARNOLD
EVERETT AVILA
JERRY L. BASSETT
EDWARD BERSHATSKY
LAURENCE C. BLUNT
ROBERT A. BRAVERMAN
JOHN CORZINE
CLINTON J. DEWITT
JEROME DIAMOND
CARL A. ERIKSON, III
HARVEY J. FOSTER
THOMAS H. FRANKEL
ROBERT D. GRONKE
JAMES E. KASSIS
L. DOUGLAS KINNEY
ERNEST H. KUNZI
SHERWIN C. MACKENZIE, JR.
ANN M. MACKAY
STEPHEN L. MILLICH
LARRY B. NORD
ROSE OLIVER
TRACY O. POWELL, II
MARGUERITE R. ROTH
CAREY W. ROYSTER
MARY SHAW
RUSSELL L. SPARLING
BRIAN L. WALKUP
DAVID M. WEETMAN
THOMAS D. WHELAN
DEPUTIES

Honorable Don Mulford
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94612

Firearms - #26483

Dear Mr. Mulford:

You have asked for information regarding the carrying of concealed firearms. We will answer your questions serially.

QUESTION NO. 1

Does Chapter 960 of the Statutes of 1967 (A.B. 1591), which prohibits the carrying of a loaded firearm in specified circumstances, apply to the carrying of a concealed firearm by a retired federal peace officer?

OPINION AND ANALYSIS NO. 1

The provisions of Chapter 960 of the Statutes of 1967 contain no exception for the carrying of concealed firearms by retired federal peace officers per se. Consequently, retired federal peace officers are a class subject to the prohibitions of Chapter 960 of the Statutes of 1967.

We note, however, that any particular retired federal peace officer might be excepted from the prohibitions of Chapter 960 by virtue of his coming within one of the numerous exceptions to the chapter's provisions, e.g., by possessing a valid license to carry a concealed firearm (Pen. C., Secs. 171c, 117d, and 12031, subd. (b), para. (6)).

Honorable Don Mulford - p. 2 - #26483

QUESTION NO. 2

✓ Does any state law permit a retired federal peace officer, as such, to carry a concealed firearm without a license to do so?

OPINION AND ANALYSIS NO. 2

We have found no state law which permits a retired federal peace officer, as such, to carry a concealed firearm without a license to do so.

QUESTION NO. 3

Is it a violation of any state law for a retired federal peace officer to carry a concealed and loaded firearm into the legislative chambers in the State Capitol?

OPINION AND ANALYSIS NO. 3

Section 171c of the Penal Code prohibits the bringing of a loaded firearm into, or the possession of a loaded firearm within, the State Capitol, subject to specified exceptions.

Assuming that the retired federal peace officer in question does not come within any of the exceptions to the above prohibitions, e.g., the possession of a valid license to carry a concealed firearm (Pen. C., Secs. 171c, 12025, and 12050 et seq.), his carrying of a concealed and loaded firearm into the legislative chambers in the State Capitol constitutes a violation of Section 171c of the Penal Code.

✓ Section 12025 of the Penal Code generally prohibits carrying of a concealed firearm without a license, subject to certain exceptions (see Pen. C. Sec. 12027). As noted above, there is no exception for retired federal peace officers as such. Unless the retired federal peace officer possesses a license or falls within an excepted class he would also be in violation of Section 12025.

Very truly yours,

George H. Murphy
Legislative Counsel

By 
Everett Avila
Deputy Legislative Counsel

August 22, 1967

Mr. Gilbert W. Colby
1 Plaza Drive
Berkeley, California 94705

Dear Mr. Colby:

Thank you for your recent letter to Assemblyman Mulford concerning his gun-control bill. The Assemblyman is on vacation. He will return to Sacramento September 4.

In answer to your question, Section 171e of the bill applies only to schools, the Capitol, or the homes and meeting places of the constitutional officers and members of the Legislature. "Immediate possession" means the ammunition must be on one's person or readily available. However, this is a determination that might have to be decided by a court of law.

The new law does not apply to your duck club. It is the opinion of the legal consultant to the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure that guests and employees of the club are exempted, along with the general membership.

If I can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Please be assured that I will bring your letter to the attention of Assemblyman Mulford on his return to Sacramento.

Cordially,

Dlyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

GILBERT W. COLBY
1 PLAZA DRIVE
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94705

AUG 9 1967

August 7, 1967.

Mr. Don Mulford, Member California Legislature,
State Capital,
Sacramento, California 95814.

Honorable Mr. Mulford,

I contribute to your campaign and am an ardent supporter of most of your policies and a great booster of yours. However, I have a comment which I offer, which may or may not be of interest. I would appreciate a reply as to what I do next to find the ~~answer~~ answer.

In your letter of August 2, in response to mine of the 30th of July you kindly sent me 2 copies of the law you introduced (rather the bill) re gun controls.

I think, and consider myself reasonably intelligent-tho not a Phi Beta-as I graduated from U. of C. at Berkeley in 1928 and then from the Harvard Business School in 1930 receiving the degree "MBA with Distinction". This latter is equivalent to the degree in regular colleges of Cum Laude. I only cite the above, not for any personal reason, but to show that I do have a bit more education, of a formal nature admittedly, than the average citizen and taxpayer of this state. Notwithstanding all of my education I find it most lacking, and perhaps I need to go to some other school, college, or what not, in order for me to understand certain phases of this bill. My point, in all this round about dissertation is: "If I can't understand the bill, and I know other intelligent hunters are in a similar dilemma because of conversations with them since the bill became law, where do I find the answer. I DEFINITELY DESIRE AND WANT TO OBEY THE LAW-but I don't understand what the law requires, to wit:

1. What is meant by the words "immediate possession" in Sec. 171e? Does it mean in my hands (Yes, I would say); in my hunting coat pocket? on the floor in the rear seat area of my car and no one is occupying that section? On the rear floor if someone else is occupying one of the rear seats? If it can be on rear seat floor-how high off the floor may it be? In the rear trunk area locked with a key on my possession, either on my key ring in my pants pocket, or on the dashboard with my ignition key? In an entirely different vehicle-in which case what distance apart must the two vehicles be? Etc, Etc-

2. I have belonged to a duck club for 40 years or so and I am pleased to note that in Section 12031, subdivision K (b), sub paragraph (4) it states: "***members of shooting clubs while hunting on the premises of such clubs" ~~are~~ are not bound by the new law. I ask, inasmuch as the act is silent on this point, are ^{clubs} ~~clubs~~ of such members also exempt from the act? If so why were they not included--also what about employees of such clubs? Further it states: "***on the premises of such clubs". We lease our lands and do not own them, does this qualify us under this section or does this section only apply to those actually owning such land.

You can see my dilemma. I want to obey the law but don't know what it means. Where can I obtain such information (I would like it soon as dove season starts Sept. 1st)? I think the Fish & Game Dept. or some other agency of the state-perhaps the Attorney General's office should issue clarifying date for ~~the~~ "ignorant" ^{FIREARMS POLICY ORG/RESOURCES} you, there are plenty.

Looking forward to an early reply, I remain, yours respectfully,

G. Colby

August 22, 1967

Mr. Gary Forth
9500 Steele Street
Rosemead, California 91770

Dear Mr. Forth:

Thank you for your recent letter to
Assemblyman Don Mulford concerning his
gun-control bill.

Assemblyman Mulford is on vacation.
He will return to Sacramento September 4.

I am enclosing a copy of AB 1591, as
you requested. Nothing in this bill
prohibits citizens from having loaded
weapons in their homes or places of
business. I have underlined the section
of the bill pertaining to your query.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

ek
Enclosure

7-28-67

DEAR MR. MULFORD;

I AM WRITING THIS LETTER IN
REGARD TO YOUR GUN LEGISLATION
RECENTLY SIGNED INTO LAW.

I WOULD APPRECIATE A COPY OF
YOUR BILL IF POSSIBLE.

WOULD YOU ANSWER ONE QUESTION
FOR ME? DOES YOUR LEGISLATION
PREVENT CITIZENS FROM DEFENDING
THEIR HOMES AGAINST RIOTERS AS
THE BELOW ARTICLE STATES?

THANK YOU

GARY FORTH
9500 STEELE ST.
ROSEMEAD, CALIF.
91770

August 22, 1967

Mrs. R. B. Schell
11028 Vena Avenue
Mission Hills, California 91340

Dear Mrs. Schell:

Thank you for your recent card concerning Assemblyman Don Mulford's gun control bill. I am enclosing a copy of the measure for your information.

Assemblyman Mulford is on vacation. He will return to Sacramento September 4.

The new law does not prohibit citizens from taking firearms and ammunition to gun clubs. The section of the law pertaining to, "immediate possession" concerns only schools, the Capitol, homes and meeting places of the constitutional officers and members of the Legislature.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

ek
Enclosure

JUL 31 1967
Dear Sir: If your law "does not work
any hardship on the legitimate citizen or the
hunter" and "a gun shall be deemed loaded
if both the firearm and its ammunition" are
in the immediate possession of the same
person" making an individual with an unloaded
gun & a pocketful of ammunition subject to the
act. (L.A. HERALD EXAMINER - p. 8 - 7/27/67) — HOW DOES
ONE DRIVE TO A GUN CLUB TO target shoot WITHOUT
BREAKING THE LAW? This is puzzling please explain.
Mrs R. B. Schell

MRS. R. B. SCHELL
11028 VENA AVE
MISSION HILLS
CALIF. 91340



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

U.S. POSTAGE

ASSEMBLYMAN DON MULFORD
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

August 22, 1967

Mrs. Harold Kirby, Jr.
1028 Cragmont Avenue
Berkeley, California 94708

Dear Mrs. Kirby:

Thank you for your recent letter to Assemblyman Don Mulford concerning gun-control laws.

The Assemblyman is on vacation. He will return to Sacramento September 4.

I am sure you are aware of the major gun-control bill to win approval in the Legislature and to be signed by Governor Reagan this year, was authored by Assemblyman Mulford.

I am enclosing a copy of the measure for your information.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

ek
Enclosure

1028 Cragmont Avenue
Berkeley, California 94708
August 1, 1967

Re Gun-control law

Assemblyman Don Mulford
STATE Capitol
Sacramento

Dear Mr. Mulford,

Apparently gun-control laws are meeting with resistance in the state legislature, the least controversial one (S7chickade) barely passing in the Senate.

Are the legislators influenced by the National Rifle Association and other lobbyists as has been true in Washington for years?
It is high time our governing bodies put the welfare of everyone before lobbyists.
I hope you will urge the passage of the strongest measure.

Sincerely,

Wayne T. Kirby
(Mrs. Harold Kirby, Jr.)

August 22, 1967

Mr. Robert F. Wagner
270 Perkins Street
Oakland, California 94610

Dear Mr. Wagner:

Thank you for your recent letter to Assemblyman Don Mulford concerning his gun-control bill. I am enclosing a copy of the measure for your information.

Assemblyman Mulford is on vacation. He will return to Sacramento September 4.

Please be assured that I will bring your letter to the Assemblyman's attention on his return to Sacramento.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

ek
Enclosure

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

Oakland, California

August 4, 1967

Don Mulford, Assemblyman
California Legislature
State Capitol
Sacramento, California.

Dear Mr. Mulford:

May I ask if your Gun Law will include the Black Panthers.

It seems to me that the armed invasion of the State Capitol Building and a Oakland Court Room certainly should draw more than a dismissal of the charges. SEE ATTACHED NEWSPAPER CLIPPING.

Since I am on the subject of the UNTOUCHABLES, your law will certainly not protect the citizens of this State from being beaten, robbed, raped and stomped to death if they venture on the streets in any neighborhood after dark. The Gangs that prey on old people do not need guns. What chance has a 70 year old man or woman have against a gang of hoodlums.

In my opinion, we should have enforcement of our present laws, not enact new laws to deprive law abiding citizens of protection if needed.

Yours truly,



Robert F. Wagner
270 Perkins St.
Oakland, California 94610

16 Oakland Tribune ...urs., July 27, 1967

4 Charges Against 'Panther' Dropped

Four charges against Bobby Hutton, 17, a member of the Black Panther Party, were dropped in Oakland yesterday. Earlier, he pleaded guilty in Sacramento to a misdemeanor charge of disturbing a State Assembly session.

Alameda County Juvenile Judge Robert K. Barber dropped the local charges after insufficient facts were produced.

Hutton, of 898 56th St., was charged with disturbing the peace, carrying a weapon in public, possession of a dangerous firearm while under 18 years of age, and outraging public decency.

The charges grew out of an attempt by Hutton and Panther generalissimo Bobby

Seale, 30, to enter the Municipal Court of Judge Martin N. Pulich May 23.

In the Sacramento case, Hutton was accused of disturbing the Assembly by joining 23 other Panthers who entered the State Capitol May 2 carrying weapons.

Hutton was ordered transferred to the custody of the Alameda County juvenile authorities for determination of sentence.

Charges were dismissed against Oleander Harrison, Lafayette Robinson, and Ordell Butler, all of Oakland, and James Dowell of Richmond.

Six adult members of the Panthers also pleaded guilty to the misdemeanor charges.

AB 1591

August 21, 1967

Mr. E. H. Erwin
1375 Missouri Street
San Diego, California 92109

Dear Mr. Erwin:

Thank you for your letter of August 17 in which you ask for two copies of arms control bills signed by the Governor.

For your information, I am enclosing copies of AB 1323, AB 1324, AB 1325, AB 1326 and AB 1591.

If this office can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

CW:mvk

Enclosures

REC'D AUG 15 1967

1375 Mission St.
San Diego, Calif. 92109
August 14, 1967

Sen. Don Mulford
Calif. State Assemblyman

Dear Sir:

Please send me two (2) copies of
the Arms Control Bill that Gov. Reagan
signed on July 27, 1967.

Thanking you kindly in advance.

Respectfully yours,
E. N. Erwin

AB 1323
AB 1324
AB 1325
AB 1326
AB 1591

*Gun Law and Wanted
Study Law
Enforcement*

August 14, 1967

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Graber
5542 Harvey Avenue
Oakland, California

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Graber:

Thank you for your letter of June 28. Assemblyman Mulford is out of the office on vacation and will return after Labor Day.

Before he left, he asked me to let you know how much he appreciated your very kind letter and that your views will always be welcome in this office.

If we can be of any assistance to you in the future, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Cordially,

Clyde Walthall
Administrative Assistant

CW:mvk

JUN 29 1967

5542 Harvey Avenue
Oakland, California

June 28, 1967

Don Mulford
State Assemblyman

Dear Sir:

We do favor your request for a committee to investigate and study State Law Enforcement Agencies.

Sir, we agree with this and would like to see more security at all state properties. We also feel that there should be more coordination between Depts. With the recent increase of Crime, narcotic usage, and general violations of laws, along with the unrest among people, what with every Community on the verge of Riots and disturbances, we feel every security must be taken. It has always been our theory that prevention is the

- 2 -

important factor.

We were well pleased at the passage of the gun law, which you sponsored, this was badly needed.

We are certainly pleased and thankful to you for your determined interest for the people and our State. Keep up the fine work.

Sincerely,

Mr. Edward Graber

OFFICE OF
C. E. BROWN
CHIEF OF POLICE



December 22, 1967

Hon. Don Mulford, Assemblyman
2150 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94612

Dear Sir:

I thought you might be interested in the fact that the revisions of the Penal Code concerning the carrying of loaded firearms, under your instigation, were very important to our citizenry last night.

Co-incident with the funeral services in our city of a murdered San Francisco Police Officer, two alleged black panthers were observed carrying a .30 caliber M1 Carbine in our downtown business area. We also had other problems from the panthers directly connected with the funeral.

Because of the new teeth in the law, we were able to minimize the effect the panthers wished to convey by searching and identifying them and their weapon.

No arrest was made because the weapon was not loaded and ammunition was not immediately available to them. We were, however, able to immediately allay the fears of merchants and citizens present.

It also enabled us to legally contact, identify and surveille the men without fear of being accused of illegal search or harrassment.

Thanks for the good work on behalf of law enforcement.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "C. E. Brown".

C. E. BROWN
Chief of Police

CEB:ML

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

From ASSEMBLYMAN DON MULFORD

Date May 25, 1967

To Legislative Counsel

Re: Para-military law

Why can't they?

fd

enclosure

Para-Military Law on Books

State
Union
SIS 207

Editor, The Union: In connection with the recent armed invasion of the Legislature by the group calling themselves Black Panthers, I question this particular escapade as a sham which hides their real motive.

We have on our books the para-military law, rammed through the Legislature by our attorney general several years ago, which fits this exact case. Why is it this group of armed men are

not indicted under our para-military law?

Or is this another of those laws to be kept hidden in the records and utilized at the discretion of whomever should be temporarily in power?

The laws of our government are for the benefit of all citizens.

MRS. PHILIP H. KOLBY
Rancho Cordova

OCT 3 1968

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
State of California

THOMAS C. LYNCH
Attorney General

OPINION

of

No. 68/175

THOMAS C. LYNCH
Attorney General
EDWARD W. BERGTHOLDT
Deputy Attorney General

OCT 3 - 1968

THE HONORABLE WALTER T. SHANNON, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, has requested an opinion on the following questions:

1. Does the term "firearm" as used in Penal Code section 12031 include rifles and shotguns?
2. Does Penal Code section 12031 prohibit the carrying of a rifle or shotgun with unexpended shells or cartridges in the magazine on a public road in an unincorporated area where there are no local ordinances or other laws or regulations prohibiting the discharge of firearms?
3. Does Penal Code section 374c make every "public road or highway" a "prohibited area," as defined in section 12031?
4. Is the term "public street" as used in section 12031 synonymous with "public road or highway" as used in Penal Code section 374c?
5. Would the "safety zone" described in Fish and Game Code section 3004 be considered a "prohibited area" as defined in section 12031(d)?

The conclusions are:

1. The term "firearm" as used in Penal Code section 12031 includes rifles and shotguns.

DD WAP Central File CE

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

2. Penal Code section 12031 does not prohibit the carrying of a rifle or shotgun with unexpended shells or cartridges in the magazine on a public road in an unincorporated area where there are no local ordinances or other laws or regulations prohibiting the discharge of firearms.

3. Penal Code section 374c does make every "public road or highway" a "prohibited area" as defined in section 12031.

4. The term "public street" as used in section 12031 is not synonymous with "public road or highway" as used in Penal Code section 374c.

5. The "safety zone" described in Fish and Game Code section 3004 is a "prohibited area" as defined in section 12031, but carrying of loaded weapons is proscribed therein only when it coincides with a "public place."

ANALYSIS

Penal Code section 12031 was enacted by the 1967 Legislature as an urgency measure and provides in part as follows:

"(a) . . . every person who carries a loaded firearm on his person or in a vehicle while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city or in any public place or on any public street in a prohibited area of unincorporated territory is guilty of a misdemeanor.

"(d) As used in this section 'prohibited area' means any place where it is unlawful to discharge a weapon.

"(e) A firearm shall be deemed to be loaded for the purposes of this section when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell, consisting of a case which holds a charge of powder and a bullet or shot, in, or attached in any manner to, the firearm, including, but not limited to, in the firing chamber,

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

magazine, or clip thereof attached to the firearm; except that a muzzle-loader firearm shall be deemed to be loaded when it is capped or primed and has a powder charge and ball or shot in the barrel or cylinder." (Emphasis added.)

In order to respond properly to the questions raised, it is necessary to look at the circumstances surrounding the enactment of section 12031 and the attitude of the Legislature to these circumstances.

In April 1967 Assembly Bill 1591 was introduced and included the addition of section 12031 to the Penal Code. At this time it prohibited the carrying of a loaded firearm on a public street or in a public place in an incorporated city. On May 2, 1967, members of the Black Panther organization entered the Assembly Chambers armed with "pistols, rifles and at least one sawed-off shotgun," all to the great alarm of the members of the Assembly. The Sacramento Bee, May 2, 1967, at 1 A.B. 1591 was then made an urgency measure. The provisions of the proposed section 12031 were expanded to extend the application of the section to certain parts of unincorporated areas. The revised bill also proposed the addition of sections 171c, 171d, and 171e to the Penal Code. These sections prohibited the carrying of loaded firearms at the State Capitol, at public schools, including state colleges and the University of California, and at the Governor's Mansion or residence of any elected state officials.

The urgency clause first appended to A.B. 1591 referred to organized bands of men "armed with loaded firearms" entering the Assembly Chambers. This was a clear reference to the appearance of members of the Black Panther organization referred to above. A.B. 1591 was subsequently enacted into law (Stats. 1967, ch. 960, p. 2459) as an urgency measure. The urgency clause of the bill as enacted reads as follows:

"The State of California has witnessed, in recent years, the increasing incidence of organized groups and individuals publicly arming themselves for purposes inimical to the peace and safety of the people of California.

"Existing laws are not adequate to protect the people of this state from either the use of such weapons or from violent incidents arising from the mere presence of such armed individuals in public places. Therefore, in order to prevent the potentially tragic consequences

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

of such activities, it is imperative that this statute take effect immediately."

Although this final version of the clause is broader than its earlier versions, it remains clear that the Legislature did not direct the provisions of section 12031 against all uses of firearms but only at uses of firearms which are "inimical to the peace and safety of the people of California."

Question No. 1 requests an opinion whether the word "firearm" in section 12031 includes rifles and shotguns. The word "firearm" includes rifles and shotguns.

The fact that this section is a part of this state's Dangerous Weapons Control Law (Penal Code Part IV, Title 2, Chapter 1, commencing with section 12000), dealing with concealed weapons, might suggest its limitation to such weapons. Reading Penal Code section 12031 in its entirety suggests, however, that "firearm" includes rifles and shotguns. Subdivision (b), subparagraph (4) talks of "hunting," an activity which more often involves rifles or shotguns than pistols or revolvers, and subparagraph (8) uses the word "weapon" without any restriction such as "concealed." In subdivisions (d) and (j) the word "weapon" appears again without any restriction.

The inclusion of rifles and shotguns within the definition of "firearm" is also suggested by the circumstances surrounding its enactment and the wording of the urgency clause. There can, therefore, be little doubt that the word "firearm," as it appears in section 12031, is not limited in meaning to "concealed weapons," as defined in Penal Code section 12001. We must conclude that the word "firearm" as used in section 12031 embraces, among other weapons, rifles and shotguns. 1/

Question No. 2 requests an opinion whether section 12031 prohibits the carrying of a loaded firearm on a public road in an unincorporated area. We conclude that section 12031 does not prohibit the carrying of loaded firearms on such public ways. For the reasons set forth in our answer to question No. 4, the term "public streets" in section 12031 (a) must be given a narrow construction. There is a distinction between "public roads" and "public streets" which is discussed

1/ For a comprehensive discussion of all the laws of this state relating to firearms see Assem. Int. Comm. on Crim. Proc., Regulation and Control of Firearms, 22 Assembly Reports 1963-1965, No. 6 (1965).

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

more fully below. The proscriptions of section 12031 are therefore not applicable to "public roads" because they are not "public streets" as that term is used in section 12031. 2/

Question No. 3 requests an opinion whether Penal Code section 374c 3/ makes every "public road" a "prohibited area" as defined by section 12031. Because the discharge of firearms is prohibited on "public roads and highways," these public ways are by definition "prohibited areas" (section 12031(d)). This does not, however, alter our conclusion that the proscriptions of section 12031 are not applicable to such public ways because, as set forth in our response to your question No. 4, the term "public road or highway" is not synonymous with the term "public street".

Question No. 4 requests an opinion whether the term "public street" in section 12031 is synonymous with the term "public road or highway" used in Penal Code section 374c. Our response is that the terms "public road or highway" are not synonymous with the term "public street".

The discussion above regarding the Legislature's purpose in enacting section 12031 suggests that the term "public street" is to be given a narrow meaning. The thrust of the section is not against the use of all firearms but only against use "inimical to the peace and safety of the people of California." Further, the application of the section's prohibition to unincorporated areas is modified by the injection

2/ The carrying of a rifle or shotgun in a vehicle with an unexpended round in the chamber is prohibited on "public highways" by Fish and Game Code section 2006, which provides in part:

"It is unlawful to possess a loaded rifle or shotgun in any vehicle . . . which is standing on or along or is being driven on or along any public highway or other way open to the public.

"A rifle or shotgun shall be deemed loaded . . . when there is an unexpended cartridge or shell in the firing chamber but not when the only cartridges or shells are in the magazine."

3/ Penal Code section 374c provides: "Every person who shoots any firearm from or upon a public road or highway is guilty of a misdemeanor." (Emphasis added.)

of the concept, "prohibited area". It is clear, therefore, that the Legislature intended that there be a recognizable distinction in applying the prohibition of section 12031 as between incorporated areas and unincorporated areas. To make "public streets" synonymous with "public roads and highways" would leave little meaningful difference between incorporated and unincorporated areas.

Additionally, earlier versions of A.B. 1591 would have amended Fish and Game Code section 2006. Such amendment was designed to conform the definition of a loaded rifle or shotgun in Fish and Game Code section 2006 to the definition of a loaded firearm in Penal Code section 12031. Section 2006 applies on all "public highway[s] or other way[s] open to the public." The failure of the Legislature to enact such an amendment to section 2006 suggests that it did not intend that section 2006 be superseded by section 12031. Had it desired section 2006 to be superseded, it would have either amended its definition of a loaded weapon to conform to section 12031 or repealed it entirely.

For these reasons we must conclude that the Legislature intended the term "public streets" be given a narrow meaning. It is not synonymous, then, with "public roads and highways," but includes only the public ways of towns and villages and not the "open roads" in rural sections of unincorporated areas.

Attention should also be called to the effect of Penal Code section 415 which provides: "Every person who . . . fire[s] any gun or pistol in . . . [an] unincorporated town . . . is guilty of a misdemeanor . . ." Section 12031(d) defines a "prohibited area" as "any place where it is unlawful to discharge a weapon." An unincorporated town thereby becomes a "prohibited area." The proscription of section 12031 is applicable to the "public streets" of such towns and to all "public places" therein. We have therefore "public places" and "public streets" in the narrow sense where the discharge of firearms are prohibited and thus the concurrence of the necessary factors to bring the proscriptions into play.

Question No. 5 requests an opinion whether the

MULFORD ACT FILES - ACQUIRED BY FIREARMS POLICY COALITION

term "safety zone" in Fish and Game Code section 3004 ^{4/} is a "prohibited area." The answer is in the affirmative, subject to the qualifications given below.

The "safety zone" described in Fish and Game Code section 3004 which lies in unincorporated areas is a "prohibited area" as that term is defined by section 12031(d). Again, however, for the proscriptions of section 12031 to be applicable, there must be a concurrence of a "prohibited area" and a "public place." Further, "public places" which do not have a building located thereon (e.g., a park) would not be "prohibited areas" and, thus, the proscription of section 12031 would not be applicable. The same would be true for those areas of "public places" more than 150 yards from any building.

It should also be noted that certain persons are excepted from the operation of Fish and Game Code section 3004. Because this exception is not in conflict with the intent of the Legislature these persons would be exempt in any case from the proscriptions of 12031.

* * * * *

4/ Fish and Game Code section 3004 states:

"It is unlawful for any person, other than the owner, person in possession of the premises, or a person having the express permission of the owner or person in possession of the premises, to hunt or to discharge while hunting, any firearm . . . within 150 yards of any occupied dwelling house, residence, or other building or any barn or other outbuilding used in connection therewith. The 150-yard area is a 'safety zone.'"