

SENATE JUDICIARY  
Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Date 3-28-07  
Bill No. HB 340

ownership.

Responsible adults — both male and female — have both a right and a need to defend themselves and their families, with lethal force if necessary. If domestic violence advocates had focused on putting a gun in Jessica's hand and training her to use it, then the three Gonzales children might still be alive. After all, Jessica knew where her husband was. Indeed, she informed the police repeatedly of his location.

Of course, the Gonzales case — in and of itself — presents difficulties for the use of armed force by private citizens. Would the same police who believed Simon Gonzales was not dangerous have believed Jessica to be justified in picking up a gun to protect her children from him? Would the police have charged her for use of a weapon? Regardless, these sticky debates would probably be taking place in the presence of three living children and not three dead ones.

Nevertheless, most anti-domestic violence advocates strenuously avoid gun ownership as a possible solution to domestic violence. Instead, they appeal for more police intervention even though the police have no obligation to provide protection.

When groups like the National Organization for Women (NOW) do focus on gun ownership, it is to make such statements as, "Guns and domestic violence make a lethal combination, injuring and killing women every day."

In short, NOW addresses the issue of gun ownership and domestic violence only in order to demand a prohibition on the ability of abusers — always defined as men — to own weapons.

That position may be defensible. But it ignores half of the equation. It ignores the need of potential victims to defend themselves and their families. Anti-domestic violence and women's groups create the impression that guns are always part of the problem and never part of the solution.

The current mainstream of feminism — from which most anti-domestic violence advocates proceed — is an expression of left liberalism. It rejects private solutions based on individual rights in favor of laws aimed at achieving social goals. A responsible individual holding a gun in self-defense does not fit their vision of society.

In the final analysis, such advocates do not trust the judgment of the women they claim to be defending. They do not believe that Jessica Gonzales' three children would have been safer with a mother who was armed and educated in gun use.

The clear message of Gonzales bears repeating because you will not hear it elsewhere. The police have no obligation to protect individuals who, therefore, should defend themselves. The content of state laws does not matter; by Colorado State law, the police are required to "use every reasonable means to enforce a protection order." The Supreme Court has ruled and that's that.

In the wake of Gonzales, every anti-domestic violence advocate should advise victims — male or female — to learn self-defense. They should lobby for the repeal of any law or policy that hinders responsible gun ownership.

The true meaning of being anti-domestic violence means is to help victims out of their victimhood and into a position of power.

*Wendy McElroy is the editor of ifeminists.com and a research fellow for The Independent Institute in Oakland, Calif. She is the author and editor of many books and articles, including the new book, "Liberty for Women: Freedom and Feminism in the 21st Century" (Ivan R. Dee/Independent Institute, 2002). She lives with her husband in Canada.*

Respond to the Writer

SEARCH



[Click here for FOX News RSS Feeds](#)

**Advertise on FOX News Channel, FOXNews.com and FOX News Radio**

Jobs at FOX News Channel.  
Internships At Fox News (Summer Application Deadline is March 15, 2007)  
Terms of use. Privacy Statement. For FOXNews.com comments write to foxnews@foxnews.com; For FOX News Channel comments write to comments@foxnews.com

© Associated Press. All rights reserved.  
This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.