

OPINION

David Rounds Publisher
 Kevin G. Keane Vice President, News
 Dan Hatfield Editorial Page Director
 Pete Wevurski Managing Editor BANG-EB
 Martin G. Reynolds Editor

Contacting us: Editorial director
 925.977.8430 Fax: 925.943.8362 dhatfield@bayareanewsgroup.com

FOR MORE GO TO INSIDEBAYAREA.COM AND CONTRACOSTATIMES.COM

Injunctions needed to stop random violence

WHAT PARENT does not want to protect his or her child from stray bullets fired by unskilled random murderers?

Why aren't the voices of the attorneys representing the anti-gang injunction opponents in Oakland equally as loud in defending the right of life for the hundreds of innocent, nonviolent people — including helpless children playing in their yards or sleeping in their beds — who were slaughtered by the people they now feel compelled to represent?

Do these attorneys advocate that verified, life-threatening offenders have the right to continue to carry guns? Will they take responsibility for the next shooting death or carjacking? Where do they live? Will they change their minds when their children are randomly

D. DAVIS
My Word

murdered by those they represent?

Of course the answer is yes. They will change their minds immediately at the last heartbeat of their child's life. Nothing equals firsthand experience to understand an issue. Tell me I'm wrong.

If the injunction had been in place in August 2009, my 17-year-old, so-very-much-loved daughter might be alive today, instead of murdered because bullets intended for someone else struck her in a drive-by shooting, in the afternoon in North Oakland. She hurt no one. She did not belong to a gang. There was neither alcohol nor drugs in her body, according to the autopsy.

She did not deserve to be murdered. She did not know her murderers. We, those who love and miss her so, do not deserve to live

our time in grief. But we do now because some people take lives without thought or care. They use guns. And we need to protect everyone else's innocent children from slaughter, now.

Read the judge's order for yourself. It is easily spelled out: Only those with criminal pasts will be included.

The city of Oakland officials are trying to save lives, very precious, never-to-return-if-killed lives. This even includes the lives of the children and families of these heinous criminals terrorizing and eliminating our children and loved ones in Oakland, while using guns.

This injunction also allows for the possibility of gang members' lives to change in unexpected ways and become better, less threatening, thus providing a safer environment for their own families and communities. It remains to be seen whether their families will mean more

to them than their crimes.

It is very difficult — impossible really — to determine just how many lives are saved by these injunctions, but without them, we can count the lives lost, as we do, one-by-one, sometimes day-by-day, until the end of the year when we tally more than 100. How can there be a choice? Whose child will be next? Yours?

I am impatiently waiting for credible answers from these attorneys; and I am unwilling to accept hot air or smoke-and-mirrors as reasonable explanations for their clients' crimes of terror and murder against the innocent.

What truth will they tell me or the hundreds of other family members of those murdered or maimed by Oakland gang violence? What will you accept?

D. Davis is an Oakland resident.