



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 15, 2026

Gun-crazy Democrats Take Aim at Second Amendment Rights

It's unbelievable though apparently true (I quadruple-checked it) that the United States' murder rate for 2025 may be the lowest it has been since perhaps 1900. Given this, even those fancying gun control a remedy may think more firearms restrictions would currently be a solution in search of a problem.

Not today's Democratic politicians, though. They're proving it, too, pushing policies that further strip Second Amendment rights.

Consider Virginia's newly-elected Abigail Spanberger, who ran for governor, as a commentator put it, "as a sane, middle-of-the-road Democrat." (Is this essentially oxymoronic now?) She's poised to sign into law a ban on "assault weapons" and "large-capacity" magazines (relevant tweet below).



Olga Mendenhall/iStock/Getty Images Plus



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 15, 2026



Greg Price ✓

@greg_price11 · [Follow](#)



The Virginia Senate has officially sent an 'assault weapons ban' to Spanberger's desk.

The bill bans new purchases of 'assault weapons' and magazines over 15 rounds.

It's author is State Sen. Sadaam Azlan Salim, who was born in Bangladesh.



12:00 PM · Mar 9, 2026



♥ 3.4K

💬 Reply

🔗 Copy link

[Read 544 replies](#)

Outrageously, however, and as the below tweet points out, these statist politicians don't even know what they're banning.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 15, 2026



NOVA Campaigns
@NoVA_Campaigns · [Follow](#)



A foreigner imported to Virginia just got guns banned in Virginia

The immigration experiment has failed.



Bryce Reeves @ReevesVA

Virginia Senate Democrats just passed an "assault weapons" ban while admitting they can't even explain the mechanical differences between the firearms they're banning. Lawmaking based on ignorance isn't leadership—it's unconstitutional overreach. The Constitution isn't optional.

Commonwealth of Virginia
Senate
2026 Regular Session

Date: 03/09/26

General
Unfinished Business - Senate

Time: 2:21p.m.

SB749 - Salim

Assault firearms & certain ammunition feeding devices; purchase, sale, etc., prohibited, penalties.

Concur House Substitute R

DEMOCRATS	YEAS - 21	NAYS - 19	RULE 36 - 0	NOT VOTED - 0
YEAS - 21				
Aird	Favola	McPike	Salim	
Bagby	Jones	Pekarsky	Srinivasan	
Bennett-Parker	Locke	Perry	Surovell	
Boysko	Lucas	Roem	VanValkenburg	
Carroll Foy	Marsden	Rouse	Williams Graves	
Deeds				
REPUBLICANS				
NAYS - 19				
Cifers	French	Mulchi	Stanley	
Craig	Hackworth	Obenshain	Stuart	
DeSteph	Head	Peake	Sturtevant	
Diggs	Jordan	Pillion	Suetherlein	
Durant	McDougle	Reeves		

RULE 36 - 0

NOT VOTED - 0

Sequence number: 1048

11:38 AM · Mar 9, 2026



4.8K



Reply



Copy link

[Read 147 replies](#)



The Straight Dope on Dopey Legislation

But one man who does know is military veteran and firearms expert Mike McDaniel. And as he [informs](#) today:

There is, of course, no such thing in firearm nomenclature as an “assault weapon.” There are military assault rifles, which fire intermediate cartridges and have select fire — automatic — capability, but such rifles are essentially banned by federal law. What Spanberger is targeting is America’s most popular rifle, the semiautomatic AR-15 and anything like it. The bill also bans magazines of greater than 15 round capacity, which encompasses many standard magazines.

The law is, on its face, blatantly unconstitutional. The Supreme Court’s *Heller* and *Bruen* decisions make clear bans on firearms in common use are unconstitutional. There is every reason to believe arbitrary bans on magazine capacity are also constitutionally out of bounds.

Yet even this doesn’t fully illustrate AR-15 bans’ inanity. (By the way, the “AR” in the preceding stands for “Armalite Rifle,” *not* “assault rifle.”) Just consider the following facts (note: I’ll reference misnamed “assault rifles” as “sporting rifles”):

- Sporting rifles’ operation is *semiautomatic only* (one bullet released per trigger pull). This makes them just like *50 percent of all new guns sold*.
- According to the FBI, “personal weapons” (hands, fists, and feet) are used in more murders than *rifles of all kinds*. And, of course, sporting rifles are just *one* kind.
- In reality, handguns are used in [62 percent](#) of murders committed with firearms. They’re also criminals’ weapon of choice because they’re *concealable*. This is why, prior to leftists’ sporting-rifle obsession (in the ’80s, for instance), gun-control efforts targeted handguns.

Then there’s the following, from an X respondent under the first tweet above. “More Virginians were killed by illegal aliens,” he [writes](#), “than ‘assault weapons’ 2025-2026 YTD.”

While this may not be true (I researched it), the numbers do appear comparable. And the preceding two points raise a couple of questions.

Why are Democrats fixated on removing Americans’ rights rather than removing illegals?

And why are they focused not on handguns, but firearms used in perhaps one percent of all murders?

It’s simple: Targeting sporting rifles is terrible policy — but terrific left-wing politics.

The State Making Virginia Look Sane

And, of course, it’s terrific left-wing politics — meaning, it pleases low-info voters — not just in Virginia. Consider Minnesota, the Land of 10,000 Lakes [and 10,000\(?\) Somali fraudsters](#). As McDaniel writes, introducing the state’s lunacy:

In *Bananas*, Woody Allen’s Latin American dictator seized power and immediately went crazy. In a classic scene, he ordered the people to change their underwear every half hour and wear it on the outside “so we can check.”



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 15, 2026

But this fiction has little on Minnesota. As George Washington University law Professor Jonathan Turley tells us:



Jonathan Turley ✓
 @JonathanTurley · [Follow](#)



Across the country, Democrats are moving to ban some semiautomatic rifles as well as large magazines. The most extreme legislation may be in Minnesota, which could not only ban sales but also require current owners to agree to home inspections.



jonathanturley.org
 Minnesota Democrats Move to Ban Semiautomatic Rifles While Requi...
 Across the country, Democrats are moving to ban popular semiautomatic weapons as well as magazines holding more than 10 o...

5:47 AM · Mar 11, 2026
 

 **3.7K**
 **Reply**
 **Copy link to post**

[Read 798 replies](#)

As [Turley wrote](#) Wednesday, this “chilling” legislation, [SF 4290](#), was introduced by state Senator Matt Klein. And among other things, the measure would ban sporting rifles and magazines whose capacity exceeds 10 rounds.

It is the aforementioned home-inspection provision, however, that makes the Minnesota law so “distinctive,” warns Turley. The law states, he writes,

that, in addition to securing state permission or certification for the possession of existing weapons, owners must “agree to allow the appropriate law enforcement agency to inspect



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 15, 2026

the storage of the device to ensure compliance with this subdivision.”

McDaniel suggests that this appears a “direct violation of the Fourth Amendment,” which he then [quotes](#):

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Whatever the case, targeting sporting rifles in the U.S. is, to an extent, targeting gun ownership itself. Turley explains why:

The AR-15 is the [most popular gun in America](#) and the number of these guns in private hands is continuing to rise rapidly, with one AR-15 purchased in every five new firearms sales. These AR-15s clearly are not being purchased for armored deer. Many are purchased for personal and home protection; it is also popular for target shooting and hunting.

And, of course, the capacity for personal protection — and to resist tyranny — is precisely what the Second Amendment was designed to safeguard.

Turley hopes that these liberal-state gun laws’ onerousness will finally compel the Supreme Court to review them. But even this, and a favorable ruling, won’t matter if something else happens. As McDaniel concludes:

Should a Democrat take the White House in 2028, and Democrats take the Congress, they’ll make good on their threat to pack the Supreme Court and no man’s life or liberty will be safe. Of course, should they ever get that kind of power, no Supreme Court precedent will be safe.

No doubt. This gets at the underlying problem, too. While our murder rate may be its lowest since 1900, the electorate’s knowledge level is now perhaps lower still. And no matter what laws are made, voters will always be able to shoot — themselves in the foot.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.