

Login

user:

pass:

login

Remember me

register

[RU](#) [EN](#) [ES](#)

User Menu

Home Page

- «Mirror of the World»
- Support the Site
- Contacts
- Iraq-War board rules

Articles

- Iraq News
- Around the World
- Historical analysis &

facts



- Current analysis
- Economics
- Hot News
- Rankings

Forums

RSS feeds

RSS RSS feed for articles and news

Weather

Baghdad	
	FR, 05/10 +38..+40 °C NE, 6 m/s
Basrah	
	FR, 05/10 +39..+41 °C W, 3 m/s

Calendar-Filter

< Oct >	< 2007 >						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	
28	29	30	31				
Today							

U.N. members move toward gun treaty

By: IC on: 04.10.2007 [05:19] (194 reads)

"Gun" not "Arm"

"Law" is a "war" using "terms and words" as opposed to "missiles and bombs".

By the use of deception, the UN and Governments have made it look like the "Right to Arms for self defence" has been removed but has it?

See below.

(6650 bytes) [c]

U.N. members move toward gun treaty

United Nations — Britain, Japan, Australia and others are pushing for an unprecedented treaty regulating the arms trade worldwide, in a campaign sure to last years and to pit them against a determined American foe, the National Rifle Association.

In what U.N. officials say is an "overwhelming" response, almost 100 governments have submitted ideas for such a treaty, to be reviewed over the next year. There's an "extremely urgent" need for controls on the international gun trade, says Kenya, echoing the sentiment in much of guns-besieged Africa.

But in the U.S., the NRA says it sees a creeping attempt to limit civilian gun ownership within nations — even though the focus now is on setting standards for arms exports and imports.

The international issues "necessarily will come to involve at some point domestic laws and policies regarding firearms," said former congressman Bob Barr, a leading NRA voice on the subject.

"That's not what we're looking at here," countered Greg Puley, of the Control Arms coalition of pro-treaty advocacy groups.

"The point is to control trade in weapons that contribute to conflict and atrocities."

The NRA and other U.S. gun lobbyists have helped blunt earlier efforts at the United Nations to rein in the weapons trade. In December, the U.S. delegation cast the lone negative vote when 153 nations approved a General Assembly resolution initiating this new treaty process.

Now, alone among the world's top 10 arms suppliers, the U.S. — by far the biggest, with almost \$13 billion in arms export agreements in 2005 — has not filed a requested report to the United Nations with its views on a treaty.

"The United States has not yet decided whether it will or will not participate in (the review), and thus we will have no submission at this time," Richard Kidd, a deputy assistant secretary of state, told The Associated Press.

The treaty campaign may encounter resistance beyond Washington as well. The reports from Russia and China, two other big arms exporters, offered only lukewarm endorsement for stricter controls.

"This is just the beginning of the process. There will be a lot said on the issue," noted Pamela Maponga, conventional arms chief in the U.N. Disarmament Affairs Office here.

Britain, a \$3-billion-a-year arms exporter, has spearheaded the effort with a half-dozen co-sponsoring nations, saying unscrupulous traders capitalize on gaps and differences in various nations' export-import laws in order to ship assault rifles and other weapons into areas where they inflame conflict and oppression.

The United States and other industrialized countries generally keep close oversight on arms sales, but dozens of nations have no regulations specific to weapons exports and imports. Only 37 nations, for example, have laws governing the operations of private arms brokers.

In its submission, Britain proposes a legally binding treaty requiring governments to authorize weapons exports only after ascertaining that they will not provoke or prolong armed conflicts, aid in human rights abuses, destabilize countries or undermine peace in other ways.

[http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2007/oct/01/un_members_move_toward_gun_treaty_lobbyists_ready_/](http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2007/oct/01/un_members_move_toward_gun_treaty_lobbyists_ready/)

Arms or Firearms ...

I've spoken on this subject many times and never really produced the evidence for you but here it is.

I have said: If you have an Arm and at some time you have licensed or registered this arm, then you have lost for ever the right to that arm as an arm and it has become in legal terms a "firearm" ... end of story.

However if you own an arm, that has not been registered or licenced as a firearm and you are not registered or licensed as a fire arms holder then there are very good grounds for you to have and hold that arm for the purpose of self defence.

I've said that:

1. An Arm is a defence tool and as such does not come under the legislation of firearms requiring license or registration.

2. A gun, firearm are terms used for sporting toys and as such require registration and license.

Now please take very careful note that:

A. the term "Arm" is not defined in the Arms Act 1983 NZ

B. That firearm is and the interpretation is such that it also includes all motor vehicles in the country.

Note that by sticking a potatoe or other shot, bullet, missile, or other projectile up the exhaust of a car, truck etc. it can be discharged by force of explosive; ... So the definition of firearm is quite vague.

When we see a vague interpretation like this we know theres a trick involved so we look deeper.

In the Defence Act 1990 Interpretation we do not find the term "firearm" at all ... however tucked away carefully for no one to find under VIII: Miscellaneous Provisions is this little beauty. A defence tool is refered to as "ARM's" not a firearm ...

Defence Act 1990 028

Commenced: 1 Apr 1990

VIII: Miscellaneous Provisions like oh we almost forgot to say???

92 Arms, etc., to remain property of the Crown

92. Arms, etc., to remain property of the Crown---(1) All arms, equipment, uniforms, and other public property of any kind supplied by the Crown to the Armed Forces shall be presumed to remain the property of the Crown in the absence of proof to the contrary.

They cannot provide legislation proving the legal removal of arms from the public because there is none. A Right is a Right unless it's deminished by the holder of that Right, and when a man agrees that his Arm is a Firearm at law, his Right to hold an Arm becomes a privilege under "Licence" and cannot be redeemed.

Licence means "The Exemption from prosecution for an act that would normally be illegal".

If it's an Arm at Law by Right, how can it be illegal?

Here's more proof.

If you go to the police to get a "firearms licence" they will ask you first "what do you want a firearm for".

If you say "For defence" they will reject your application ... and rightly so because a firearm is not a defence tool ... but they will not tell you that.

So how does an "arms holder" buy ammo for his "Arm".

Without a "Firearms Licence" no one can buy fully made rounds however anyone can buy cases, bullets, powder and primers without much trouble at all.

If the law was designed to remove the "Right to Arms" surely they would close this loophole ... but they can't.

Try not to be deceived by governments ... an Arm is a bloody Arm not a gun or firearm.

2 comments

<input type="radio"/> Only comments	Comments per page <input type="text" value="50"/>
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Article and comments	<input type="button" value="Send"/>

Prone to defeat

by LittleHelper on 05.10.2007 [05:23]

There is a strain inside the government elite which always souhgt to remove arms/guns completely from the average people and the poor. They want only the government and their representatives, the police, to have the right to carry a weapon.

Never allow your government to succeed with such ideas.

It will inevitably lead into dictatorship.

Unfortunately Littlehelper

by iron_clay on 05.10.2007 [06:16]

there are next to no men left on the planet.

I see evidence only of males.

As soon as their beloved government make demands of the men they pass their balls over through fear of standing out in a crowd.

Unfortunately Littlehelper the number of people that will stand and not bow and worship the governments today are very small.

Especially in the west.

Neal

Page: 1/1

Posting comments:

You should be registered AND logged in user to post comments here.

