

ATTENTION: The European Commission already voided the results gathered by this poll in the past 24 hours, stating that “they had been falsified”. So let's not give them an excuse to ignore the will and the opinion of hundreds of thousands of honest European citizens.

*DON'T GIVE IN TO LAZINESS: DO NOT CUT-AND-PASTE WHAT YOU READ ON THIS PAGE OR ANYWHERE ELSE.* Write something that's yours and yours only.

Hereby is a list of what we oppose and why. Keep this list in mind, but once again, *NO CUT-AND-PASTE!*

- This proposal would be flat-out impossible to implement, as it requires hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of firearms and deactivated firearms Europe-wide to be rounded up and destroyed. The cost in terms of money and effort for the European Union and for the EU-member Countries would be staggering high.
- A total ban on Category B7 firearms – both operational and deactivated – would be extremely unpopular, as those are currently the top-selling civilian firearms in Europe and the most sought-after by the younger generation of shooters.
- A total ban on Category B7 firearms would cause harm to the European economy as it would cause a shrinkage, if not an outright collapse, on the legal sporting and civilian guns market.
- According to the European Commission, the ban on Category B7 firearms – both operational and deactivated – would bear “zero cost”. But this would mean raids on gun owners' properties and confiscation without compensation. This would be illegal as per EU rules and unconstitutional in all EU-member Countries. As such, the reaction of some law-abiding owners could be energetic and cause public safety issues.
- Making deactivated firearms, blank-firing guns, alarm guns, and generically-described “replicas” fall under the scope of the European Firearms Directive as Category C guns would mean force all owners of the above-mentioned non-firearms to ask for a gun license to maintain them, and then register them with their local law enforcement. The lack of a definition for “replicas” could cause even toy guns and Airsofts to be submitted to licensing and registration requirements. Plus, the effort in worktime and money for national law enforcement agencies would be unbearable all around Europe, and the rate of non-compliance – due to refusal or just outright ignorance of the new law requirements – would be extremely high, turning hundreds of thousands of law-abiding citizens into criminals overnight.
- There is no need for “common criteria” for marking firearms. Even if a serial number is filed off, the effect on the punch that marks the gun in the factory goes so deep in the metal or polymer that a serial number can be still read with forensics instruments unless the part where the serial number has been imprinted is totally cut off (thus making the gun inoperable). The “need for common criteria” is just an excuse to force the industry to adopt expensive microstamping measures which would cause some companies to exit the market as they couldn't afford them – thus shrinking the market – and forcing surviving manufacturers to finance the acquisition of microstamping technologies by raising the cost of their guns.
- There's no need for further restrictions on On-Line sales. As of today, several EU-member Countries already have a total ban in place for On-Line sales of firearms, ammunition, and

essential gun parts. In those Countries where On-Line sales is legal, strict criteria are in place to make sure that all those components can only be ordered by a licensed gun owner, that the parcel travels always under strict surveillance, and that only the individual who placed the order can receive it in person. Such restrictions are actually aimed to hit the On-Line market of some kind of accessories (“tactical” optics and add-ons, gun-lights, lasers, etc.), that politicians at EU level and in many member Countries would like to see become MIL/LE items only. Furthermore it would hit the On-Line sales of non-essential parts, used by countless shooters to perform small repairs and ordinary maintenance of their guns at home; further restrictions would cause ordinary maintenance of legally-held guns to become harder and more expensive, thus becoming a deterrent to gun ownership instead.

- Common criteria for the deactivation of firearms and for the manufacture of blank-firing replicas should be cautiously pondered. You can not ask the industry to completely modify their manufacturing procedures, and owners of deactivated guns shouldn't be forced to cut their expensive paperweights in four parts. Plus, even if front-firing blank guns and the so-called *Expansion Weapons* (firearms deactivated in a “mild” form in order to be easily reactivated) were to be more strictly regulated, those items have a legitimate market – think of the movie industry and the preparation of custom models – that must be safeguarded.
- Better communication and information exchange among EU-member Countries should be carefully pondered. Interlinking all the national databases on gun owners would allow those who manage them to know basically everything about all European citizens who own firearms; measures must be put in place to secure those datas and make sure that only authorized, vetted officials can access them – and with a case-by-case justified reason, not “just to check on” someone. Furthermore, interlinking the national databases increases the risk that malicious individuals may gain illegal access on the personal data of all European gun owners just by cracking one single system.
- Last, but most important: none, absolutely *none* of the measures included in the draft amending the European Firearms Directive could have stopped the Paris attacks, nor will ever stop criminals, terrorists and madmen from obtaining military-grade weaponry and explosives.