

16 MAR 2009

Memo to members of the CT General Assembly

Subject: Proposed legislation mandating micro printing on newly sold firearms

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to make several points in stating my opposition to the idea of causing future firearms sales in this state to be predicated on the adoption of micro stamping capability.

First, let me give my credentials. I served a total of 36 years in the military. I served 8 years (1972-1980) as an auxiliary policeman in Meriden. I worked for 21 years as a Military Technician for the CT Army National Guard. About fifteen years of this full-time employment was in the capacity of Small Arms Repairer, Armament Inspector and Armament Maintenance Supervisor. I worked primarily on small arms – pistols, rifles, machine guns, grenade launchers as well as an occasional revolver. I also served in Baghdad, Iraq in 2004-2005.

Micro printing? What is it? It is the idea that by putting tiny markings on the tip of the firing pin, the primer of the fired shell can be traced to a particular firearm. Presumably, this would enable police to determine the weapon used in a crime. Let's look a little closer.

How difficult is it to change a firing pin? Well, in the case of a M1911A1 caliber .45 pistol, it would take less than 10 seconds. Revolvers, would involve a little more time and work, but certainly would not be difficult. Anyone who is willing to use a firearm to commit a crime, be it murder or armed robbery, would not be deterred from replacing a firing pin.

Even easier, how much trouble would it be to dress the tip of the firing pin with fine sandpaper or a stone? Since this micro stamping would be microscopic, it would be very shallow. Even if it was not purposely removed, how long would it take to wear off? Anyone with any knowledge of firearms could see how unrealistic a scheme like this is.

If this is an impractical idea, it means one of two things. Either that the person proposing it has no idea of what he or she is talking about, or it is just one more attempt of attack one of our fundamental rights.

Over the last forty plus years, I have witnessed a continuous assault on our right to keep and bear arms, a right protected not only by our federal Constitution, but also by the Constitution of Connecticut. Why is it that many of our public servants, men and women pledged to protect our rights, continue to undermine them? I have seen the Second

Amendment assaulted by such terms as “assault weapons”, “cop-killer bullets”, “Saturday night specials” and other words to generate fear and revulsion toward firearms.

I have heard that the only purpose of a firearm is to kill people. Do policemen carry firearm so that they can kill people? Of course not. They carry firearms to protect themselves, and that’s the reason we all do.

We hear about a weapon have no legitimate “sporting” purpose, as it the purpose of the Second Amendment was duck hunting. This is really insulting. They Founders were not concerned about our hobbies, they were concerned with our freedoms.

We hear that we don’t need firearms for our protection today, we don’t have to worry about hostile Indians or the Redcoats. Well, just recently we had a home invasion in Cheshire. Would it have helped if there were firearms in the house? I don’t know, but I know that it certainly wouldn’t have made the situation any worse.

Some of our politicians in Washington, DC are working to undermine our Second Amendment while they have a private army protecting them – at our expense. Why don’t they rely on the DC police, like the common people?

As I stated at the beginning of this paper, I served 11 months in Baghdad. I was on the street almost every day, but I worked out of the Republican Palace. There were soldiers from about two dozen countries. Everybody was armed. I had two weapons – an M16A2 rifle and an M9 pistol. Some people had three weapons. Some carried machineguns waking down the hall in the palace. There was NEVER any incidents between any of us. This goes to demonstrate that an armed society is a polite society.

The only time firearms are misused is when someone who is criminally disposed feels an advantage over his victim. In Iraq, we were all armed. Everyone was friendly and polite. Does putting a uniform on change people? No, human nature is consistent, and it is universal. We all had a healthy respect for each other.

Compare this with the situation when a criminal knows that everybody on the street besides himself, is helpless. This is why Washington, DC is the per-capita murder capital of the world. Other than the police (who are usually busy protecting “important” people like politicians) no one else is carrying.

The truth is, the more firearms in private hands, the safer we all are. This goes against the propaganda we continually hear. We are told that we are safer if we don’t have a firearm. That it will probably be used against us. We are safer when we are helpless?

People often ask why the Jews didn’t fight the Nazis. The reason is, they registered their firearms under the Weimar Republic. When the Nazis came to power, they confiscated them. Hitler is reported to have stated “Now we have gun control”.

We either disperse power, or we concentrate it. If power is dispersed, there is freedom. When it is concentrated, we have Nazi Germany, we have the Soviet Union. This is why the Founders put the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights.

As regards the Militia, that refers to able bodied men (and today, presumably women) who are NOT in federal service. I certainly do not believe in private militia, but I strongly believe in the concept of an armed citizenry. I think an armed citizenry is a deterrent.

The civil rights of the American people have suffered under the abuse of our politicians in recent years. We have seen the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments of the Bill of Rights under assault. I am referring to the Patriot Act, the Military Commissions Act, the Protect America Act, the Real ID and the Department of Homeland Terrorism.

Our politicians have invented "emergency powers", not authorized in the Constitution. The idea that a president can declare an emergency, and then assume dictatorial powers, and still not be perceived as a dictator is a concept that escapes me. The idea that we can trust one man (or one woman) is foreign to our concept of Constitutional government. The decision to use these "emergency powers" would in reality be a coup against Constitutional government.

In the Declaration of Independence, we read that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. That means rights that cannot be taken away by any legitimate government. We also read that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. This means that the reason we have government is to protect our rights.

Does it seem correct for us to have to continue to attend public hearing to fight for our rights to protect them from the very people who are sworn to protect those rights?

Thank you for your time.



Gregory H. Butko
3 Hope Hill Rd
Wallingford, CT 06492
203-265-4314