



A Gun with His Name On It

September 27, 2023

An “X” post by a Trump spokesperson implicated the former president in a crime.

What followed implicates the U.S. Government in something *far worse*.

But first, to clarify:

1. By “X” I mean “Twitter.” Remember, Elon Musk changed the name of his social media company.
2. By “Trump” I mean, of course, Donald John Trump, Jr., former president of the United States running the same office, a man surrounded by armed guards at all times.
3. By “crime” I mean an infraction of federal law, not a willful abuse of someone’s rights at common law.

4. The [crime in question](#) is the act of receiving “any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce” by a person “under indictment . . . a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.” Trump’s been indicted quite a number of times, recently, and therefore isn’t legally allowed to buy a gun.

The initial tweet said Trump admired a Glock that had his name stamped on it. It was the “Donald Trump edition,” gold-colored, retailing for under a thousand bucks. Trump’s on video saying he wants one of these handguns.

When X went all a-twitter with the implications, spokesman Steven Cheung took down his post and the campaign issued a corrective: “President Trump did not purchase or take possession of the firearm. He simply indicated that he wanted one.”

This is all [explained](#) by Jacob Sullum at *Reason*, who also goes on to slyly indicate that the law makes no real sense. The obvious absurdity of not allowing a well-guarded presidential candidate to guard himself with gun of any kind, that’s one thing. Flouting the Second Amendment by prohibiting the *innocent*, i.e. not yet proven guilty, from bearing arms, looks *far worse* — a policy of rights suppression.

This is Common Sense. I’m Paul Jacob.