# Episode 191-- The Supreme Court & the Future of Gun Laws in ...

**F**ri, 7/1 5:03PM **B** 36:03

#### SUMMARY KEYWORDS

gun violence, second amendment, gun, brady, gun laws, law, people, decision, public health, court, kelly, states, policy, mccord, research, impact, heller, ruling, frustrating, case

#### SPEAKERS

Gerald Harmon, JJ Janflone, Kelly Sampson, Jon Lowy, Alex McCord, Aalayah Eastmond



# JJ Janflone 00:09

This is the legal disclaimer where I tell you that the views, thoughts and opinions shared on this podcast belongs solely to our guests and hosts, and not necessarily Brady or Brady's affiliates. Please note, this podcast contains discussions of violence that some people may find disturbing. It's okay, we find it disturbing too.



# JJ Janflone 00:37

Hey everybody. Welcome back to another episode of Red, Blue and Brady. I'm JJ, one of your hosts.



#### Kelly Sampson 00:42

And I'm Kelly, your other host.



# JJ Janflone 00:44

And today, we are really excited to be bringing you audio from a live event that we held here at Brady, although you know, don't panic, we're still digital. We're not there yet for fully in person events.



#### Kelly Sampson 00:55

Yeah, we held it in Brady's digital conference space, which is everywhere. And it's a really, really important conversation about what the Supreme Court's latest Second Amendment and latest firearms decision means for all of us.



# 🛐 JJ Janflone 01:11

It was a panel that could have easily gotten very, very wonky, but we were blessed with some phenomenal panelists who really broke down what this decision was, and all of its implications in a way that I thought was really accessible and actually really quite fun to participate with.

# Kelly Sampson 01:27

Yeah, I mean, I personally found it to be very accessible. And also surprisingly, and if you're in the mental space right now, like a lot of people where you feel discouraged, or you feel like there's nothing you can do, I would especially recommend listening to this one because I think we end on a note that is hopeful in a real way, not in a false way, about the fact that there's so so much that we can do to prevent gun violence.



# JJ Janflone 01:53

It was a phenomenal panel of legal experts, public health experts and advocates and I cannot wait for you to meet all of them.



# JJ Janflone 02:01

We have been joined by some phenomenal guests to talk about some stuff that could get a little wonky, but I think is really important for us to dig into, which is the recent Supreme Court decision in the Bruen case. So before we get into that I would love if our panelists could introduce themselves to our audience. Can we start with you, Dr. McCord?



# Alex McCord 02:22

Sure. Thanks for having me. My name is Alex McCord. I am an assistant professor in the Department of Health Policy and Management at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. I'm also the Director of Legal Research for the Johns Hopkins Center for gun violence solutions.



# JJ Janflone 02:36

Thank you. There's a lot of folks who have legal degrees on this call. Once again I'm going to feel kind of left out. Can we kick over to you, Jonathan Lowy.



#### Jon Lowy 02:45

All right. I'm John Lowy and Vice President of Legal and Chief Counsel at Brady.



# JJ Janflone 02:50

And Dr. Harmon.



#### Gerald Harmon 02:52

I'm Gerald Harmon, a family physician in rural South Carolina and immediate past president the American Medical Association.



## Kelly Sampson 02:59

Kelly. Hi, everyone. I'm Kelly Sampson. I'm Senior Counsel and Director of Racial Justice here at Brady.



# JJ Janflone 03:05

And last but certainly not least, a woman who wears many hats in many different orgs, Aalayah Eastmond?

#### Aalayah Eastmond 03:11

Hi, everyone. My name is Aalayah Eastmond, and I am the Team Enough national administrator.



#### JJ Janflone 03:17

Aalayah also does about 1000 other things. She's an organizing powerhouse. So we can just point that out. Kelly, can you give us a brief recap about what the Supreme Court case, you know, the New York State rifle vs Bruen was even about.

# Kelly Sampson 03:32

Sure thing. So the case was about several things at once. Strictly speaking, the case was about whether or not a New York State law that required individuals seeking a concealed carry license to show that they had proper cause. And in that case, proper cause meant something above sort of a general anxiety around safety, whether or not the state requiring individuals to show that was constitutional. So that's one thing. But obviously, there's so many other things and a few of the other issues that came up in deciding that issue was, first of all, the scope of the Second Amendment outside the home, because up until this point, the Supreme Court hadn't squarely decided that. And then also the standard of review that courts should be using when

they're analyzing the legality of gun laws. So the case was about a New York State law, but it also was about the scope of the Second Amendment and the standard of review for gun laws throughout all courts in the United States.

# JJ Janflone 04:28

And then if we, you know, I'm still going to use Brady privilege. If we can get over to John, you know, what, ultimately then was decided here in this case?

# Jon Lowy 04:37

Sure. Well, the court, not surprisingly, given that the composition of the current court by a vote of six to three held that the New York proper cause requirement that Kelly explained is unconstitutional. And the court held that individuals have a right under the Second Amendment to carry guns in public spaces to use them for self defense or what the court calls confrontation. And to be plain, what that means is that individuals have a right to carry guns in public spaces, so that they can pull those guns out and shoot other people when they believe it is necessary in their judgment to do so, and potentially kill those other people. So that was one aspect of the ruling. The other one was an issue that Kelly touched on, and actually the court did not need to decide. But the court established a new rule that governs all challengers to gun laws. And the rule that had been applied by every single Court of Appeals in the country since the Heller decision in 2008 was essentially to keep out the wonkiness. Essentially it said that the government can restrict gun rights in order to further an important interests such as saving lives so long as there's they don't unduly restrict those rights. There's a sort of they they're not overreaching, and not restricting, right, more than they need to or is reasonable. And I could get more wonky, but that's the gist of it. And that's basically the sort of rule that applies for virtually every right in the Constitution. But the court with an opinion authored by Justice Thomas created a new rule, which has never existed in American law for any right, which says that if a law restricts or impinges on protected Second Amendment activity in some way, it cannot be sustained, cannot be allowed, unless it has historical precedent unless there was a law in American history that is somewhat similar to that previous law. And the court said, in fact, if there was a problem that was similar that in in 1800, let's say, and Congress and states didn't enact a certain law that people now want. courts may find well, you can't enact a law like that, because it wasn't done in 1800. It is history and tradition test, which sort of locks us into the past, again, unheard of in American law. And that now is the rule going forward. We'll go into more details later. But that's that's the gist of it.



# JJ Janflone 07:42

Thank you, Kelly and John, I think that sets us up really well for the beginning. We kind of have the bracket now for what we'll be discussing. I would love to open it up to the floor, though. I think, Jon, you just expressed how you were I think it's clear, surprised by this particular ruling, in some ways, probably based on the scope of the decision that was made. And I wonder what what were your sort of thoughts? Were you surprised at the way that this ruling has has shook out and how it affects the communities that you serve and your work? And maybe we can start with Dr. McCord?

#### Alex McCord 08:14

Sure. So I was not surprised by the general holding, or really by the the kind of expansion of the Second Amendment to outside the home. I thought that seems relatively likely after oral argument. And in fact, after the Dobbs opinion leaked, I thought it seemed even more likely that the court would veer in this direction. What struck me the most what I was surprised by when I read the opinion, there were actually two things. One was that I didn't think the tests that Justice Thomas articulated was especially clear, I think it was it was really poorly done. It seemed like there was an opportunity to, to at least to clear things up. There had been some discussion about the the older tests being still a little bit confusing for courts. And so maybe there would be a clearer test here. But that didn't happen. It was some, some scholars have said that he used cherry picked history, it wasn't clear whose history was included, and what history was included. And the other thing that really struck me was the the complete dismissal of public health there. There was really, especially in some of the concurring opinions, it was almost disdainful treatment of of evidence and research. And that that caught me off guard.

# JJ Janflone 09:38

Yeah, I'd love Dr. Harmon. If you could weigh in on that, certainly as a physician yourself, and then within the position that you've held within the AMA, your thoughts on the ruling, especially from a public health perspective?

#### Gerald Harmon 09:48

Well, the AMA is first, we see gun violence as a public health crisis. In 2020 There were more than 45,000 people killed by gun violence and we declared gun violence public health crisis six years ago in 2016, and decades prior to that, we've been pushing Congress to pass common sense reforms that helped keep guns out of the hands of people who would harm others. We have policy, a long standing policy, including expanding background checks and waiting periods and eliminating ghost gun loopholes and things like that. We also have urged Congress to earmark funds for gun violence research, that's actually happened in the last year or so which is good. We're disappointed in the Supreme Court's ruling here, it seemed to be a an appropriate response by the state government to, to what we call the scourge of gun violence in the local communities. If you allow easier access to weapons and fewer restrictions on who can carry them, it's going to cost life, there's no question about it.



# JJ Janflone 10:41

And Aalayah, especially as a community activist and as a survivor yourself, I wonder what your sort of response was too?

#### Aalayah Eastmond 10:48

Absolutely especially as someone that has los

Absolutely, especially as someone that has lost a family member to gun violence in New York, it's completely frustrating. And I think it's the complete opposite of what we've been pushing and trying to do. We've been talking about, like restricting guns and making it harder to be in



the hands of those that can harm themselves or other people. And we are basically just giving the guns out and giving the right to people to decide whether or not someone it could be a harm. And we see things like Stand Your Ground law in New York, Stand Your Ground Law in Florida, excuse me, that disproportionately impacts black and brown lives, we see that law causing the deaths of people that look like me, and Kelly. So I'm just honestly scared. This makes us less safe. And unfortunately, we're going to see more guns, because of this ruling.



# JJ Janflone 11:36

So much of this ruling is tied up in historicity or claimed historical precedent. But I think it's important for us to talk about, you know, how did we get here to begin with both with sort of the levels of gun violence that we have in the US, but sort of past legal decisions? So I'd love maybe if we can start with you, John, just because I've never heard someone talk about Heller the way that you do. And so for our listeners, can we talk about that decision? And then, you know, how that that domino effect has maybe started to impact gun violence rates.

# Jon Lowy 12:03

I mean, Heller was sort of the original sin of this second amendment misreading that we've seen. If you want me to step back to to brief history of in 1791, the James Madison wrote the second amendment because of concerns by anti Federalists, that is people who wanted state power and were concerned about this new US government, which had strong federal authority, and the anti Federalists were afraid that their state armies would be starved by this new Federal Congress. So Madison wrote, and it was an act of the Second Amendment which says, A well regulated militia being necessary for the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. And for over 200 years, one of the most settled propositions of law was the second amendment was all about protecting state militias, state armies, which today is the National Guard, and that pose no impediment at all to gun laws. Chief Justice Warren Burger and Nixon employed to you know, liberal, said that the idea that the Second Amendment poses an impediment to gun laws restricting private gun use was one of the greatest frauds perpetuated in the American people, pretty strong language. Well, that fraud was accepted by the majority the Supreme Court in the Heller decision. And they basically sort of erased the first half of the Second Amendment, disregarded the whole history that it was about militias, and held that there's a private right to engage in armed self defense, which was completely invented. There is no mention of self defense anywhere in the Constitution, or in the history of the Second Amendment. So that's how we got there that was a product of a decade's long propaganda campaign by the NRA, with a lot of articles of phony history and to say the second amendment about this private right of armed self defense. And that isn't to say that people didn't believe in self defense and framers didn't have guns and those sort of things. That just isn't what the Second Amendment was about, and every historian agrees. So that's as a legal matter, that's how we got there. And then once there was that precedent, based on faulty history and disregarding tax, the court in Bruen said, Well, you got a right to keep guns in the home. You also in the court in Second Amendment have a right to bear guns, which means to carry them and they're, the Conservatives are sort of off to the races expanding this, this right.

Thanks for that John, and helping us understand how we got here. Can we talk a little bit and this is to anyone who wants to chime in about what this decision means for New York and also for other states around the country.

# Alex McCord 14:59

I can jump in here. So New York's law changes in pretty specific ways. So this proper cause requirements that that New York had, is struck down. There are, you know, specific legal machinations, as you know, to determine when that actually happens. But for all intents and purposes, it's it has been struck down and is no longer in place. But New York still requires a license to carry and carry concealed weapon, the rest of that licensing infrastructure is still in place. So New York just has to revise its law to remove that piece of it or just have it be removed by judicial action. What this means for other states is slightly more complicated. So there's a handful of states that have a similar provision in their law, a proper cause, or a good reason to carry a concealed weapon in public. This decision likely means that those provisions are similarly unconstitutional, but they're not automatically struck down. So states have to act to either change the implementation or enforcement of their law, or the text of their law. As we've seen, some states like New Jersey, say that they will not be enforcing that element of the law and instead be focusing on the other aspects of concealed carry permitting. So that's those are the most immediate effects of the of the court's ruling.

# Jon Lowy 16:28

I would add to that, as bad and wrong handed as this decision. It does leave open a lot of strong regulation. I mean, for one, you know, even under this history test, if you actually applied history, there's a strong tradition of gun regulation throughout American history, which should support probably all gun laws that we'd greatly favor. If you're honestly looking at the history. Now, history supported the New York law and the proper cause requirements. Justice Thomas and his colleagues chose to disregard inconvenient history and rely on their own. So a lot of it depends on which judges are deciding. But also importantly, there was a concurring opinion by Justice Cavanaugh and Chief Justice Roberts, which reaffirmed language in the Heller decision, which talked about the fact that the Second Amendment is not unlimited, and number of other gun laws remain constitutional. So you know, there is safe harbor, and even in the public carry arena, there is a lot that states can do to beef up those laws.

# JJ Janflone 17:40

I'm curious what some of the public health implications more broadly are of this law, both and or this decision, rather, in New York and elsewhere? And so I'm gonna start maybe by asking Dr. Herman, maybe an unfair question of you, you know, will this decision like, do you think that this decision could end up harming folks, do you think that this decision can cause harm?

# Gerald Harmon 18:02

Well I think so. I mean, clearly, if you have less control, or if you have more increased access, as I talked about opening statement to guns, and there's gonna be more opportunity for

violence, gun violence. Right now 79% of nomicides are associated with gun violence and 50% of suicides from gun violence. So we're already witnessing an epidemic of gun deaths. We talked about 45,000 annually, you know, doctors, unfortunately, we get to see the damage. We're the ones who were the people who see the folks that are shot with guns, we are the first one to see them after they're brought to our attention, we treat them. And in some cases, we're the people that save them. So we know what their guns can do to the human body, we see it up close, and I'm working in the emergency room this evening, I may see some gun injuries there. It's devastating. We have brain injuries, we have wounds, paralysis, post traumatic stress, just to name a few of the long term effects of firearm wounds. So it's, it's important to us from a public health situation to address this and to limit access and reduce the number of guns in the hands of folks who would do harm. So I think it stands to reason, from my point of view, as a public health specialist, and as a frontline worker, I can expect to see more gun violence as a result of this type of ruin.

# JJ Janflone 19:14

Well, and Aalayah, I wonder as somebody who you work as a community organizer, right, you're out there holding marches and things. Does this scare you? Or concern you at all the thought that folks might be out in public armed more than they already are?

# Aalayah Eastmond 19:27

Yes, absolutely. It just again, like doesn't make sense to me, especially for a state like New York where it's so congested, and there's so many people and there's already heightened gun violence. It honestly scares me and it it puts fear in me because I have so many family in New York and and this is not just something that's going to impact New York only this is going to impact our entire country. So you know it. It's frustrating to me, and, you know, I just I want us to do what we've been trying to do which is shift the culture of guns in this country and prevent people from like, constantly wanting to have a gun, because I feel like that's the basis of this country and a big part of our culture. And things like this just heighten that culture and make it much stronger, which is the opposite of what we're trying to do. So, for me, I'm just frustrated and angry. But, you know, this just shows us that we have a lot more work to do. And we have to continue this fight, and continue to uplift the voices that will be impacted by this the most, which it seems like it will be black and brown voices, voices and bodies, because people will be able to deem, who is a threat to them. So this is just super, eerily similar to stand your ground. To me, being a Florida resident.

# Kelly Sampson 20:40

Thank you for raising that Aalayah and talking about some of the broader context that this decision came down in. And I want to open it up to anyone else to talk about other, you know, some of the other consequences of this decision, and how it might impact us.

# Alex McCord 20:53

There's quite a bit of research into these types of of laws, these public carry laws that have found that making the switch that that New York is effectively forced to make you're moving

from a more discretionary or regulated system, to what we call a shall-issue law that requires the state to issue a permit much more readily, when states make that switch, there's generally an increase in certain measures of violence, including violent crime, and homicide, among others. So it's likely that we'll see some effect in the states that have to make the change that we'll probably see increases in certain levels of violence.

# Jon Lowy 21:40

Can I add, you know, going beyond carry laws, because of this test that the court has established, virtually all gun laws of any sort are at risk. Now, those laws should be upheld, because there's a tradition of gun regulation. But what the court has done is it's created a test, where if there's a judge who has a policy agenda, as I believe a number of justices on the Supreme Court have, and they want to further this sort of extreme gun policy agenda, they can do it. And they can cherry pick history, as Justice Thomas did, and find a way to strike down virtually any gun law. Again, they shouldn't, but they can. And I think we're going to see that path. And what they've done again, the court is they've taken public health and safety completely out of the equation, which is, it's hard to to, you know, get a grasp on how insane that is. And what they what they're saying is, if you had a gun law, that 100% of the experts agreed, would save 1000s of lives. If 100% of Americans want that law. It still might be impermissible in America and unconstitutional, unless judges are satisfied that in 1791, or 1868, very different America and America that I don't think anyone want to go back to for a lot of reasons. Unless they passed legislation that was somewhat similar. We can't have that law today. That is insane. And it basically takes the issue of gun policy out of the hands of the American people who basically had it for throughout our history, and puts it in the hands of an increasingly conservative policy driven judiciary.

# JJ Janflone 23:41

And so I wonder, Is it hard for you particularly, I'm thinking of you Dr. McCord, and you, Dr. Herman, when your public health experts that you have medical training you're in you're in this and you don't see that public health side being represented in decision makings that impact all Americans?

# Gerald Harmon 23:59

Well, I'll tell you, JJ, it is frustrating for me. Our AMA has got pretty strong policy. And we you know, we've had some legislative efforts. We have we've had the bipartisan Safer Communities Act, it's been signed into law and it'll expand access to community and school based behavioral health service for Children and Families shrink to background checks for those that are seeking to purchase firearms. So that will be hoping that wouldn't be impacted by this ruling. I'm not the lawyer expert, not for the counselors on this call. But now that Congress seems to be willing to act in a bipartisan and even a nonpartisan effort at solution to address the epidemic of gun violence. I'd like to see us continue to move where the Supreme Court ruling may be moved us in the other direction that that's frustrating for us and we've been also interested in had discussed her discussions on this panel about firearm safety and firearm injury research. You know, we got we have right now in one of our legislative efforts an effort to spin millions more dollars on farm research so we can not be just driven by emotion here. But by research that

tells us what we need to do to help reduce gun violence deaths, we've got a, we've got some more efforts from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and NIH, because of this gun violence, research expenditure. Let's make sure we take the science and apply it rationally in our legislative and our ruling decisions. But I'll tell ya, when I take care of gun injuries, and I'm, I've done it for 40 years now, it's incredible demand to damage the violence inflicted by by weapons, particularly military, military grade weapons that really need to have some more restrictions. That's a policy, it does hurt us in the public health arena and in the frontline arenas, and it, it causes a devastating effect in our communities, kids should be able to go to school or folks should be able to go to work places of worship, we should be able to shop safely. We should not be threatened with public health impact of gun violence, with lack of application to reasonable gun protection laws.

# Alex McCord 25:57

I agree that it's just enormously frustrating and disappointing to see public health evidence ignored like this. But I also think that it it has to be motivating, in some ways, we have to be able to keep working to translate research to make sure that policymakers and advocates understand what we're finding for a research perspective, because this doesn't close the door, the sky is not falling, it definitely changes the landscape and makes things much more challenging. But that just means from from a research perspective, we have to be more creative. And we have to look at new aspects of these policies that we haven't looked at before. And we have to look at new policies that we haven't looked at before. So it's absolutely frustrating. It seems to be a trend with respect to recent policy decisions and also Supreme Court decisions that that health factors are ignored. But you know, hopefully, we can make a positive impact as a result.

#### Kelly Sampson 26:58

And I mean, I think in some cases, what was really frustrating is that it was worse than ignored. It was dismissed, as was the case in Alito was concurrent where I was sort of like, well, why is this relevant? And it's like, of course, it's relevant. People are dying every day. And so I kind of want to open up a question to anyone who wants to chime in, which is, where do we go from here? We're sitting here today, this decision has come down. We've talked a lot about how, on one hand, it can be really devastating. But on the other hand, there's no reason why we should think that gun laws are foreclosed. So what can we do? Is there something legislators can be doing? Is there something that courts can do to make sure that we can still preserve reasonable gun laws?

# Jon Lowy 27:38

Well, there's certainly a lot we can do. One thing we can't do is give up. That that is, you know, all we can do is to keep on fighting. And and, you know, the fact is, I've been doing this work with Brady for 25 years, and there have been a lot of times where we thought the sky was falling When Heller came down when the PLACAA was enacted. Well, there have been a lot of setbacks, but we keep on fighting and keep ultimately making progress. And I think the same can be done here. You know, there are avenues for states to enact strong laws. There are arguments even within this Bruen decision to defend all of those laws effectively, forcefully.

And certainly we at Brady and other groups will be, you know, working to do that. And it will be ultimately in the hands of judges, I think there are going to be a lot of judges around the country who will be upholding gun laws and who will, you know, will realize how off base this decision is, that doesn't mean they will disregard it. They cannot disregard it. But they can construe it narrowly, and they should. And if you do that, and rely on the actual history, I think he would support uphold a lot of our laws. And the fact is, while the Supreme Court may not be going anywhere, the Supreme Court does not take that many cases. They're not going to be taking every gun case, most cases, as has happened in the 14 years since Heller are decided by lower courts. And those courts are they're not all great, but they are much, much better and more sensible than the current conservative block on Supreme Court.

# JJ Janflone 29:22

What what do you think that this, if folks are worried about, you know, gun violence in their communities, or they want to kind of get activated? What are some steps that they can take as well?

# Aalayah Eastmond 29:32

Yeah, my big thing is just figuring out who in your community is doing this work? Who is doing gun violence prevention and who's working with students impacted, who's working with parents that have lost children, and really get connected with them and see the ways that you can amplify them and support them and get engaged. I think that's the best way is just locally, but even if you want to talk about it nationally, I think social media is a great tool. That's something that my generation has kind of mastered. But definitely just like talking about it is the big thing for me is making sure that people are aware of this, people know that this is happening, and ways that you know, we can amplify this and support each other, it's my biggest thing. So definitely get connected locally and utilize tools that we have, such as social media.

# **E**

# JJ Janflone 30:16

And with that, I want to do a quick just around so that everyone has a chance to give one, you know, your your final thought, you know, what is if you can, you know, trap someone in an elevator with you, who says, Tell me about this decision, you know, what is one thing you really want to make sure that they know? And then also, where can folks after this? Because you've all been brilliant? Where can they find you to continue learning more about your you and your orgs' phenomenal work. And so we'll start off from Dr. McCord with you.

# Α

# Alex McCord 30:44

I think the biggest takeaway is that the court is dismissing public health evidence here. Public Health evidence still has a major role to play in policy development and implementation. We should direct more resources toward that, that goal. And if I encourage you all to check out the center for gun violence solutions at Johns Hopkins, the website and also follow us on social media, we have all sorts of great resources both on this case, but also on several other key gun policy and gun violence topics.

# Gerald Harmon 31:23

Again, I endorse what you just heard from my colleagues on this distinguished panel. The mission statement ama is advanced the art and science of medicine and the betterment of public health. This is clearly a public health issue in a crisis. We have lots of policy, we're going to continue to advocate for gun violence, research for safety, as we move forward based upon that research, and our website is ama/a ssn.org. Check it out, it's good website.

# Aalayah Eastmond 31:52

You can find me on social media at Alayah Eastman it's literally just my name. Or you can go on teamenough.org. And find us also on social media at Team enough. And my biggest thing for me is just making sure that people are not feeling discouraged or disappointed. I know this is something that is upsetting and can be frustrating. But we have seen progress in the GVP world recently, we've gotten great wins. So I think this is just a hump in the road. And we must continue despite this. So I just hope people are still hopeful and still ready to take on all of the work that we had to do in this fight to end violence.

# Jon Lowy 32:29

Well, I'm going to assume that that Kelly, you give the Brady info, and everyone else has covered the headlines of the decision. So for more hope, I mean, I think Aalayah Eastmond gives us hope, you know, I am inspired by her. And if as I hope turns out to be that she remains a leader in this country. And people like her, there is great hope, because that is the future of America. And that is a lot better future than the one that was handed to her.

#### Kelly Sampson 33:04

I'm continuing on the hope train. I mean, I just the Supreme Court isn't the end all be all. And if it were, I'd be asleep, and I will be able to vote. So clearly, like whatever they say. Doesn't mean that that's fate. So that would just be my kind of keep going thing.



# JJ Janflone 33:19

Thank you all so so much for joining us. Thank you so much for the work that you do, and that you continue to do. So on that note of love. Thank you all have a wonderful day. Thanks to our listeners. We'll see you later.



#### JJ Janflone 33:34

Okay, so that panel was phenomenal, Kelly, but I loved your wrap up as well.



# Kelly Sampson 33:39

Oh, thanks. It's something that I try to tell myself. Again, throughout history, there's a lot of things that the Supreme Court has said shouldn't happen or can't happen, that we are living with today.



# JJ Janflone 33:51

Isn't that the truth? I just the thing that I keep coming back to I think are the points that were brought up repeatedly by all of our panelists, which is just that, you know, these decisions, these legal decisions have far reaching implications that are going to be felt by all of us, but that there was going to be an undue burden placed on particular populations. And that, you know, it is our job to try to make sure that we live in an equitable world and correct these problems.

# Kelly Sampson 34:20

Yeah, I love that, and how that came up multiple times. And a big thing for me is something that Jon said, and also something that Aalayah said, putting together which is that John was saying the Supreme Court doesn't take that many cases a year. And that is true, they don't. And so that that means that even if people will sue and try to use this decision to invalidate gun laws, doesn't mean that we should stop pressing forward. And to that end, I love what Aalayah said about thinking locally, and thinking about your community and what you can do there because I think that's also really important.



# JJ Janflone 34:57

Hey, want to share with podcast? Listeners can now get in touch with us here at Red Blue and Brady via phone or text message. Simply call or text us at 480-744-3452 with your thoughts, questions, concerns, ideas, whatever, Kelly and I are standing by.



#### Kelly Sampson 35:12

Thanks for listening. As always, Brady's life saving work in Congress, the courts and communities across the country is made possible thanks to you. For more information on Brady or how to get involved in the fight against gun violence. Please like and subscribe to the podcast. Get in touch with us at Bradyunited.org or on social at Bradybuzz, be brave and remember, take action not sides.

