



**Episode 836: A Gun Lawyer's Briefing on Where Gun Law Is and Where It's Going**

**Guest: Dick Clark**

**WOODS:** We have serious things to discuss, but before we get into serious things, look, I've got to deal with the elephant in the room here. Your name is Dick Clark.

**CLARK:** That's true.

**WOODS:** Now, you used to go by Richard, so I know it wasn't by accident that you chose to go by Dick Clark. Is the story – is it really the case that you began to go by Dick Clark – I'm trying to remember back ten years ago when we used to have lunch together. The story was you were at a bar and it was New Year's Eve or something and you were betting the bartender a drink if you could prove that your name was Dick Clark. And then from that point on, you realized, hey, it's actually kind of cool to be Dick Clark. Did I imagine that, or is that the truth?

**CLARK:** Well, I think there might be a little innovation on your part in that story –

**WOODS:** [laughing] Oh, too bad, because I wish that – Why don't we retroactively make that the reality?

**CLARK:** You know, what I used to say is one of the fringe benefits of being named Dick Clark is I could never pay for my own drink on New Year's, and so I can see how that could have converted into this story. The answer is my grandfather was Dick Clark, my dad is Dick Clark, and when I ended up in the freshman dorm in Auburn, a kid across the hall from me figured out, Hey, this guy, Richard Clark, I could call him Dick Clark. And it turned out the critical mass for a name change was about 310 folks. Once 310 folks in your immediate vicinity start calling you something new, you really have no choice but to acquiesce. And so that's what happened to me, and I started going by Dick Clark. But that's not all bad. People remember the name a little easier that way, I guess.

**WOODS:** Okay, all right. Well, fair enough. [laughing] I just had to bring that up. All right, let's talk about – You know, you also talk about serious things. Let's talk about some of those serious things. First of all, you moved to Nebraska some years ago, and I guess that's where you're still living?

**CLARK:** That's right, Lincoln, Nebraska.

**WOODS:** And you did some public policy work there.

**CLARK:** Yeah, I was policy advisor to Governor Heineman for several years, and I've worked for some nonprofits like the Platt Institute for Economic Research, Crayton University's Institute for Economic Inquiry. So I'm a little bit of a public policy and economic policy nerd, I guess you could say.

**WOODS:** And I know that you were therefore keeping up with various trends at the state level and where different issues were going, and I thought, well, combine that with your knowledge of guns, and you seem to be a natural person to talk about this, just because there are some questions that I've had as a non-gun guy. Now, I don't mean I don't have a gun. I don't mean that I'm against them or whatever, but I'm not knowledgeable about them.

**CLARK:** Right.

**WOODS:** I'm just not knowledgeable about them. I'm starting to know more, but I have a feeling that there are others like me, and they feel like it would be emasculating if they admitted to this. So I'm going to take one for the team here and ask some of my elementary questions. First of all, start off by telling us what it is that you do today. You're in private practice, but you specialize in a particular kind of case.

**CLARK:** Sure. I'm an attorney in a solo law practice, and primarily I'm helping gun owners. I'm helping gun dealers, manufacturers. And the gist of it is I'm trying to help everybody navigate the very complex federal, state, and local laws that apply in this area. I help a lot of individual gun owners do their estate planning, because transferring a gun to Junior after Dad's death is a little more complicated than transferring the couch out of the living room to Junior after Dad's death, and we want to make sure that people don't get tripped up by this sort of maze of laws and regulations that may apply and that that valuable asset stays in the family, gets where it's supposed to go. So that's a lot of what I do.

And then I also help folks get their civil rights restored. If they've run afoul of some law and ten years later have demonstrated that they're law abiding now and they want to prove it and get those rights back, I help folks apply for pardons and set-asides and other means of what we call post-conviction relief. So that's a lot of what I do.

**WOODS:** Wow, okay. And so you're doing of course all cases in Nebraska? What's your local area?

**CLARK:** Yeah, so I'm admitted to practice in one of your favorite states, Massachusetts, although I'm really inactive there. But that's where I went to law school, so I was licensed there. Just serving a clientele here in Nebraska. Occasionally will consult with attorneys in other states, helping with their clients. But yeah, really here in Nebraska, that's my focus.

**WOODS:** All right, let's start with things that I know more about, and then we're going to proceed little by little to things I know less about. You'd written to me some time ago, and I was just in the throes of a horrifying project and I wasn't able to get

through Facebook messages. But you were writing to me about trends in the states that I've followed a little bit because I'm interested in the Tenth Amendment and nullification, about how states are pushing back against firearm regulations. But give me an example of this, and are these regulations really so onerous?

**CLARK:** Well, they sure can be. So here in Nebraska we're fighting what's called a preemption battle, which is an argument about which level of government ought to regulate these sorts of activities, activities related to firearms. Right now in Nebraska in certain locales – say, Lincoln where I'm sitting right now – you can lose your firearms rights for some fairly trivial events. For example, the city of Lincoln says you're a prohibited person for purposes of firearms ownership and possession if you have any number of misdemeanor past offenses on your record, one of which might be anything to do with a weapons offense.

So we had a gentleman named Kevin Williams here in Lincoln a few years ago who was raided by the police, had a very extensive firearms collection taken from him by force because he once got a \$90 ticket for having a pocket knife that was a quarter inch too long. And because it was in his pocket it was considered a concealed deadly weapon, and the city of Lincoln considered that a weapons violation, such that they decided he couldn't have any right to have a weapon. Now, thankfully some national organizations, nonprofits that are advocates in this area, came in and supported the legal battle to get this guy's rights back, to get his property back as well. But just little minor things, where you don't even necessarily have to appear in court for the violation that you committed, can have very serious collateral consequences for your rights.

And then of course there's a whole patchwork of regulations that may apply where some cities in Nebraska – for example, Omaha – may require registration of handguns, to just legally possess that handgun in the city. They might try to change whether or not you can openly carry a firearm. There are even some cities in Nebraska, like the city of Blaire, that will threaten you with arrest even as a concealed handgun permit holder, and say, Oh, you can only raise the fact that you're a permit holder as a defense once we've got you in criminal court. We may arrest you and charge you with a crime anyway, even though you have a permit to do the thing that you're doing.

And so a lot of people do not realize how extensive these local regulations can be and how in the modern era, where lots of folks are driving an hour in a car – you know, miracle of modern capitalism that you can live 60 miles away from where your occupation is carried out – you could drive through all these different jurisdictions and just be totally oblivious to the fact that your fundamental natural right to keep and bear arms is sort of changing as you're moving down the highway and you might be subject to arrest for something at mile marker 25 that at mile marker 60 is totally legal.

And in the state of Pennsylvania right now, they already have a very strong preemption law, where the state preempts local regulation in this area, but a lot of the local governments are just doing it anyway. And there's a great lawyer named Josh Prince who is suing their pants off right now and to good effect, knocking out these illegal local ordinances. But you know, the folks who are against your gun rights are

fighting tooth and nail to hold on to these tools they have to invade individual liberty, and we're having to beat them back the best we can.

**WOODS:** All right, let's go back to the issue of, in particular, the state pushback against this, because what I've seen is mainly statements by states that if anything comes down further from the Obama administration we're going to push back. So it's kind of like a hypothetical situation. It's not really a: "Here is a specific thing and we are just not going along with it," Is there anything like that?

**CLARK:** Well, there are a number of states that have passed nullification bills into law. Kansas I think is the most important example right now, because there is active litigation on a nullification case in Kansas. So one of the areas that I work on relates to what we call National Firearms Act firearms. Right now the hottest thing in that world are silencers, which are more heavily regulated under this federal gun control law that was passed back in 1934, but it also includes things like short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, a few other items.

And in Kansas, they basically said, Look, you can make one of these items, you can transfer one of these items, and as long as it is not sold interstate, as long as it's just intrastate commerce, we're asserting as the state of Kansas that that is not within the purview of federal regulation, that we are affirmatively telling you, as the citizens of Kansas, that that's legal in the state of Kansas. And so there is a guy down in Kansas — his name escapes me right now — but who made some silencers relying on this state promise of nullification of federal law and was prosecuted by the feds.

So last I saw, the Kansas attorney general is going to bat, making the argument that, Hey, feds, why do you have the right to invade the activities of our Kansans and what they do with firearms just within our state of Kansas? And so that is a hot battle that's going on right now. We don't know what the outcome is going to be. Obviously a lot of folks on the progressive side of things want to just say the word "supremacy clause" and move on. Your book would provide an argument in the opposite direction, but we'll have to wait and see how that goes in the federal courts.

**WOODS:** And of course Dick is referring to my book *Nullification* from 2010, so I'll link to that at [TomWoods.com/836](http://TomWoods.com/836). Speaking of the show notes page, by the way, is it okay to link to your law practice website?

**CLARK:** Sure, yeah, [DickClarkLaw.com](http://DickClarkLaw.com), or you can get there — a little easier to remember, [SilencerLawyer.com](http://SilencerLawyer.com).

**WOODS:** Oh, all right. Let's get to silencer in a minute, but as long as we're on state versus federal, let's talk about national reciprocity regarding concealed carry.

**CLARK:** Sure.

**WOODS:** Now, is that in some way in opposition to the rights of individual states to make their own policies? How do you navigate that argument? And first of all, tell us what national reciprocity is.

**CLARK:** So national reciprocity, the core principle behind this idea is that look, we have this right to keep and bear arms that's recognized by the U.S. Constitution, that's recognized by virtually all the state constitutions. Many states affirmatively grant a right via permit to carry concealed, and this is a right that should be more uniform throughout the U.S. If it's a fundamental right, then it should be recognized as such as long as we're traveling here in the same country that operates under the same constitution.

Now, obviously making that more uniform creates a tension with the idea of state control over its own policy and the idea of what is the extent of the state police power that sort of operates in opposition, you know, butts up against some of these constitutionally guaranteed rights that are enumerated in the Bill of Rights. So the concern that a lot of folks on our side of the aisle have, folks who believe in the individual right to keep and bear arms, is that a national reciprocity law would create this new pressure for states to make their permitting process more restrictive in their state, the idea that, okay, to in order to get reciprocity for our permit holders, now we've got to raise the bar so that it meets this minimum threshold for whatever the new federal standard would be for reciprocity.

And I think that is a real concern because in some states you don't have to have a permit to carry a firearm concealed. In some states the permit to carry a concealed firearm is really just a rubber-stamp process, while in other states, like for example where I live here in Nebraska, you have to do eight hours of training and you have to take a shooting test and you have to submit to a fingerprint-based background check and have your picture taken and all the rest.

And so the concern is if you're in a freer state where your permitting process is less onerous, that's a serious downside to a national reciprocity law. The idea that now there's this other policy pressure to get our otherwise pro-gun lawmakers and our pro-gun state to make this permit process tougher. To me, the solution is constitutional carry, the idea that states that are very pro-gun should back away from requiring any sort of permit to exercise this natural right of bearing a firearm, whether concealed or openly, but then they could have an optional permit to facilitate that reciprocity with other states.

And we do see a major move in the states towards constitutional carry. It wasn't so long ago that there were two states that allowed it and they were two states maybe more likely than others where you've have to wear a parka, where a concealed carry might be the only practical way to carry a handgun. Alaska and Vermont were the two ones that allowed this permit-less concealed carry. Now just in the last few years, we see Arizona on the list, Arkansas on the list, Idaho on the list, Kansas, Maine, Missouri. We've got Mississippi; we've got West Virginia, Wyoming. There are limited forms of constitutional carry in New Hampshire, Montana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. We have proposals being debated even now as we speak in Texas, Nebraska, and a number of other states.

So I think that that might help mitigate some of the risks of the national reciprocity idea, because now all of a sudden when you're talking about going to the grocery store in your home state, maybe that just wouldn't be relevant to you because a permit isn't required for that sort of concealed carry anyway. So a little bit of a sticky issue. I

think that if we can get state legislators to take action to make their states freer in general, all of a sudden it becomes less of a problem when we're concerned about our gun rights at the local level.

**WOODS:** All right, more to come after we thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

When I asked you about your website, you said that there was another way to remember you, and that was SilencerLawyer.com. And I just typed that in, and sure enough, it redirects to DickClarkLaw.com. So let's talk about that because there's something that I didn't know about really until I was looking into having you on. The Hearing Protection Act? Apparently this is in the news, and it's just gone completely over my head, or I just haven't been aware of it. And it has something to do with the federal government making silencers more difficult to get. Can you lay this out?

**CLARK:** Sure, so there's a bill that was just introduced, H.R. 367, I believe, which is the Hearing Protection Act of 2017. It's a revival of H.R. 3799 that was introduced in 2015. The idea is that the federal government has very onerous and burdensome restrictions on the making or transferring of silencers. And it doesn't make sense to have those restrictions.

So let's just get into a little bit of the background. In 1934, the Congress passed the National Firearms Act of 1934, the first major gun control legislation at the federal level. The act purported to target so-called gangster weapons. And remember, in the 1930s the federal legislators didn't believe that they necessarily had the inherent authority to just ban things. In 1937 when marijuana was acted against by the feds, it was the Marijuana Tax Act of 1937 where they passed a prohibitive tax to try to stamp out marijuana.

And they very much used the same play from the same playbook in 1934 against these so-called gangster weapons. They did not outright prohibit them; they simply passed a prohibitive making-and-transfer tax of \$200 – which, you know, if we do the inflation calculator arithmetic, that's something like four grand in today's money. So to transfer an item that costs significantly less than that, now you've got to put down money that would buy you a used car just for the bureaucratic privilege of having your paperwork in order. So clearly intended to prohibit these items but not an outright prohibition the way the law reads.

So for silencers and most NFA items, this is going to be an effective prohibition, but really the reasoning for silencers was different. For machine guns, they're talking about the Valentine's Day Massacre and the rate of fire and police being outgunned. But that really wasn't the legislative rationale for silencers. Silencers being part of this regulatory regime really was on the basis of claims that, Oh, they might enhance the ability of poachers, illicit hunters, to ply their craft, to get out and shoot Bambi offseason or without a permit from the state, and boy, they might get away with it because the game warden wouldn't hear them.

And what is at the root of this misapprehension of what silencers do really boils down to the marketing. "Silencer" is a trade name that was made up by a fellow named Hiram Percy Maxim, whose dad invented the Maxim machine gun way back when. And Hiram Percy Maxim stayed in the family business, and before he invented the car muffler, he invented the firearm muffler. And "silencer" was just sort of like, you know, we say Kleenex. Boy, it sounds catchy. My nose is going to be clean. Does it really clean your nose? No, it doesn't. Well, does a silencer really silence your firearm? No. It does make it a little less obnoxiously loud, but again, really more of a trade name, more of a marketing hype than reality. What a silencer does do is it makes a gun more hearing-safe. It takes it from "my head's in a jet engine" loud to "boy, I'm mowing the lawn and I can hear my lawnmower" loud. So it's still obnoxiously loud, but it's not, you know, "my wife's going to have a hard time telling what chores she needs me to do" loud.

So that's the benefit. That's why the federal legislation that we see now is called the Hearing Protection Act, because really this is about making these firearms, making this type of equipment safer for the user, safer for bystanders. I have a friend in my Sunday school class at church who's an occupational audiologist, and she talks about, Look, when I go into a workplace, the first thing we do is not hand out personal protective equipment. That's a last resort. The first thing we do is try to make the machine safer. We try to make the workplace ambient noise level lower before we start slapping on earplugs and earmuffs and all the rest. That personal protective equipment is what we do as a last resort. And that's the philosophy here. Let's make the machine, let's make the firearm itself safer, and now if there's a bystander you're not aware of or whose hearing protection equipment isn't up to snuff, we've already protected them at the muzzle of the gun.

And I think that makes good common sense, and frankly, we're already seeing development for more silencers to be built into guns in anticipation of this law coming out. The distortion in the market that exists right now is, Boy, there's this big transactional headache when I want to get into one of these silencers, and so I just want to buy the minimum number of silencers so I can swap them between all my firearms in my collection. And again, that's because you're paying a per-silencer tax when you have one of these items transferred to you or when you make one of these items if you're the handy do-it-yourselfer type. And so if we can start adding them to individual firearms without having a per-silencer tax, that's really the direction the market wants to push in, because now you can have a specialized item that's more effective for that particular tool. It might not add to the overall length to the same extent, easier to clean, all the rest.

And so Silencer Co., sort of one of the movers and shakers in the silencer industry, just finally brought out the first integrally suppressed 9mm pistol. It's called the Maxim, named in honor of the originator of the firearm silencer who we already described, and that just hit the shelves just a couple of days ago. And I think that's the direction the market is likely to go in. But no, it's exciting times and really fixing this improperly hyped public policy problem that shouldn't have existed in the first place, that of course really was an offshoot of another public policy mistake, alcohol prohibition.

And I have to mention: it's not a mistake that this law was passed just a few months after the end of alcohol prohibition. The passage of the NFA was literally six months

after repeal of the Volstead Act. And they had this perfectly good federal bureaucracy, the Bureau of Prohibition, that was going to be mothballed. And of course we can't let a good bureaucracy go to waste, Tom, and so they repurposed the Bureau of Prohibition to become what we now know as the ATF or the BATFE, because they've added explosives to the mix of things that they regulate. We might call them the Bureau of All Things Fun and Exciting. You've seen the t-shirt that, "Hey, it ought to be a convenience store and not a federal bureaucracy." But yeah, the culture that still exists in that agency is the culture of people going out with axes to break stuff, and it's very much not an agency that's focused on customer service. It's focused on making people's lives harder if they're engaged in activities which are within the realm of the regulated issue area.

So it's interesting to think about the possibility of silencers just being something you could buy over the counter instead of having to go through this multi-month approval process. The status quo under the NFA is you have to submit paperwork that gets filled out at the dealer counter basically, goes off to this black hole of a federal bureaucracy, and disappears. And right now, the wait time is eight or nine months to see your paperwork come back. That's eight or nine months after you've paid the tax, after you've jumped through all these hoops and had your fingerprints rolled and filled out all this paperwork. And then finally they send back the approval with the little "canceled tax" stamp on it to your dealer saying, Hey, you can give this person his property. And then you get that blessed phone call that day saying, Hey, come get your toy.

And so what the Hearing Protection Act would do is just treat silencers like other firearms. You'd still have all of the other rules that apply to acquisition of a firearm — background checks and all the rest — but it just wouldn't be this onerous, costly, burdensome process that we currently have. So a real improvement for liberty, and frankly an improvement for everybody except the folks who sell hearing aids. So something we can look forward to, hopefully.

**WOODS:** All right, I want to ask you something just for me, but again, I suspect there are probably some people who would also benefit. I want to know what — again, I'm sorry, people. I don't know everything. I want to know what are — tell me what black rifles are.

**CLARK:** Well, in our racist culture, not all rifles are created equal, and some rifles that to some folks appear scarier than others get a bad rap. And so that's what we jokingly refer to as black rifles, the idea that some rifles just look like they're more dangerous, just look like they're military equipment and not friendly civilian hunting rifles.

But really what it amounts to is modernization and the manufacturing processes, the fact that it used to be that a gunsmith is a guy who's lovingly fitting handcrafted parts together, and all these parts are made to only fit with each other. And this pistol that Samuel Cold would have made, you can't have parts from another pistol he made; they wouldn't be interchangeable. We've moved beyond that, thank goodness. Eli Whitney, you know? The idea of interchangeable parts, it's finally made it in its fullest sense into the firearms industry. And so now we do have modularity in firearms. And a great example of that in the modern era is the AR-15, which is sort of the quintessential

black rifle, if you will, and of course it's a rifle that's very popular with a number of militaries, with police agencies, and it's probably the most popular rifle among civilians in the United States right now.

The ironic thing about all of the hype about these black rifles is that they're actually less powerful than grandpa's deer rifle. In fact, the value proposition of these rifles is that they are lighter and less powerful and have less recoil than those heavy deer rifles that are intended to bring down big game, bring down the elk or the moose or the bear. These are rifles that it's easier to move around with that are more user-friendly and they're more customizable. And frankly, they're also more reliable than a lot of the rifles of yesteryear, and they happen to be very effective tools for defense and for sport. I used one of these scary rifles to shoot a deer in our Nebraska regular firearms deer season in November, and the deer didn't know any better. She didn't know that I was shooting a scary black rifle; she thought I was just shooting a plain old hunting rifle, and so she obliged me by falling down where she stood.

But yeah, it really is more about appearances than about function. You can have two rifles where the fundamental operating principles of the machine are essentially identical, but because the furniture on one happens to be wooden, whereas the furniture on the other firearm is made out of black polymer, you might get a very different impression from the uninformed onlooker just because of the cosmetics. And that's something that we're trying to push back against and trying to educate against, but people have to be willing to learn about something that they don't know and not just go off of talking points. And that's sort of the struggle.

**WOODS:** What are other terms that black rifles or black guns might be known to people as?

**CLARK:** Well, so when folks who don't like them are talking about them they often refer to them as assault weapons.

**WOODS:** There you go. No, how do you answer that, because the average person who's a libertarian who doesn't know all the details about guns does get hit with this, that, "Why would you defend assault weapons?" And you feel like saying, Well, I don't know. I guess because I'd rather have regular people have them than the creeps who run the show — I mean, but what would be the good, meaty, Dick Clark-style reply to that?

**CLARK:** Well, there's a kernel of etymological truth to the term, okay, and we can admit that. Actually, it was Nazi Germany who came up with that term, the *Sturmgewehr*, the assault rifle. The idea was, Hey, we're going to have a lighter rifle that's easier to move around with, so as opposed to being a weapon that you use in an emplaced, barricaded position where you're just sitting there and you can't move the thing around because it's so heavy, now here's a weapon that you can use while you're moving. That's why that adjective "assault" was tacked onto the front. The idea is this is a lighter, less powerful weapon that guys who are moving around while they're engaged in whatever activity they're engaged in, they can carry it. They don't have to be He-Man to carry it. And so literally that German word was ported over into the English language and then used in a pejorative sense.

And so in so far as we're just talking about weapons that are lighter, that are less powerful, fine, let's talk about that being a difference between these other battle rifles that are more traditional for military use pre-World War II. That's fair to point out those differences. But again, the modern sense, when we hear "assault weapon" or "assault rifle," folks think of the crime or tort of assault where we're aggressing against somebody else. And again, that's not what they're for at all. People use these weapons or these firearms every day in competition. They use them in target shooting.

But I'll tell you, the most important thing about your right to keep and bear arms is that it enables you to defend against aggressors. And frankly, yes, these firearms are useful to defend against aggressors, and yes, even multiple aggressors. We had a young man here in Lincoln, Nebraska just a few years ago – and I'll tell you, Lincoln's a very safe place. I mean, usually you can count on your two hands the number of murders that happen in Lincoln, Nebraska, which is almost population 300,000. So a very safe place. Over a given year, usually less than ten murders.

But we had a guy just a few years ago on the Fourth of July, he's driving home, kid runs out into the street – actually, runs into the side of his car as he's driving by, so he doesn't hit the kid; the kid bumps into him. He doesn't even realize it. He thought he hit a firework in the street or something, so he keeps driving, kid is uninjured. But the child's father was furious, thought that this guy had hit and run his child. And so this guy goes to the driver's house, follows him with some friends with guns. Three armed assailants show up at this guy's house, young man in his twenties. And they came there with the intent to kill him.

And this young man, who happened to be black, had a civilian semiautomatic-only variant of the AK-47 rifle, and he had that in his house. And he was able to defend his life against these men with murderous intent on his doorstep. And it wasn't a fair fight. There were three men there to do him harm, and because he had a rifle that was user friendly that used a less powerful, non- – you know, mostly we think of it as a non-hunting round that has less recoil – he was able to save his own life and legally act to defend himself.

And that's a piece of technology that people ought to have access to, because bad guys don't fight fair, and good guys ought to have every advantage that they can, and that's what these rifles do for us. So it is important to fight for these rifles, not just for all the sporting uses which are the predominant use, but because it makes it more possible for a defender to defend his home.

**WOODS:** All right, wow. Man, you are a much better guest than I thought. [laughing] There's no way for that not to sound wrong, but wow. I just didn't know – we never really talked about this stuff all that much, although I guess I remember you kind of nudging me to go out shooting with you, right?

**CLARK:** [laughing] Well, you know, I'm a proselytizing gun nerd, I guess you could say.

**WOODS:** Yeah, we need that kind, absolutely. Most gun people seem to be that kind, I find.

**CLARK:** Well, we enjoy it as a sport. My dad was a gun owner. He wasn't a hunter, but he was a gun owner, and I really learned to shoot in the Boy Scouts and later taught rifle shooting and shotgun shooting merit badges and archery merit badge in the Boy Scouts. And I'm a true believer that I'm safer when good guys have guns and know how to safely employ them, know how to safely use them, know how to safely not use them – you know, keep your finger off the trigger till you're ready to shoot. Don't point a gun at anybody that you don't have a right to shoot, but always keep that gun pointed in a safe direction.

I want there to be more knowledge about guns, not less, because I think that makes my kids safer, not just from aggressors, but from accidents. We have more guns in this country than we have people, and it's just ludicrous to think that we wouldn't take every opportunity to teach people, whether they're going to become a hobbyist, whether they're going to become a conscientious gun owner or not. They need to understand gun safety just like they need to understand car safety, because these are things that are going to be around; they're machines they're going to encounter in American society, and let's make it safer. There's no reason in the world to have more hazard associated with these tools.

**WOODS:** Well, the website if you'd like to visit Dick is [DickClarkLaw.com](http://DickClarkLaw.com) or [SilencerLawyer.com](http://SilencerLawyer.com). So you came up with that?

**CLARK:** Oh yeah, just you know, snatched up a bunch of seemingly sounding domain names, and that was one of them.

**WOODS:** I always love when I'm pleasantly surprised that a domain name, a .com is still available, one that really by rights should not have been available to me. I mean, [LearnAustrianEconomics.com](http://LearnAustrianEconomics.com), I could not believe that was available. And then my favorite: [SupportingListeners.com](http://SupportingListeners.com). That's such a good site, that everybody assumes that's a general site that you go to to support different causes you like. Nope, it's just for me. [laughing] It's just mine. It was there, and I grabbed it. I was salivating with my ten smackers that I put down for that. So yeah, [SilencerLawyer.com](http://SilencerLawyer.com) is worth more than you paid for it, I bet.

**CLARK:** I think so.

**WOODS:** That's really terrific, yeah.

**CLARK:** Well, it's the new race to homestead valuable property that's out there, right? It's not covered wagons; it's sitting at the keyboard.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah, you're right. Yeah, that's a whole episode in and of itself. All right, thanks so much, Dick. We'll have to talk to you again soon.

**CLARK:** Thanks for having me on, Tom.