I am submitting this comment in strong opposition to the proposed rule to transfer oversight of non-military firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department. This proposed rule has one purpose and one purpose only: to garner profits for a U.S. gun industry that is faring poorly domestically. It comes after a multi-year lobbying campaign by the NRA and National Shooting Sports Foundation (the NSSF has already boasted the change would lead to a 20% increase in firearms exports). NO ONE other than the gun lobby asked for this change. It would make U.S. exports of small arms far more dangerous, by transferring oversight responsibilities to an agency that prioritizes business over national security. The U.S. Congress would also lose its ability to oversee commercial weapons sales of $1 million or more, which is inane. I’m also disgusted by the rules attempts to legitimize semiautomatic assault rifles as civilian products when these battlefield weapons have stolen so many of our loved ones from us. If your agency approves this blatant corporate giveaway, I will do everything in my power to hold your leadership accountable for the resulting bloodshed that occurs globally. That will include advocating against your budget priorities across-the-board until a new administration cleans house.
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General Comment

I'm 60 years old and semi-retired. I operated a gunsmith shop in my early twenties but gave it up to better support my family. However, I always intended to go back to gunsmithing later in life. Finally that happened, I spent quite a bit of money that would have funded my retirement starting my business. I had a new building built, I bought and learned to use 3 manual lathes and a mill with the intention of getting a manufacturers FFL and making a few custom firearms a year, restoring and selling a few older firearms a year and doing general repairs. I figured I would make $5000 to $10,000 a year to supplement my retirement while doing a job my community needed. I probably spent $85,000 or so on my building, equipment and tools.

However, the Obama administration changed the interpretation of the ITAR rules and started requiring holders of FFL-07 licenses (manufacturing FFL) to send nearly $3000 per year to the state department in ITAR fees. This could well have been half or more of my yearly profits and meant I had to settle for a type 01 FFL and be a gunsmith only. At that time, as a gunsmith I could do nearly any repair, customization or improvement for a customer on his/her firearm but could not improve, customize or refinish a firearm and then sell it as that would make me a manufacturer. Although this wasnt the future Id worked towards for nearly 40 years, it was better than nothing.

Then, in July of 2016 the Obama administration again reinterpreted the existing rules and decided to bring virtually all the jobs gunsmiths do under the ITAR umbrella. This was obviously intended to bankrupt the nations gunsmiths, and, I suspect to chill pre-election free speech. It did not suppress my free speech but it did cause me to start turning away 90% of my potential customers. Under these rules refinishing firearms and replacing parts is about the only thing a gunsmith is now allowed to do. According to the 2nd Obama reinterpretation of the ITAR rules even making a screw or stock for a 150 year-old firearm could be interpreted as a violation.
Since these rules took effect in July of 2016 I dont believe I have made a monthly profit, even once. Threading barrels, customizing, making stocks, dovetailing sight groves, re-chambering, making obsolete parts and the like are all still banned to my knowledge. And, with the exception of the occasional machine shop work, my three lathes and my mill are still idle.

I am again considering closing my shop because of this. My insurance alone is nearly a grand a year and Im not sure how long I can survive while waiting on this to be fixed. Please, lets get the State Department out of the gunsmith business and again allow a gunsmith to make and sell a few custom firearms a year without being bankrupted by ITAR.
I am writing in opposition to moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce because the proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as "non-military." This is despite the fact that U.S. troops routinely use their military rifles in semiautomatic mode, these weapons are used by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and the civilian possession of such weapons is prohibited in many countries. The proposed rule also: eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals; transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers; and, enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. The proposal reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports and transfers gun export licensing from an agency with a mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with a mission to promote trade and which lacks the resources to adequately enforce export controls.

Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not fewer. More people are being killed and/or terrorized by these weapons. We need to seek a more peaceful world, and this proposal will work against that effort.

Thank you for considering this.

Mary Ann O'Connor
I am writing in opposition to moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce because the proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as "non-military." This is despite the fact that U.S. troops routinely use their military rifles in semiautomatic mode, these weapons are used by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and the civilian possession of such weapons is prohibited in many countries. The proposed rule also: eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals; transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers; and, enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. The proposal reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports and transfers gun export licensing from an agency with a mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with a mission to promote trade and which lacks the resources to adequately enforce export controls.
I am writing in opposition to moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce because the proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as "non-military." This is despite the fact that U.S. troops routinely use their military rifles in semiautomatic mode, these weapons are used by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and the civilian possession of such weapons is prohibited in many countries. The proposed rule also: eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals; transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers; and, enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. The proposal reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports and transfers gun export licensing from an agency with a mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with a mission to promote trade and which lacks the resources to adequately enforce export controls.

Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not fewer.
I am writing in opposition to moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce. Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not fewer.
I oppose moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce because the proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as non-military. These weapons are used in armed conflicts, and the civilian possession of such weapons is prohibited in many countries. The proposed rule also: eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals; transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers; and, enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. The proposal reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports and transfers gun export licensing from an agency with a mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with a mission to promote trade and which lacks the resources to adequately enforce export controls.

Firearms kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. This is the kind of violence that sends refugees fleeing to our borders. Arms exports must be subject to more controls, not fewer.

Thank you, in advance, for saving lives.
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General Comment
To: Secretary of State Mike Pompeo
Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross

We urge you to reverse the proposed regulations that would make it easier to export semi-automatic weapons and
ammunition,
eliminate Congressional oversight of these sales, weaken end-use controls, and enable production of 3D weapons
anywhere.
We have seen the effects of these weapons in U.S. shootings, and know they are used around the world to kill
and attack
hundreds of people every day in violent crime, wars, and political violence. U.S. export controls for weapons
used in violence
should be made stronger, not weaker.
Submitter Information

Name: Carina Sarabia

General Comment

We urge you to reverse the proposed regulations that will make it easier to export semi-automatic weapons and ammunition, eliminate Congressional oversight of these sales, weaken end-use controls, and enable production of 3D weapons anywhere. We have seen the effects of these weapons in U.S. shootings, and know they are used around the world to kill and attack hundreds of people every day in violent crime, wars, and political violence. U.S. export controls for weapons used in violence should be made stronger, not weaker.
General Comment

I urge ATF to finalize its proposed rule clarifying that bump-fire stocks, along with other conversion devices that enable semiautomatic weapons to mimic automatic fire, qualify as machineguns under the National Firearms Act and are generally illegal to possess.

On the night of October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire from a hotel room on the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay hotel into the 22,000 person crowd at the Route 91 Harvest country music festival in Las Vegas, Nevada, killing 58 people and injuring more than 500. The gunman fired more than 1,100 rounds of ammunition in 11 minutes, using semiautomatic rifles modified with dangerous firearm accessories designed to dramatically accelerate the rate of fire, commonly known as bump-fire stocks. These devices are intended to circumvent the restrictions on possession of fully automatic firearms in the Gun Control Act of 1968 and the National Firearms Act of 1934 by allowing an individual to modify a semiautomatic rifle in such a manner that it operates with a similar rate of fire as a fully automatic rifle. Bump stocks and similar conversion devices that accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic firearm are extremely dangerous and pose a substantial risk to public safety.

In the absence of immediate action by Congress, ATF should finalize its proposed rule, clarifying that conversion devices like bump-fire stocks are included in the definition of machinegun under the National Firearms Act of 1934. And then Congress must act as well to ensure that manufacturers cannot continue to endanger public safety by designing devices that imitate machine guns and subvert the law. The continued presence of these dangerous devices puts all of our communities at risk and both Congress and ATF must take action quickly to address this threat.

I'm not sure why we even have to petition for this common sense measure. PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING!
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
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General Comment

This is a dangerous, unnecessary move guided by greed and corruption, It should not happen!!

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce
Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal
agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that
destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds
of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder
Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged
him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a
3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling
3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]
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General Comment

I urge the Commerce and State Departments to oppose relaxing rules that would make it easier for U.S. firearm manufacturers to export assault rifles and other guns, with less oversight and accountability. With gun violence killing 1,000 people around the world every day, we should be making it harder, not easier, to export U.S. made weapons of war.

Please put people over profits.

Thank you.
Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less! I oppose the proposed changes.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.
I am disgusted that the United States seems to be determined to share its gun problem with the rest of the world! I am strongly opposed to the proposed rule to transfer oversight of small arms (firearms) exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department. This rule would make U.S. exports of small arms far more dangerous by transferring controls to an agency that prioritizes doing business over safeguarding national security. The rules elimination of congressional oversight of commercial weapons sales of $1 million or more is also reckless. This rule has one purpose only: to garner profits for a U.S. gun industry that is faring poorly in the domestic market. It comes after years of lobbying by the NRA and National Shooting Sports Foundation. No one else asked for it or wanted it. The NSSF, the trade group for the gun industry, has already boasted the rule would lead to a 20% increase in American gun exports. We see the gun lobby’s influence in the rules description of semiautomatic assault rifles like the AR-15 as civilian products. These weapons were not designed for household use, they were designed to kill en masse on the battlefield. That is why they are the weapons of choice for mass shooters. If you go forward with this disastrous policy, I will do everything in my power peacefully and democratically to hold your leadership accountable for the resulting global bloodshed. That will include advocating against your budget priorities across-the-board until a new, non-corrupt administration can come in and clean house.
General Comment

Your proposed rule change would have the following effects, which are totally unacceptable in a civilized society:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]
The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]
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General Comment

I am opposed this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organised crime and terrorist organisations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilises countries and causes mass migration.

How else would the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place?

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Please block this rule change.
General Comment

PLEASE review this again. There are too many negatives for our own security.

On May 24, the Trump Administration formally proposed a new rule that would loosen regulations over gun exports, potentially increasing the risk that dangerous weapons may end up in the hands of international criminals. The proposed rule would dramatically change the regulatory structure for firearm exports. The proposed rule is complex and appears to be largely driven by the interests of industry. We are concerned that the proposed rule may not adequately address our national security, foreign policy, international crime, terrorist threats, or the need for transparency so Congress and the public may understand the impact of these rules and potential firearm exports. We are also concerned that the proposed rule fails to recognize the inherently military nature of many of the relevant firearms. Rather than moving forward with the proposed rule, the Administration should consider other alternatives to better balance the important interests at stake.
Submitter Information

Name: Nikki Sachs
Address:
   2341 Acton Street
   Berkeley, CA, 94702
Email: nikkisachs@gmail.com

General Comment

I oppose the rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. I am against this change.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.
It would eliminate the State Department’s Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Department’s block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Another terrible idea put forward by this administration to promote more war and terrorism around the world. Do not try and pull the wool over Americans’ eyes, this move jeopardizes our safety and futures further, all in the name of GREED.
I oppose the rule change that would switch the regulation of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Thank you.
In my opinion, switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

I believe the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place in the following ways:

1. It would eliminate the State Department's Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. It would remove the State Department's block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon.
4. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
General Comment

The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.

I OPPOSE this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. THIS RULE CHANGE MUST NEVER HAPPEN!
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General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Please do not allow the rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State...
Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
General Comment

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
General Comment

Comment:
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Please don't switch the regulations from the US State Department to the Department of Commerce.

thank you
General Comment

The proposed rule should not be allowed, because:

Treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military, despite their use by U.S. troops, their use by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and their prohibition for civilian possession in many countries.

Eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals.

Transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers.

Removes statutory license requirements for brokers, increasing risk of trafficking.

Reduces or eliminates end-use controls, such as State Depts Blue Lantern program, and by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s.

Enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms.

The Commerce Department does not have the resources to enforce export controls, even now.

Reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports.

Transfers gun export licensing from an agency with mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with mission to promote trade.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

This is a matter of national security and should be treated as such by remaining under the control of the US State Department.
General Comment

The NRA is trying to pull another fast one. The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.
I very much oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department!
Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]
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General Comment
I oppose this rule change. Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less! The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department
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General Comment

"I oppose moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce because the proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as non-military."
General Comment

I have the following concerns about the rule change. Specifically, it

Treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military, despite their use by U.S. troops, their use by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and their prohibition for civilian possession in many countries.
Eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals.
Transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers.
Removes statutory license requirements for brokers, increasing risk of trafficking.
Reduces or eliminates end-use controls, such as State Depts Blue Lantern program, and by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s.
Enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms.
The Commerce Department does not have the resources to enforce export controls, even now.
Reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports.
Transfers gun export licensing from an agency with mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with mission to promote trade.

None of these changes is beneficial for the broader public, either in the US or abroad.
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General Comment

I am strongly opposed to this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

HERES THE LOW DOWN: Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries.[2] With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.[3]

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:
It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]
Submit comments now to the State Department and the Commerce Department opposing the rule change.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!

Thank you for taking action to help make our country and our world a safer place. #VeteransForPeace #MomsDemandAction
My name is Neta Jackson, and I live in the Chicago area. I am very concerned about having common sense gun control and oversight of the gun industry, which in no way robs our citizens of their rights under the Second Amendment.

I oppose the proposed rule and urge you to abandon the proposal that will make it easier to export semi-automatic weapons and ammunition, eliminate Congressional oversight of these sales, weaken end-use controls, and enable production of 3D weapons anywhere.

Because military-style assault rifles clearly have substantial military utility, transfer of these firearms to Commerce Department control is inconsistent with the statutory framework enacted by the Congress to regulate the export of arms. Congress will no longer be automatically informed about sizable sales of these weapons. That will limit its ability to comment on related human rights concerns.

The new rules would transfer the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers and the gun exporters that benefit from these sales should bear this cost. National laws for brokers and financiers who arrange firearm shipments are a weak link in curtailing trafficking of small arms and light weapons. Firearms brokers would no longer be subject to US brokering laws which would make it easier for unscrupulous dealers to escape attention. The rule reduces end-use controls and public reporting on gun exports and human rights violations.

The transfer of licensing to Commerce will remove new exporters and brokers from the State Department database, weakening enforcement against arms trafficking. The rule enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. The Commerce Department does not have resources, data, expertise or institutional relations to enforce export controls.

The proposed change will reduce transparency and reporting on gun exports. The rule would eliminate
Congressional and public awareness of the total amount (dollar value and items) of firearms sales authorizations and deliveries around the world, since the Commerce Department annual reports currently only cover about 20 countries. This rule would transfer gun export licensing to an agency the Commerce Department - whose principle mission is to promote trade.

Firearms, both assault weapons and non-semi-automatic weapons, are uniquely and pervasively used in criminal violence around the world. Controlling their export should be handled by the State Department, which is mandated and structured to address the potential impacts in importing nations on stability, human security, conflict, and human rights. Military assault style firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. The export of these weapons should NOT be subject to weaker controls.

Thank you!
Neta Jackson
I oppose the passing of this rule that would loosen regulations on weapon exports because it would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe. This rule should not pass.
Public Submission
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General Comment

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!

Thank you for taking action to help make our country and our world a safer place.
The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds
of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!

Thank you for taking action to help make our country and our world a safer place.
I oppose transferring the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Department of Commerce. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

The proposed rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place because:

- It would eliminate the State Department's Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
- It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
- It would remove the State Department's block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

This rule change would make not only the United States, but every country in the world much less safe. Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
To Whom It May Concern:

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

The proposed rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place for the following reasons:

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Thank you for your considerations.

Sincerely,
General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. Moving the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business) is the NRAs wildest dream and regular citizens worst nightmare.
General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. You can also copy and paste in other parts of this email, too, in order to make your case.
DEATH NEVER TAKES A HOLIDAY. THE MERCHANTS OF DEATH, LOOKS LIKE, DON'T EITHER.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as "military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries.[2] With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.[3]

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
To whom it may concern,

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

So please keep gun sales the way are, under the State Department.
A concerned Navy Combat Veteran!

Sincerely,
Ken O'Connell
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Thank you for reading my comment.
On May 24, the Trump Administration formally proposed a new rule to loosen regulations over gun exports, potentially increasing the risk that dangerous weapons may end up in the hands of international criminals.

The proposed rule would dramatically change the regulatory structure for firearm exports. The proposed rule is complex and appears to be largely driven by the interests of industry.

I am concerned that the proposed rule may not adequately address our national security, foreign policy, international crime, terrorist threats, or the need for transparency so Congress and the public may understand the impact of these rules and potential firearm exports. I am also concerned that the proposed rule fails to recognize the inherently military nature of many of the relevant firearms.

Rather than moving forward with the proposed rule, the Administration should consider other alternatives to better balance the important interests at stake.

The rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place because:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
General Comment

Maintain Control of International Traffic of Arms Regulations with the State Department where it current exists. Do not change the current rule.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries.[2] With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.[3]

The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]
General Comment

I am writing in strong opposition to moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce. The proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as non-military. This is despite the fact that U.S. troops routinely use their military rifles in semiautomatic mode, these weapons are used by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and the civilian possession of such weapons is prohibited in many countries. Consider those American soldiers recently killed in Niger. It is possible the weapons they used came from the US.

The proposed rule also: eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals; transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers; and, enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. The proposal reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports and transfers gun export licensing from an agency with a mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with a mission to promote trade and which lacks the resources to adequately enforce export controls.

This change defies sound reasoning, Aristotelian logic, and common sense to place the baseness of greed above global public safety.

Firearms are used to kill thousands of people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, street crime, political violence, terrorism, and myriad human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not fewer. Humanity deserves to be free from the threats posed by deranged, greedy, corrupt individuals like those responsible for proposing this absurd change.
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General Comment

I oppose a rule change that would switch the regulation of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
I am opposed to switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department as it would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

It would eliminate the State Department's Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
I am writing to OPPOSE the proposed rule change that would switch regulations of firearms export to the Department of Commerce. There are MANY reasons for opposing this change. Here are some:

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Guns kill people. We need more controls, NOT less!!

The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
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General Comment

I oppose this rule change.
I oppose switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department. That would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration. Please do NOT change this rule.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change the NRA is pushing for, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

In addition, the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged
him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
PUBLIC SUBMISSION
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General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. Furthermore, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.
PUBLIC SUBMISSION
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General Comment

See attached file for comments

Attachments

Comment on BIS-2017-0004
As a domestic violence prevention advocate, I know full well the toll gun violence takes on women across the world. Abusers’ use of firearms to threaten, control, injure, and kill knows no borders or boundaries. I oppose the proposed rule for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rule treats semi-automatic assault rifles as “non-military.” But many state and non-state groups in importing countries use semi-automatic rifles in armed conflicts, causing enormous damage. U.S. troops use rifles in semi-automatic mode an overwhelming amount of the time. Regarding wide retail availability of firearms, about which comment has been requested, many countries prohibit civilian possession of semi-automatic rifles and handguns, as well as of any larger caliber firearm. Six U.S. states, the District of Columbia, and several large retail chains also prohibit retail sale of semi-automatic assault rifles. Many semi-automatic rifles are also easily converted to fully automatic firearms. Because military-style assault rifles clearly have substantial military utility, transfer of these firearms to Commerce Department control is inconsistent with the statutory framework enacted by the Congress to regulate the export of arms.

2. The proposed rule would eliminate Congressional oversight for important gun export deals. Congress will no longer be automatically informed about sizable sales of these weapons. That will limit its ability to comment on related human rights concerns, as it recently did on the Philippines and Turkey. Congressional action in 2002 required sales of firearms regulated by the US Munitions List valued at $1 million or more be notified to Congress. Items moved to Commerce control would no longer be subject to such notification. In a September 15, 2017, letter, Senators Benjamin Cardin, Dianne Feinstein, and Patrick Leahy explicitly noted that this move would violate Congressional intent and effectively eliminate Congress’ proper role.

3. The new rules would transfer the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers. Registration fees that since the 1940s have been used to offset the costs to the government of tracking who is manufacturing weapons would no longer apply to manufacturers of semi-automatic weapons, and Commerce does not charge any fee for licensing. So the government -- i.e., taxpayers -- will absorb the cost of reviewing applications and processing licenses. Gun exporters that benefit from these sales should shoulder this cost.

4. National laws for brokers and financiers who arrange firearm shipments are a weak link in the chain of efforts to curtail trafficking of small arms and light weapons. There is good reason for concern that firearms brokers will no longer be subject to US brokering law. Although Commerce states it will retain rules on brokering for a State Department list that includes assault rifles, there is no statutory basis for brokers of these weapons to register and obtain a license, increasing the risk of trafficking. That will make it easier for unscrupulous dealers to escape attention.

5. The rule reduces end-use controls for gun exports. It would eliminate the State Department’s Blue Lantern program for gun and ammunition exports, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. It also would move license approval out of the department that compiles the U.S. Government’s information on human rights violations, reducing the ability to effectively deny weapons licenses to international human rights violators. End-use controls also are weakened by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s. Registration of exporters allows the State Department to check an exporter’s history whenever a manufacturer or broker requests a license for a particular gun export sale. But the transfer of licensing to Commerce will remove new exporters and brokers of these firearms from the State Department database, weakening enforcement against arms trafficking.

6. The rule enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for 3D-printing weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The Commerce Department is
unlikely to make the same argument once those weapons are transferred to their control. Unless corrected, the new regulations run the risk of effectively condoning and enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe. By effectively eliminating many means to detect firearms, background checks on domestic sales and end-use controls on international exports for such weapons, this change could generate many preventable tragedies.

7. The Commerce Department does not have resources to enforce export controls, even before the addition of 10,000 firearms export license applicants as a result of this rule predicted by Commerce. The BIS’s enforcement office, with no staff in Latin America, Africa, or many other parts of the world, is not equipped to take the same level of preventive measures for end-use controls. Moreover, the State Department has developed extensive data, expertise and institutional relations to implement the Leahy Law for security assistance, which can serve as a critical foundation in both pre-license and post-shipment checks to control and verify end uses and end users. Commerce does not have these resources.

8. The proposed change will reduce transparency and reporting on gun exports. The rule would eliminate Congressional and public awareness of the total amount (dollar value and items) of firearms sales authorizations and deliveries around the world, since the Commerce Department annual reports currently only cover about 20 countries.

9. This rule would transfer gun export licensing to an agency – the Commerce Department - whose principle mission is to promote trade. Firearms, both assault weapons and non-semi-automatic weapons, are uniquely and pervasively used in criminal violence around the world. Controlling their export should be handled by the State Department, which is mandated and structured to address the potential impacts in importing nations on stability, human security, conflict, and human rights.

10. Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. Research indicates that the types of weapons being transferred to Commerce control, including AR-15, AK-47, and other military-style assault rifles and their ammunition, are weapons of choice for criminal organizations in Mexico and other Latin American countries that are responsible for most of the increasing and record levels of homicides in those countries. The export of these weapons should be subject to more controls, not less.

---


General Comment

I oppose moving the regulating of fire arms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department for the following reasons:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]
Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
General Comment

The rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
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General Comment

I oppose this rule change which would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. The regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

This rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Firearms are dangerous. They're used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!

Thank you for considering my thoughts to help make our country, and our world, a safer place.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Right now, firearms exports are rightly classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. This puts the safety of our Nation and our troops abroad at risk.
I oppose the rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns. Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
I am writing to object to switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department. Such a switch would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Department’s Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

It would remove the State Department’s block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
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General Comment

Just what the world needs, more tools to kill each other! I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Where is the simple honesty that recognizes the insanity of the motives of the N.R.A.?

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Trump wants to stop Muslims from coming into the U.S. to make us safer. Where then is the logic in exporting weapons to the world?
General Comment

Please do not make the proposed change Moving the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.
General Comment

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less! That is why I adamantly oppose changing the rule that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. If this rule is changed, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep illegal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Firearms are dangerous! They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of terrorism, organized crime, political violence and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less. The Commerce Department does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls! This rule change would remove essential safe safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents from obtaining the weapons that fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration. Please do the right thing and forgo this disastrous rule change.
General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

And please remember that the majority of military-grade weapons used by the Mexican drug cartels are obtained from the US!
General Comment

Firearms exports are currently classified as military. That is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. That means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

The rule change would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them; would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking; would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
I oppose the rule change that would shift the handling of firearm exports from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department because I believe that leaving this responsibility to the U.S. State Department maintains the safety of Americans, as opposed to the best interests of corporations and their shareholders.
General Comment

I am concerned that this proposed rule may not adequately address our national security, foreign policy, international crime, terrorist threats, or the need for transparency so Congress and the public may understand the impact of these rules and potential firearm exports. I am also concerned that the proposed rule fails to recognize the inherently military nature of many of the relevant firearms.

Rather than moving forward with the proposed rule, the Administration should consider other alternatives to better balance the important interests at stake.

Everything I've heard from this administration is that they want to protect citizens from terrorists and that focus has been on immigration. I've also heard the NRA say they fully support keeping weapons out of the hands of dangerous people but this rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
I oppose the proposed rule for the following reasons:

The proposed rule treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military. But many state and non-state groups in importing countries use semi-automatic rifles in armed conflicts, causing enormous damage. U.S. troops use rifles in semi-automatic mode an overwhelming amount of the time. Regarding wide retail availability of firearms, about which comment has been requested, many countries prohibit civilian possession of semi-automatic rifles and handguns, as well as of any larger caliber firearm. Six U.S. states, the District of Columbia, and several large retail chains also prohibit retail sale of semi-automatic assault rifles. Many semi-automatic rifles are also easily converted to fully automatic firearms. Because military-style assault rifles clearly have substantial military utility, transfer of these firearms to Commerce Department control is inconsistent with the statutory framework enacted by the Congress to regulate the export of arms.

The proposed rule would eliminate Congressional oversight for important gun export deals. Congress will no longer be automatically informed about sizable sales of these weapons. That will limit its ability to comment on related human rights concerns, as it recently did on the Philippines and Turkey.[2] Congressional action in 2002 required sales of firearms regulated by the US Munitions List valued at $1 million or more be notified to Congress. Items moved to Commerce control would no longer be subject to such notification. In a September 15, 2017, letter, Senators Benjamin Cardin, Dianne Feinstein, and Patrick Leahy explicitly noted that this move would violate Congressional intent and effectively eliminate Congress proper role.

The new rules would transfer the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers. Registration fees that since the 1940s have been used to offset the costs to the government of tracking who is manufacturing weapons would no longer apply to manufacturers of semi-automatic weapons, and Commerce does not charge any fee for licensing. So the government i.e., taxpayers will absorb the cost of reviewing applications and processing licenses. Gun exporters that benefit from these sales should shoulder this cost.

National laws for brokers and financiers who arrange firearm shipments are a weak link in the chain of efforts to curtail trafficking of small arms and light weapons. There is good reason for concern that firearms brokers will...
no longer be subject to US brokering law. Although Commerce states it will retain rules on brokering for a State Department list that includes assault rifles, there is no statutory basis for brokers of these weapons to register and obtain a license, increasing the risk of trafficking. That will make it easier for unscrupulous dealers to escape attention.[3]

The rule reduces end-use controls for gun exports. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program for gun and ammunition exports, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. It also would move license approval out of the department that compiles the U.S. Governments information on human rights violations, reducing the ability to effectively deny weapons licenses to international human rights violators. End-use controls also are weakened by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s. Registration of exporters allows the State Department to check an exporters history whenever a manufacturer or broker requests a license for a particular gun export sale. But the transfer of licensing to Commerce will remove new exporters and brokers of these firearms from the State Department database, weakening enforcement against arms trafficking.

The rule enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for 3D-printing weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The Commerce Department is unlikely to make the same argument once those weapons are transferred to their control. Unless corrected, the new regulations run the risk of effectively condoning and enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe. By effectively eliminating many means to detect firearms, background checks on domestic sales and end-use controls on international exports for such weapons, this change could generate many preventable tragedies.

The Commerce Department does not have resources to enforce export controls, even before the addition of 10,000 firearms export license applicants as a result of this rule predicted by Commerce.[4] The BISs enforcement office, with no staff in Latin America, Africa, or many other
Im Nick Britten and Im for increased gun safety around the world. For that reason Im against this proposal. More specifically Im against this proposal because it does the following things:

Treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military, despite their use by U.S. troops, their use by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and their prohibition for civilian possession in many countries.
Eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals.
Transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers.
Removes statutory license requirements for brokers, increasing risk of trafficking.
Reduces or eliminates end-use controls, such as State Depts Blue Lantern program, and by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s.
Enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms.
The Commerce Department does not have the resources to enforce export controls, even now.
Reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports.
Transfers gun export licensing from agency with mission to promote trade, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with mission to promote trade.
Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less.
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General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
Right now, firearms exports are classified as military and therefore are under the regulation of the State Department, and thus Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.
Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
Come on -- it is obvious our national security implicated. The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world as this is how they make money. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.
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General Comment

I strongly oppose this rule change that would move the regulation of firearms exports from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

This makes it so much easier for home-grown terrorists to work with foreign countries without any oversight. The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

In addition, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

In so many ways, the rule change would make the world a more dangerous place.
It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling...
3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

This rule change must not be implemented
I am opposed to this rule change because:

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Please do everything you can to stop this proposed rule change.

Thank you.
The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business).[1] This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.

HERES THE LOW DOWN: Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries.[2] With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.[3]

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its
Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

There's no time to waste - submit comments now to the State Department and the Commerce Department opposing this rule change!

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Department's Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

It would remove the State Department's block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]

Submit comments now to the State Department and the Commerce Department opposing the rule change.

*You can copy and paste the points in this email or use your own voice to make unique comments to the State and Commerce Departments.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!

Thank you for taking action to help make our country and our world a safer place.

-- Gloria, Kristin, Monifa, Dorie, and the entire MomsRising/Mams con Poder team


[3] Ibid., The Boston Globe


[5] The Trump administration proposes making gun exports easier. Here's how to submit your public comment on this dangerous proposal, Violence Policy Center.


I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:
1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed
founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Again, as a citizen of the United States, I oppose this rule change that takes regulatory control from U.S. State Department and transfers that control to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Keys
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General Comment

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries.[2] With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.[3]

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged
him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!


[3] Ibid., The Boston Globe


[5] The Trump administration proposes making gun exports easier. Heres how to submit your public comment on this dangerous proposal, Violence Policy Center.


General Comment

Firearms are dangerous. I oppose the proposed changes in the U.S. Munitions List Categories I, II, and III for the following reasons;

1. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

2. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

3. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

4. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

Do not change the regulations.
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Submitter Information

Name: Raymond Zahra
Address: 1555 Horseshoe Dr. Florissant, MO, 63033
Email: raisemail2000-divert@yahoo.com
Phone: 3142766049

General Comment

Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration. The State Department should continue to regulate these sales.
I strongly oppose the proposed rule! It is unacceptable to change the regulation of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. I demand that this Bureau withdraw his proposed rule immediately!
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulation of firearm export from the US State Department to the US Commerce Department.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

In addition, the Commerce Department does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. The Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The proposed rule would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them. The risk of trafficking would increase because there would no longer be licensing requirements for brokers.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

This rule would create more unnecessary chaos and violence.

Keep more controls on guns, not less! Keep guns under the purview of the State Department.
I strongly oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration. The rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place.

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

All of these changes will make the world more dangerous and our country less secure. Please do not enact this rule change.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. To do otherwise endangers all human beings and leaves the U.S. open to huge liability issues.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

This change would
1. eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. The rule switch would effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the world.

Thank you.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
I strongly urge the Commerce and State Departments to oppose relaxing rules that would make it easier for U.S. firearm manufacturers to export assault rifles and other guns, with less oversight and accountability. With gun violence killing 1,000 people around the world every day, we should be making it harder, not easier, to export U.S. made weapons of war. Please do what is for the common good of all.
I oppose the proposed rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. The Commerce Department does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
We have learned that the NRA and gun manufacturers are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.

We oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.
Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

This rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place for these reasons, among others:

It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

All of which leads us to urge that this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department be OPPOSED!
This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition. The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
Weapons manufacturers want to sell guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business).[1] This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.

Right now, firearms exports are classified as "military." This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries.[2] With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.[3]

Meanwhile, the Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce
Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.[4]

Here are more details on how the rule change would make the world a far more dangerous place:

It would eliminate the State Department's Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.[5]

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.[6]

It would remove the State Department's block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.[7]

Firearms are dangerous. They are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less.


[3] Ibid., The Boston Globe
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Submitter Information

Name: Steven Solomon
Address: West Hollywood, CA, 90046
Email: gofindsteven@icloud.com
Phone: 3236502099

General Comment

I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to
the U.S. Commerce Department. Firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent
and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition
if the switch is allowed.
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.

With this rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey.

It would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

This is a very bad policy proposal that will make the US less safe.
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Submitter Information

Name: Tris Palmgren

General Comment

Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the proposed rule.
I am a parent and active member in the early childhood education community in Chicago. I am OPPOSED to the proposed rule allowing the President to determine which articles no longer warrant control under United States Munitions List (USML) Category I: Firearms, Close Assault Weapons and Combat Shotguns; Category II: Guns and Armament; and Category III: Ammunition/Ordnance would be controlled under the Commerce Control List (CCL).

The firearms industry is hurting financially - revising these rules to benefit the firearms industry's bottom line is NOT in the best interest of Americans or any global citizens.

We do not need more guns in the hands of those that wish to cause us harm. These high powered weapons belong in the hands of our military and not civilians.

Also, the amendments proposed would limit Congressional oversight on important gun export deals and drastically increases the possibility for gun trafficking. This is unacceptable.

I respectfully ask that the Commerce Department does not proceed with the proposed rule.

Regards,

Aisha Noble
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. Thank you for your consideration of this very serious matter.
The Commerce Department just does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

I strongly oppose this regulation.
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Name: Sara Ashley-Cook
Address: 2195 Tallmadge
        Ravenna, OH, 44266
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General Comment

As a citizen of the United States of America I am already shocked and appalled at the fact that my country has the reputation of being the Arms Dealer to the rest of the world to draw relaxed gun laws. I'm appalled at the fact that Mexican drug cartels come to the United States to buy their guns and that guns that were originally from the United States find their way into places like South America and the Middle East where they help fuel the violence in those parts to world. As such under no circumstances do I want any law to be passed for any reason that makes it easier for guns from the United States of America to be sold or transferred or trafficked to any other country in the world. If anything I want to see this made more difficult. I'm tired of gun manufacturers and the NRA profiting off the blood of innocent people. I'm also tired of the government helping them do it.
I am a gun owner and I strongly OPPOSE switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Department of Commerce. This change would make our country and the world more dangerous in many ways:

It would remove the State Department ability to restrict 3D printing of weapons and open the floodgates for more weapons domestically and internationally.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers.

Would stop the program that inspects pre-license guns and issues reports.

Without the State Department oversight and regulatory authority, firearms will be exported to anyone with money and fuel increased organized crime and terrorism.

There is NO need switch control of firearms exports unless it is to pay for firearms lobbyists. Please do not approve this move.
Dear sir,

I am writing to oppose the proposed changes to the regulation of domestic Firearm sales to foreign purchasers. The United States has supplied weapons to foreign groups in the past only to have those same weapons used against our own military personnel. Mistakes were made in the past but I would rather arms sales were regulated by the State Department whose aim is to protect the safety of our nation. The Commerce Department has a goal of increasing our sales and isn't tasked with determining whether those sales constitute a future danger to our country.
Docket: BIS-2017-0004
Control of Firearms, Guns, Ammunition and Related Articles the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)

Comment On: BIS-2017-0004-0001
Control of Firearms, Guns, Ammunition and Related Articles the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)

Document: BIS-2017-0004-0299
Bulk comment 111_Representative sample

Submitter Information

Name: Christine De Angelis
Address: Houston, TX, 77280
Email: ciara77055@yahoo.com
Phone: 7134984412

General Comment

There is no need to impose our 'gun culture' on other countries. In fact, it is far beyond time to repeal the 2nd Amendment as it pertains to private citizens.

Treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military, despite their use by U.S. troops, their use by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and their prohibition for civilian possession in many countries.
Eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals.
Transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers.
Removes statutory license requirements for brokers, increasing risk of trafficking.
Reduces or eliminates end-use controls, such as State Depts Blue Lantern program, and by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s.
Enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms.
The Commerce Department does not have the resources to enforce export controls, even now.
Reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports.
Transfers gun export licensing from an agency with mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with mission to promote trade.
Loosening regulations on export of weapons is patently irresponsible and reckless! The USA must keep close check on munitions and ammunition!
I oppose the rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Firearms exports are military. The Commerce Department does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls.
The proposed changes to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations are a threat to our national security. Right now, firearms exports are classified as military. This is why they are under the regulation of the State Department, and why Congress can block sales of large batches of firearms to foreign countries. With the rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns, such as the Philippines and Turkey. They would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.

It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.

It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

The bottom line is that switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.

I am strongly opposed to these proposed changes which will provide a heightened threat to our national security and endanger the safety of American citizens. As well it will put the lives of citizens around the world at unacceptable risk, especially American citizens living or traveling abroad.
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Name: Gerritt and Elizabeth Baker-Smith
Address: 
   338 Braeside Ave
   East Stroudsburg, 18301
Email: egbakersmith@gmail.com
Phone: 5703694485
Fax: 18301

General Comment

We oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. Please do not approve the rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. Thank you for your attention.
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Name: Joe Buhowsky
Address:
   83 Tahoe Court
   San Ramon, CA, 94582
Email: jbuhowsky@sbcglobal.net

General Comment

I strongly oppose switching the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department.
Submitter Information

Name: Thomas Rogers
Address: Congregation Ahavath Beth Israel  
11 North Latah Street  
Boise, ID, 83706
Email: SocialAction@AhavathBethIsrael.ORG
Phone: (208) 949-7807

General Comment

To whom it may concern,

The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department and benefit only NRA backers and American gun manufacturers and put other Americans and citizens of the wider world at risk of greater gun violence.

Thomas Rogers
Eagle, Idaho
United States of America
**General Comment**

The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. *Submit a comment now to the State Department and the Commerce Department through the link above. You can write in something like: I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. The public comment period for this rule change ends on July 9.
I am writing in opposition to moving export license oversight for firearms from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce because the proposed rule change treats semiautomatic assault rifles as non-military. The proposal reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports and transfers gun export licensing from an agency with a mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with a mission to promote trade and which lacks the resources to adequately enforce export controls.

Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not fewer.
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Submitter Information
Name: Eileen Chieco

General Comment

The NRA and gun manufacturers want guns everywhere, for everyone, not just here in the United States, but around the world as this is how they make money. They are pushing hard for a rule change that would move the handling of export licenses of semiautomatic assault weapons and other powerful firearms from the U.S. State Department (focused on safeguarding our nation) to the U.S. Commerce Department (focused on promoting American business). This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security.

With the proposed rule change, Congress would no longer be automatically informed about sizable weapons sales that it could stop in the name of national security, even to countries where there are serious human rights concerns. Moreover, the Commerce Department does not have the resources to adequately enforce export controls. Its Bureau of Industry and Security does not have staff everywhere. This means that firearms traffickers, organized crime, terrorist organizations, and other violent and dangerous agents would face far fewer hurdles to obtaining large caches of American guns and ammunition.

Additionally, the rule change would make the world a more dangerous place for the following reasons:
It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.

In summary, firearms are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political
violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
Hello,

My name is Megan Prier and I am a resident of California and employee of UC Berkeley. I strongly believe that we need to have responsible gun control and restrictions on gun exports. I oppose the proposed rule for the following reasons:

The proposed rule treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military. But many state and non-state groups in importing countries use semi-automatic rifles in armed conflicts, causing enormous damage. Regarding wide retail availability of firearms, about which comment has been requested, many countries, including Mexico, prohibit civilian possession of semi-automatic rifles and handguns, as well as of any larger caliber firearm. Because military-style assault rifles clearly have substantial military utility, transfer of these firearms to Commerce Department control is inconsistent with the statutory framework enacted by the Congress to regulate the export of arms.

The proposed rule would eliminate Congressional oversight for important gun export deals. Congress will no longer be automatically informed about sizable sales of these weapons. That will limit its ability to comment on related human rights concerns, as it recently did on the Philippines and Turkey.

National brokering laws are a weak link in the chain of efforts to curtail trafficking of small arms and light weapons. The switch from State to Commerce will mean that the brokers and financiers who arrange shipments of semiautomatic firearms will no longer have a statutory requirement to register and obtain a license, increasing risk of trafficking. That will make it easier for unscrupulous dealers to escape attention.

The rule reduces end-use controls for gun exports. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program for gun and ammunition exports, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment
inspections and publicly reports on them. It also would move license approval out of the department that compiles the U.S. Governments information on human rights violations, reducing the ability to effectively deny weapons licenses to international human rights violators.

End-use controls are weakened by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s. Registration of exporters allows the State Department to check an exporters history whenever a manufacturer or broker requests a license for a particular gun export sale. But the transfer of licensing to Commerce will remove new exporters and brokers of these firearms from the State Department database, weakening enforcement against arms trafficking.

The rule enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for 3D-printing weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The Commerce Department is unlikely to make the same argument once those weapons are transferred to their control. Unless corrected, the new regulations run the risk of effectively condoning and enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe. By effectively eliminating many means to detect firearms, background checks on domestic sales and end-use controls on international exports for such weapons, this change could generate many preventable tragedies.

The proposed change will reduce transparency and reporting on gun exports. The rule would eliminate Congressional and public awareness of the total amount (dollar value and items) of firearms sales authorizations and deliveries around the world, since the Commerce Department annual reports currently only cover about 20 countries.

This rule would transfer gun export licensing to an agency the Commerce Department - whose principle mission is to promote trade. Firearms, both assault weapons and non-semi-automatic weapons, are uniquely and pervasively used in criminal violence around the world. Controlling their export should be handled by the State Department, which is mandated and structured to address the potential impacts in importing nations on stability, human security, conflict, and human rights. Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. Research indicates that the types of weapons being transferred to Commerce control, including AR-15, AK-47, and other military-style assault rifles and their ammunition, are weapons of choice for criminal organizations in Mexico and other Latin American countries that are responsible for most of the increasing and record levels of homicides in those countries.[ii] The export of these weapons should be subject to more controls, not less.
I am concerned that the proposed rule may not adequately address our national security, foreign policy, international crime, terrorist threats, or the need for transparency so Congress and the public may understand the impact of these rules and potential firearm exports. We are also concerned that the proposed rule fails to recognize the inherently military nature of many of the relevant firearms. Other points include:

1. It would eliminate the State Departments Blue Lantern program, in place since 1940, which carries out hundreds of pre-license and post-shipment inspections and publicly reports on them.
2. It would remove licensing requirements for brokers, increasing the risk of trafficking.
3. It would remove the State Departments block on the 3D printing of firearms. When Defense Distributed founder Cody Wilson posted online instructions for how to 3D print weapons, the State Department successfully charged him with violating arms export laws, since his open-source posting made it possible for anyone with access to a 3D printer, anywhere, to produce a lethal weapon. The rule switch would remove this block, effectively enabling 3D printing of firearms in the U.S. and around the globe.
My neighbor and fellow citizen said it best:
"Easing restrictions on the export of firearms -- including types already banned in several U.S. states -- does a disservice to the U.S. and the world. The United States is already the #1 exporter of small arms and light weapons, many of which end up in the hands of drug cartels and militias from Bogot to Jakarta. These transfers are documented in detail by wide-ranging research, including the Small Arms Survey and the U.N. Office for Disarmament Affairs. We will only be shooting ourselves in the foot (pun intended) if we choose to give gun manufacturers more freedom to contribute to instability abroad. We will also be repeating the same travesty our government has condoned for decades: putting firearm industry profits over human lives.

I urge the Department to reconsider this and any other relaxation of existing restrictions on small arms exports."
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for trafficking lethal arms internationally, with serious implications for our national security - the last thing our government should advance.

Firearms are used to kill people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. They should be subject to more controls, not less!
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I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rule regarding control of firearms and related articles. The rule would dramatically change the regulatory structure for firearm exports. The proposed rule is complex and appears to be largely driven by the interests of industry. I am concerned that the proposed rule may not adequately address our national security, foreign policy, international crime, terrorist threats, or the need for transparency so Congress and the public may understand the impact of these rules and potential firearm exports. I am also concerned that the proposed rule fails to recognize the inherently military nature of many of the relevant firearms. Rather than moving forward with the proposed rule, the Administration should consider other alternatives to better balance the important interests at stake.
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Final Response to weapons sales proposals
For thirty-five years I have been a member of Amnesty International USA and currently chair our Women's Human Rights Coordination Group. Amnesty International is the world’s largest grassroots human rights organization, and our global movement consists of millions of members and activists who defend justice, dignity and freedom for everyone without exception. The Women’s Human Rights Coordination Group’s particular area of interest is in the human rights of women and girls.

We are concerned about recent proposals to move responsibility for oversight of licensing of international sales of some small arms and light weapons from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce and the removal from the US Munitions List (USML) of several semi-automatic firearms, including AR-15s, some AK-47s and high capacity ammunition cartridges. Since 2014, the U.S. has been one of the world’s largest arms dealers, and is responsible for approximately 30 percent of conventional arms transfers with regards to monetary value. Consequently, these changes would make sales of these weapons easier and expand access to them at their destination. They would also reduce accountability for their use in commission of human rights abuses.

It is now recognized that rape and sexual assault are systematically used as weapons of war in conflicts around the world. Attacks on women and girls terrorize families, communities or ethnic groups, humiliating and demoralizing local residents to bring them under control, or causing them to flee from disputed territory.

In interviews with women and girls who have survived sexual violence during conflict, a very high number of their stories include descriptions of the torture they endured at the point of a gun. Although the particular models of firearms involved are seldom identified, there is no doubt that a military-style weapon contributed to gross violations of their human rights. Even after a conflict has officially ended, the weapons left behind are used all too often by perpetrators of domestic violence. Colombia receives a large proportion of their weapons from the U.S. These guns are often linked to the patriarchal culture that supports the notion that firearms help men to defend themselves and protect their families. However, these weapons exacerbate violence against women and girls. In Colombia, 2 out of 10 women who are internally displaced identify sexual violence as the primary cause. The exact model of firearm used in violence against women and girls is irrelevant, and all military-style weapons and ammunition currently on the US Munitions List should remain.

Amnesty International was actively involved for two decades in negotiating the global Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), which went into force in December 2014. This treaty requires that before authorizing a transnational sale of firearms, governments must assess the risk that the weapons under consideration would be used to commit or facilitate serious violations of international humanitarian or human rights law, undermine peace and security, or to engage in transnational organized crime. An "overriding" risk that the arms would be used for these purposes would prohibit the sale.

After intense lobbying by women's human rights organizations and activists during the drafting of the ATT, it became the first treaty that recognized the link between the international arms trade and gender-based violence. Article 7(4) of the treaty made it mandatory for arms exporting countries to assess the risk that weapons being considered for sale would be used to commit or facilitate gender-based violence and deny authorization in the case of an "overriding" risk.

Moving responsibility for authorizing international sales of additional weapons and ammunition from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce would bypass the requirement to assess the risk that the merchandise in question would be used to commit or facilitate human rights violations, including gender-based violence. It is essential that these standards continue to be upheld, and we strongly urge the Government to maintain responsibility for international sales of weapons and ammunition manufactured in the US with the Department of State.

Sincerely,

Alice Dahle, Chair
Women's Human Rights Coordination Group
Amnesty International USA
I am a U.S. taxpayer, resident, and citizen by birth. I oppose the transfer of oversight of firearms export from the State Department to the Commerce Department. Firearms are used to kill a thousand people every day around the world in acts of organized crime, political violence, terrorism, and human rights violations. Research indicates that the types of weapons being transferred to Commerce control, including AR-15, AK-47, and other military-style assault rifles and their ammunition, are weapons of choice for criminal organizations in Mexico and other Latin American countries that are responsible for most of the increasing and record levels of homicides in those countries. The export of these weapons should be subject to more controls, not fewer. Thank you.
PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Docket: BIS-2017-0004
Control of Firearms, Guns, Ammunition and Related Articles the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)

Comment On: BIS-2017-0004-0001
Control of Firearms, Guns, Ammunition and Related Articles the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)

Document: BIS-2017-0004-0316
Bulk comment 128_Representative sample (1)

Submitter Information

Name: Susan Waltz
Address: United States,
Email: swaltz@unich.edu
Phone: 517 980 0309

General Comment

Comments attached. (I believe I previously submitted these but am sending again as I do not have a receipt.)

Attachments

Comment_on_regs_6-30-18
30 June 2018

To: DDTCPublicComments@state.gov
Office of Defense Trade Controls Policy, Department of State
and
Regulatory Policy Division, Bureau of Industry and Security, U.S. Department of
Commerce, Room 2099B, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington DC
20230

Subject: ITAR Amendment - Categories I, II, and III
EAR Amendment - RIN 0694-AF47

I am writing to submit comments on the proposed changes to ITAR (USML) and EAR (CCL) recently published in the Federal Register. I write in a personal capacity but the views expressed are informed by my research, policy analysis, and teaching as a professor at the University of Michigan, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy.

By way of a few introductory remarks, I am familiar with the complexities of US arms export laws and policy, as well as the regulatory framework. There is a legitimate need for periodic updates of the USML and—in view of the labyrinth of entangled laws, regulations, and agencies involved in the current system—I am supportive of the reform initiative. I am generally more concerned about keeping weapons out of the hands of those who would misuse them than in making them easier to procure, but that end is not at odds with the objective of putting in place a single control list and a single administrative agency. The reform effort has not progressed to that point, however, and I am wary about these proposed regulatory changes as an interim step. I will also add that I have been following the export control reform project since it was announced in 2009 and this is the only time I have felt the need to express concerns about the proposed changes. That is largely due to the particular, complete and recognizable, weapons that are being considered for change.

1. I urge you to delay the effective date of the proposed changes until the Government Accounting Office or the Library of Congress has publicly reported to the Congress their impact on numerous statutes referring to “defense articles.”

If enacted, the changes would have implications for several provisions of law. From my reading of both sets of proposed regulations, I am not reassured that the implications have been fully considered. The USML is formally defined in the AECA (22 USC 2778) as a definitive list of defense articles,¹ and from a quick search of US statutes the term “defense article” appears in some 45 sections,² in many instances (but

¹ 22 USC 2778(a)(1).
not always) explicitly linked to the USML. In addition, several provisions of the AECA itself are explicitly linked to an item's presence on the USML (without necessarily referring to "defense articles"). On a separate statutory track, the Foreign Assistance Act was recently amended to include CCL 600 series items as defense articles, along with all items contained on the USML [22 USC 2304.(d)(2)(C)], but the legislation did not anticipate the new 500 series so there is likely a gap there with regards to Congressional intentions. To complicate things further, the US Munitions Import List (USMIL) makes liberal use of the term "defense article," defined as articles on the USMIL—which currently include the same items that are slated to lose the "defense article" designation that extends from inclusion on the USML - so that items designated as defense articles on the USMIL will not be considered defense articles for purposes of export.  

It is very challenging to sort out the tangle. Some of the instances where terms and definitions are at variance may not prove significant, but others may have far-reaching implications. Due to the disparate definitions and linkages, the proposal to remove specified firearms from the USMIL raises some important questions about the continuing applicability of provisions of law that refer to "defense articles," a term that currently encompasses such firearms. In numerous situations the current statutory treatment of non-automatic firearms would be altered – or at least become ambiguous — as a result simply of moving these weapons from Category I of the USMIL to the 500-series on CCL. Statutory provisions that could be affected by the proposed change range from Export-Import Bank financing of defense article sales to human rights conditionality on security assistance, to the provisions for third-party transfer of grant-supplied defense articles, and various reports to Congress. (See references in the footnote below.) In some cases, the law in question is not directly linked to arms exports, but the relevant statute refers to defense articles and links the definition to items on the USMIL. In this way, removing specified firearms from the USMIL is likely to have a host of unintended and unanticipated repercussions.

Further, if semi-automatic weapons and other non-automatic firearms are removed from the USMIL it will impact the ability of law enforcement to charge weapons traffickers with violating the AECA as was done in several of the cases cited in a recent report from the Department of Justice on export enforcement.


4 The numerous places where the meaning of "defense article" would be called into question by the proposed rules include:

- Export-Import Bank financing of defense article sales, including multiple end use considerations and other conditions (12 USC 635);
- Requirement to give Congress notice of commercial firearms sales of $1,000,000 or more (22 USC 2776);
- Annual report to Congress on military assistance, and specifically on transfers of USMIL Category I firearms (22 USC 2415);
- Provisions for supplying defense articles on a grant-basis, and multiple restrictions (22 USC 2314);
- Conditions for third-party transfer of defense articles provided on a grant basis (22 USC 2314);
- Certification of end use as a condition of sale or lease of defense article (22 USC 2753);
- Post-delivery verification of credible reports of misuse of weapons (22 USC 2753);
- Brokers of items included on the USMIL are required to register and activity must be licensed; exporters of USMIL items must identify all consignees and freight forwarders in license application (22 USC 2778).

As Acting Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs Tina Kaidanow explained to the House Foreign Affairs Committee last June, the US arms export architecture is very complex and involves what her predecessors have described as “cradle to grave” oversight of exported US defense articles. Removing that designation defense article from non-automatic weapons has the effect of detaching them from the US Munitions List and the regulatory framework built around it: there may well be significant unintended consequences.

In the event that consideration of the proposals is not delayed, I would recommend several other changes to the proposed ITAR and EAR revisions.

2. Retain existing USML I(a) and (d) unchanged; retain the existing coverage of USML II(a) unchanged; delete proposed 0A501.a and .b; and limit proposed 0A502 to renumbering existing 0A984.

My concern here is based on principle and definition. Several of the weapons that would be moved to CCL are military-style weapons that are either used in battlefield situations or are substantially comparable to weapons as used in battlefield situations – including semi-automatic assault rifles and bolt-action sniper rifles. All of USML I(a), I(d), and II(a) are currently designated “significant military equipment” due to “their capacity for substantial military utility or capability,” per the ITAR definition. The prevalence of armed extremists and insurgents who depend on weapons currently included in USML Categories I and II makes the military utility or capability of these weapons as relevant as ever. Due to their size and long shelf life, firearms are easily diverted and resold on black markets around the world. The Department of Justice’s January 2018 summary of major US export enforcement cases noted above includes recent smuggling of semi-automatic assault rifles (and other firearms) to Dominican Republic, the Gambia, Russia via Latvia, Thailand and other destinations. In addition, the report documents the case of two men in Georgia attempting to export firearms to a range of international on the dark net, and another similar case from Kansas.

While the US military may not derive great advantage from most of these weapons, they still have the military utility and capability of threatening the lives and welfare of many people around the world. It is in the interest of the US and American citizens to keep the tightest control on them. Indeed, it is for that very reason that the same weapons being proposed for removal from the US Munitions List are expected to remain on the US Munitions Import List, where their entry into the US will remain tightly controlled. It is also for that reason that a growing number of states are imposing limitations on the retail availability of these weapons and many retailers are voluntarily removing them from their shelves. They should remain where they are, on the USML.

3. Before proposed regulatory changes are adopted, an opinion should be obtained from the

---

8 Department of Justice, op. cit.
Department of Justice concerning the legality of applying ITAR brokering restrictions to exports of firearms transferred from the USML to the CCL. Furthermore, Congress and the public should be informed as to how the proposed arrangements will address the risk of diversion.

There are several reasons to be concerned about the proposed rules pertaining to brokering. From their origin in the 1930s, a major intent of efforts to regulate arms exports has been to curtail illicit and undesirable trafficking in weapons. In the 1980s and 1990s, illicit flows of small arms flooded international markets, with calamitous effects in every region of the world. The rate of flow may have slowed since the 1990s, but as the 2018 Justice Department report attests, the efforts to supply contraband firearms are very much alive in our own time. From a global perspective, brokering laws are considered a weak link in the regulatory apparatus, to the extent that in the 1990s there was some talk of negotiating an international treaty focused entirely on arms brokering. Provisions written into US law around that time were considered some of the strongest in the world. With the transfer of specified semi-automatic and non-automatic weapons to CCL, the brokering laws would no longer be applied to these weapons (or would be applied only in a much-weakened version) and they would not be available to law enforcement for prosecution purposes.

My specific concerns with the proposal to apply existing AECA/ITAR brokering rules to items intended for transfer to the CCL are twofold, related to the dubious statutory underpinnings of the proposed rule change and to its practical implications.

(a) The first concern is a matter of statutory coherence and proper statutory authority. The brokering clauses of the AECA require commercial brokers involved in the transfer of defense articles to register with the State Department and apply for their transactions to be licensed (22 USC 2778). The AECA brokering provisions are explicitly linked to defense articles on the USML (and by implication, ITAR). Because the proposed changes to ITAR and CCL would remove specified non-automatic and semi-automatic firearms from the USML, on the face of it, it would seem that commercial brokers of these items would be released from ITAR registration and brokering requirements. To prevent this outcome, the State Department proposes a patch, by asserting that the AECA brokering provisions will also apply to the US Munitions Import List (which, as noted above, will continue to include the items that—for export purpose—are deemed no longer to warrant control under the USML). The intended effect is that brokers wanting to export items included on the list of items controlled as defense articles for import (but not for export) will be subject to the rules pertaining to the export of such items. The logic is convoluted at best, and it raises questions about the statutory grounding for requiring brokers who are exporting items “no longer warranting control under USML” to register with the State Department and comply with related ITAR requirements. Given the complexity of the issue and the risks associated with brokering activities, it would seem advisable and prudent to seek a legal opinion within the Executive Branch to ensure that the provisions of the AECA pertaining to brokers—including the registration requirement—can be applied robustly to all involved in the wide range of brokering activities associated with the export of items on the

---

9 Per 22 USC 2778 (b)(1)(A)(i), "...every person (other than an officer or employee of the United States Government acting in official capacity) who engages in the business of brokering activities with respect to the manufacture, export, import, or transfer of any defense article or defense service designated by the President under subsection (a)(1), or in the business of brokering activities with respect to the manufacture, export, import, or transfer of any foreign defense article or defense service (as defined in subclause (IV)), shall register with the United States Government agency charged with the administration of this section, and shall pay a registration fee which shall be prescribed by such regulations."
US Munitions Import List. Such a legal opinion should be obtained and considered before the regulatory changes are adopted.

(b) The second issue about brokering rules relates to the practical effects of the numerous proposed changes to ITAR section 129. It is hard to imagine, in the first place, the steps by which the licensing of a transaction will be handled by Commerce and any brokering aspects (including completion of information required by 22 CFR 129.6) will be handled by State. It boggles the mind to consider how this might actually amount to a time-saving simplification of rules. I am primarily concerned about the proposed amendment 129.2(b)(2)(vii), however, which appears to negate the controls on brokering for transactions subject to EAR and open a significant loophole for unscrupulous brokers. If I have understood the proposed changes to Section 129.2 correctly, if a Michigan-based retail sports outlet licensed to sell firearms in the US wanted to sell, say, AR-15 semi-automatic rifles to clients in another country, then so long as the Michigan retailer could secure approval via the BIS licensing process, the various parties involved in shipment, financing, and possibly transshipment would be exempt from any registration and approval requirements. Nor would they necessarily be known to licensing and enforcement agents based in the Commerce Department. What in this scenario would deter an unknown and independent handler from diverting the weapons to unauthorized end-users? I would like to assume that government officials in the State and Commerce Departments have thought through the implications of the proposed rules as they might be bent for nefarious purpose as well as their service for industry cost and convenience, but the proposed rules do not provide assurance in that regard. More clarification is needed about how the brokering regulations will be applied, how the inter-agency process will be managed, and the extent to which the proposed arrangements for registering and licensing brokers involved in acquiring, financing and transporting exported firearms will address the risk of diversion to non-authorized end-users. One effect of transferring non-automatic firearms from the USML to the CCL is to remove them from the remit of the State Department’s Blue Lantern program, which otherwise might be engaged to make post-shipment checks. It is not clear whether Commerce has a comparable program or what resources it will assign to monitoring the commerce in semi-automatic firearms.

4. Amend proposals for EAR Section 734.

BIS has indicated that items moving “to the CCL would be subject to existing EAR concepts of jurisdiction and controls related to ‘development’ and ‘production,’ as well operation, installation, and maintenance ‘technology.’” This approach would appear to give rise to the possibility of widespread and openly sanctioned circulation of open source, non-proprietary instructions for using computer-aided design (CAD) files to produce via 3D-printing technology, or text files to produce via CNC milling the firearms removed from USML. Until now, this development has been blocked in the courts via application of ITAR provisions requiring export license. Either the Department of Commerce should clarify that it views any software instructions for producing controlled firearms already to be within the ambit of the EAR, or EAR Section 734.7 should be amended to bring circulation of open-source, non-proprietary CAD and other electronic files under EAR control - possibly by establishing that electronic files for producing functional firearms are subject to EAR control as production technology.

1) When questions arose in 1996 as to the authority of the President to restrict munitions imports under the AECA, the Office of Legal Counsel in the Justice Department was asked to provide an opinion. A similar request for opinion is warranted here. See https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/olc/opinions/1996/02/31/olc-v020-p0049_0.pdf.
5. Amend provisions for License Control – Crime Control

Shotguns controlled under 0A502 are subject to the Crime Control because they are not controlled by Wassenaar. It is not evident, however, why items 0A501a are controlled for Regional Security but not Crime Control, as firearms are a main element of crime control equipment used by police and security forces. Moreover, federal statutes explicitly prohibit the export of crime control equipment to police and security forces in countries whose governments have a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, with exceptions requiring Presidential certification. To bring the proposed regulations into alignment with provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act [22 USC 2304(a)(2), which makes explicit reference to crime control equipment under the aegis of the (expired) Export Administration Act], items in 0A501A should be subject to Crime Control.

6. Include information from enhanced reporting on certain firearms exports in annual 655 Report.

Enhanced reporting of items in the 501 series is potentially one bright spot in the proposed regulations. Several proposed changes are welcome, including: proposed changes in EAR part 748 requiring information about required import licenses; proposed changes in reporting mandated in EAR part 758; the required use of EEI filing for 0A501.a firearms; and the proposed recordkeeping requirement in part 762.

If the proposed rules are ultimately accepted, the information provided to the Wassenaar Arrangement and the UN Register of Conventional Arms will provide more granular information about US commercial exports of firearms, which seemingly could be included without significant additional effort in the annual 655 report mandated by the Foreign Assistance Act, 22 USC 2415.

7. The balance of costs and benefits significantly favors industry over the taxpayer.

The two sets of proposed rules include calculations of expected costs and benefits of the changes. Having invested several hours parsing the proposed rules, I suspect that one major benefit of the changes will accrue to the attorneys who help clients wend their way through federal regulations. The registration system as it was initially set up was intended to pay for itself, via modest registration and licensing fees that covered the costs of recording and updating information on US arms manufacturers and reviewing details for proposed transactions. In some sense, it has been a fee-for-service arrangement. The proposed changes significantly alter that approach with regards to firearms proposed for transfer to the CCL.

Except for the presumably few brokers unable to qualify for the firearms registration exemption outlined in proposed changes to ITAR section 129.2, no registration or license fees will be collected. Some of the transactions may be straightforward, but the workload promises to be substantial, with 4000-10,000 applications and virtually every 0A501 transaction subject to at least regional security controls, with no license exceptions available. Whereas under the current system fees paid by industry and brokers help offset the costs of processing the license applications, under the proposed system the expenses associated with reviewing license applications will be charged to the taxpayer. In the current political
environment where government hiring is anathema, unless a streamlined new process delivers extraordinary returns, it is difficult to imagine how the tally could come out in the taxpayer's favor without significant sacrifice of quality control. With respect to firearms exports, taxpayers and the public at large should be concerned about pressures to cut corners that could result in authorization of irresponsible transfers. **In my view as a taxpayer, the ITAR fee structure is yet one more reason for retaining non-automatic and semi-automatic firearms on the USML, and should these weapons ultimately be transferred to the CCL, I urge public officials at the Commerce Department to explore charging a service fee for processing export license applications.**

**Conclusion**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on these rules. I am disappointed, however, that by and large they downplay the lethality of the weapons currently controlled in ITAR categories I and III. I realize that these documents were prepared for a different purpose than the materials posted to inform the global public about US government programs and policy, but the difference between the tone and emphasis of the proposed rules and the public presentation of US policy on the export of small arms and light weapons over the past twenty years is striking. By contrast to the public statements and documents, including the 2017 Congressional testimony by a State Department official, the emphasis in these regulations is on reducing transaction costs for industry rather than promoting the public good, including national security and public safety.

In response to public comments on the proposed regulatory changes, I hope that the Departments of State and Commerce will reconsider the proposal to transfer any complete weapons from the USML to CCL. In the event that the proposed regulations go forward substantially unchanged, I can only hope that other countries will tighten and strictly enforce their own import restrictions to reduce the risk of diversion and misuse.

Thank you,

Susan Waltz  
Professor  
Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  

swaltz@umich.edu
I oppose this rule change that would switch the regulations of firearms export from the U.S. State Department to the U.S. Commerce Department. This transfer of authority would open new floodgates for arms sales internationally, with serious implications for our national security. Switching the regulation of firearms exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department would facilitate firearms exports to oppressive regimes, remove safeguards that help keep extra-legal agents like organized crime and terrorist organizations from obtaining weapons, and further fuel violence that destabilizes countries and causes mass migration.
Comment: For the following reasons I strongly protest the following provisions of The U.S. Department of State (DOS) Proposed Rule: International Traffic in Arms Regulations: U.S. Munitions List Categories I, II, and III: This proposal

- Treats semi-automatic assault rifles as non-military, despite their use by U.S. troops, their use by state and non-state groups in armed conflicts, and their prohibition for civilian possession in many countries.

- Eliminates Congressional oversight for important gun export deals.

- Transfers the cost of processing licenses from gun manufacturers to taxpayers.

- Removes statutory license requirements for brokers, increasing risk of trafficking.

- Reduces or eliminates end-use controls, such as State Depts Blue Lantern program, and by eliminating registration of firearms exporters, a requirement since the 1940s.

- Enables unchecked gun production in the U.S. and exports abroad by removing the block on 3D printing of firearms.

- The Commerce Department does not have the resources to enforce export controls, even now.

- Reduces transparency and reporting on gun exports.
- Transfers gun export licensing from an agency with mission to promote stability, conflict reduction, and human rights, to an agency with mission to promote trade.