

"*Quemadmoeum gladiis neminem occidit, occidentis telum est.*" (A sword is never a killer, it is a tool in the killer's hands.)

- Lucius Annaeus Seneca, circa 4 BC – 65 AD

“*Americans [have] the right and advantage of being armed, unlike the citizens of other countries whose governments are afraid to trust their people with arms*”

- James Madison, considered the father of the US Constitution

"[T]he people are not to be disarmed of their weapons. They are left in full possession of them."

- Zacharia Johnson, speech in the Virginia Ratifying Convention, 1788

“*During World War II, six million Swiss had guns and six million Jews did not.*”

- Author unknown

“*...sort of like the people who repeat foolish slogans like "guns kill" – as though guns sprout little feet when no one is looking and run around shooting people all by themselves.*”

- Doug Casey, financial columnist

“If you don’t have to give up your car because others drive drunk with theirs, then why do you have to give up your gun because others commit crimes with theirs?”

- Anonymous internet wag

“*The horrifying truth is this: we live now in a culture that not only does not respect life, but discards it like trash — not only at the beginning of life, but also at the end, and every place in between. What has happened to us?*”

- Catholic Deacon Greg Kandra

“*...we’re also going to make it clear that when a pig gets iced that’s a good thing, and that everyone who considers himself a revolutionary should be armed, should own a gun, should have a gun in his house.*”

- Bill Ayers, leftist activist and confidant of gun control happy Barack Obama, in A Strategy To Win, appearing in New Left Notes, September 12, 1969

INTRODUCTION

The utterly horrific Colorado and Connecticut shootings are still being processed, as I write, into the collective conscience of America. First, clearly the care for the wounded and survivors must be paramount for everyone. Let us all labor with one goal to that end at present. Once this is over, however, there will be time for reflection on what has caused tragedies such as these, and others. Here are some preliminary thoughts – that join my thoughts and prayers for the victims - that may be worth reflecting on in the months ahead:

Is it guns, or people, that kill? As the old saying goes, Teddy Kennedy’s cars have killed more people than all the guns of 99.999% of all gun owners in America. And this true around the world. My brother lived in ultra-safe Switzerland for years. Why is Switzerland so safe? Is it because guns are outlawed?

Hardly.

Wikipedia notes: “If you were a Swiss man, you would be a soldier as well. Every able-bodied Swiss man must go to the army in Switzerland for 90 days (*Rekrutenschule-Ecole de recrue*) and then every 2 years until the age of 42, he must return for practice for 19 days. This allows the government to raise an army of 400,000 men, fully armed, within 24 hours, as every soldier has an assault gun in his house, complete with ammunition.”

<http://switzerland.isyours.com/e/swiss-business-guide/swiss-army.html> “; moreover, “Each individual is required to keep his army issued personal weapon (the 5.56x45mm SIG 550 rifle for enlisted personnel or the SIG 510 rifle and/or the 9mm SIG-Sauer P220 semi-automatic pistol for officers, medical and postal personnel) at home with a specified personal retention quantity of government issued personal ammunition (50 rounds 5.56/48 rounds 9mm...)”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/gun_politics_in_switzerland.” Switzerland which has had three times the gun ownership as, for example Germany, has also had a much *lower* murder rate. And statistics like this ring true throughout the world. A short 3 minute video is here, for those that wish to see a short report on the Swiss and their guns

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1WfUu7cfa7k&feature=player_embedded#t=22s

Indeed, Thomas Sowell notes countries with stronger gun control laws than the US, such as Russia, Brazil and Mexico (Mexico basically bans firearms completely, yet has a *higher* gun homicide rate than the US), have much higher murder rates, while there are many countries with high rates of gun ownership but low murder rates, such as Israel, New Zealand and Finland. In fact, in Mexico, the murder rate is 22.7 murders per 100,000, whereas the global average is ~7 homicides per 100,000, and the gun happy US is 4.8 murders per 100,000.

<http://landdestroyer.blogspot.com/2013/01/how-to-end-gun-debate-forever.html>. That is correct - the US, which has the widest gun ownership in the world, *is below the worldwide average in homicides*. Of course, in the US, approximately 90 million legal owners of guns, owning 300 million firearms; murdered zero people last year. Contrast that with the approximately 170 million Prof. R.J. Rummel of Univ. of Hawaii, in his book *Death by Government*, says were killed in the last century, the majority of them after their governments disarmed them (Stéphane Courtois, author of the highly regarded *Black Book of Communism* estimates 94 million were murdered by Communists alone). An hour long, very sobering summary video documenting what happens when the population has their weapons removed can be found at

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iDivHkQ2GSg&feature=player_embedded#t=8s Or perhaps one might wish to contrast this to the 32,000 people who lost their lives – including thousands of youth – in car accidents last year (see

<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s1103.pdf> or

<http://www.nhtsa.gov/NCSA> to get the latest exact figure). And for those of you who correctly answered the “cars are necessary, but guns are not” objection, a gold star, for indeed you are correct – an armed population, as the Founding Fathers *repeatedly* noted, is the *sine qua non* of a free country and a free population. “Free” as in, as historical records show, a country like the USSR, Cuba or China that don’t end up murdering *millions* – including children (just google “Ukrainian Kulak” and look at the photos of *millions of children* who were murdered by Stalin’s government. As the saying goes, “Free men have guns; slaves do not.”

HOW EFFECTIVE IS GUN CONTROL?

So, how effective *is* firearms control? In gun-control happy Chicago – which has banned guns for all practical purposes - the city has become the leading “alpha” city for gun murders *in the world*. 2012 ended with around *five hundred murders* in the city. <http://news.yahoo.com/chicago-reaches-500-homicides-fatal-shooting-145951769.html> - *sixty of which were children!* In fact, “gun free” Chicago had more murders than the entire nation of Japan in 2012. For comparison,



drug war ridden Mexico City has 8.0 murders a year per 100,000 population, Moscow 9.6, Sao Paulo 15.6 and Chicago 19.4. Similarly, Washington DC, which has banned concealed carry since 1975, has one of the highest rates of murder in the U.S. And of course, one might also have the temerity to ask *why* there are no theatre, mall or school shootings in Israel, where a goodly percentage of the population is armed, including fully automatic weapons. (Picture from <http://janmorganmedia.com/2012/12/why-you-dont-hear-about-any-school-shootings-in-israel/>)

And New York City? Yes, there was a reduction in gun shootings in 2012, but there were *still 414 homicides in 2012*. Notwithstanding the fact that NYC is almost becoming a police state, a one year drop could be attributable to many things, and as Frank Zimring, professor of law at UC Berkeley told NPR, “If you’re gonna make the assumption that changes in crime rates always are responding to policies then why shouldn’t we be blaming the police for the slight increases [in New York’s murder rate] in 2010 and 2011?” No word from Mr. Bloomberg on that... nor why Mr. Bloomberg has changed his tune from “al Qaeda hates us for our freedoms” to the situation today, where the NYPD conducts unconstitutional stop-and-frisk searches all over NYC. And the reality is that the general trend in NYC has been a general trend of a drop in murder rates in NYC since the 1990s.

As a matter of fact, Dr. John Lott spoke on the Piers Morgan show shortly after the Connecticut school shooting, and noted that since 1950, in almost every public mass shooting in which three or more people died, it was in a setting where guns are banned, such as schools. Of course, relative to the Sandy Hook tragedy, Connecticut already had banned “assault weapons,” and the Newtown school was already a gun free zone. There also is already a total ban on guns in the possession of mentally unstable in Connecticut. A lot of good that did. And if the shooter didn’t get it from his mother in this case, do you really think he wouldn’t have gone to the black market to get one, or turned to other tools, such as the bombs the leftist Unibomber or Timothy McVeigh used? Were people any less dead because those two men used bombs instead of guns? On a personal level, when I was a student teacher in Illinois, a young high school student set a bomb right outside my classroom – it was found before it went off, but could have killed many students if it hadn’t been found in time. Are we next going to ban *intelligence* so that people can’t make bombs out of various materials? As a matter of fact, perhaps we already *have* banned intelligence – or at least wisdom – from our schools. But that is a story for another day.... along with some enterprising researcher conducting a study correlating the number of school shootings with the number of teachers having sex with their students.

Meanwhile, hidden from public view by a leftist media, school shootings are indeed occurring in countries with strict gun control. Former psychology professor and Army Ranger Lt. Col. David Grossman noted in Dec., 2012, on his Facebook site at www.facebook.com/LtColDaveGrossman, that gun control poster child Germany has had two mass murders in their high schools that had body counts surpassing those at Columbine, while Dunblain, Scotland had a massacre in a kindergarten class, and just down the road from where I used to live in Alberta, Canada, the town of Taber experienced a school massacre. Handguns are outlawed in Canada. Finland has had three school massacres, and of course there was the Anders Breivik massacre in Norway, which also has restrictions on gun ownership. And if it isn't guns, it's knives. Grossman notes in gunless Belgium, a sicko dressed as the Joker from Batman got into a day care centre and hacked a dozen babies in their cribs, injuring them. Two more babies were killed, as well as one daycare worker. If leftists want schools and other areas as "gun free zones," perhaps we should make those who created gun free zones liable for the murders that occur there? And at the same time, may we ask why government buildings in Washington DC are "gun free zones" – or is it that the "let them eat cake" ruling class gets armed security everywhere *they go* in the town (not to mention exemption from ObamaCare), while the rest of us poor, unwashed masses have to trust our safety to luck?

The top ten school massacres are listed here, for your reference:

<http://listverse.com/2008/01/01/top-10-worst-school-massacres/>, the worst being the Beslan school massacre in Russia, with 386 dead, and over 700 injured by Chechen militants. In the US, one of the first US school massacres occurred, as Mark Steyn notes, on July 25, 1764, when "...four Lenape Indians walked into a one-room schoolhouse in colonial Pennsylvania and killed Enoch Brown and ten of his pupils. One child survived, scalped and demented to the end of his days" (no assault rifles were recorded as being used in this attack); and the worst massacre in a US school occurred May 18, 1927, in Bath, Michigan, when school board treasurer Andrew Kehoe used a *bomb* to blow up the Bath Consolidated School, killing 44 people, including 38 children. Again, much to the chagrin of the left, no assault weapon was used.

And the comments from the left that masquerade as "fact," such as the post-Sandy Hook Bill Clinton statement: *"Half of all mass killings in the United States have occurred since the assault weapons ban expired in 2005. Half of all of them in the history of the country."*

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_detailpage&v=or-inV1KKDE#t=0s are not even close to reality. Leaving aside the definition of what "is" is, what are the actual facts?

Unfortunately – similar to the ClimateGate revelations – someone actually did the research in a 2007 book entitled Mass Murder in the United States A History, authored by Grant Duwe, director of research and evaluation at the Minnesota Dept. of Corrections. Here's what Duwe found, as summarized from <http://freedomoutpost.com/2013/01/bill-clinton-caught-in-lie-over-mass-shootings-fact/> :


In the past 100 years, there have been 156 mass killings where at least four people were killed publicly with a firearm in under 24 hours, where the killings did not include robbery, drugs or gangs. As of Jan., 2013, there have been 32 mass public shootings since Clinton's assault weapons ban expired on Sept. 13, 2004, with seven in 2012. Here is the tally by decade:

1900s : zero

1910s: 2

1920s: 2
1930s: 942
1940s: 8
1950s: 1
1960s: 6
1970s: 13
1980s: 32
1990s: 42
2000s: 28
2010s (three years): 14

Data from Boston.com, using data extracted from official police reports to the FBI, shows mass shootings in the US over the past 30 years have *not* increased. (See http://boston.com/community/blogs/crime_punishment/2012/08/no_increase_in_mass_shootings.html or as below)



Of course, the vast majority of these were *not* committed with semi-automatic rifles

On the other side of the school shooter equation, in 2008, the isolated Harrold Independent School District in Texas, noting the damage done in the Columbine shootings, among others, decided the 20 minutes it could take police to arrive could lead to a horrific disaster, trained school staff were allowed to carry firearms in school. The result? Dead students? Mayhem? Actually... nothing, except a safe school. School district superintendent David Thweatt simply stated "We're the first responders. We have to be. We don't have 5 minutes. We don't have 10 minutes. We would have had 20 minutes of hell" if the school was attacked.

But lurking behind the school shooting question is the issue of “never let a crisis go to waste,” per Rahm Emmanuel. Is it really guns, or is it rather the gun grabber agenda that is in the dock here? If the former, *why no comment from the leftist media that every month after the Sandy Hook shooting, on average 40 juveniles will be murdered with something other than a rifle?* Or doesn't that meet with the agenda du jour? (And I'm just waiting to hear some leftist claim that rifles cause global warming!)

And finally, if gun grabbers are so “concerned for the kids,” why then this story that came out just after Sandy Hook:

“Amid all the hubbub surrounding Sen. Dianne Feinstein's “assault weapons” ban, there are still everyday stories of average law-abiding citizens using firearms to defend themselves and others from evil -- or in this case, serious harm. An 11-year-old boy was riding his bike in a Washington, DC, neighborhood when he came upon three pit bulls. The dogs pounced, mauling the boy. Fortunately, a neighbor saw what was happening, grabbed his handgun and rushed out to shoot one of the pit bulls. A DC police officer patrolling nearby on a bicycle heard the shot, and came to the boy's aid as well, shooting the other two pit bulls. The boy's injuries were severe, but he will survive, thanks to the quick action of this neighbor. However, the hero is under investigation for violating local gun laws -- discharging his weapon while not on his own property. No word yet on whether charges will be filed, but DC's gun laws are what put children at risk.” (Source for this story not retained, but published week of 21 Jan., 2013)

This story *clearly* illustrates that for many on the left, it is *not about the kids*. It is about *their agenda*.

DEFENSIVE GUN USE

Could it be, as former gun control advocate turned gun rights supporter Dr. John Lott of Univ. of Chicago maintains, in his eponymous book *More Guns, Less Crime*, that we are *safer* with more guns? The young boy who drove off two home invaders in Houston in 2012 – reported at Houston's KHOU TV – with his father's AR-15 “evil” *assault rifle* would certainly agree. See www.youtube.com/watch?v=j-q2zHlovOE_. And here's another story of an “evil” AR-15 used to drive off intruders: New York Resident Scares the Hell out of Intruders” – video at http://www.thedailysheeple.com/ar-15-defense-weapon-new-york-resident-scares-the-hell-out-of-intruders_012013; story also found at <http://www.kfiam640.com/pages/MoreStimulatingTalkRadio.html?feed=104668&article=10729296>. And then there were the young students in Rochester, NY who thankfully were able to use an AR-15 to protect their lives during a break in – see <http://www.13wham.com/news/local/story/Homeowners-Scare-Off-Burglars/7yaLSXAvCUGBkwgAZpGO4q.csp>

But returning to Dr. Lott, here is Exhibit A: scarcely one week before the Colorado tragedy, a similar situation had an opposite ending in Florida, where 71 year old Samuel Williams stopped an armed robbery when two masked men entered the Palms Internet Cafe around 10 p.m. Friday, July 13, 2012. Make your own conclusion from the surveillance camera, which captures it all: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wZNC2VwyaPU&feature=player_embedded#t=0s. Exhibit B: Scarcely a month after the Colorado theatre shooting, on the opposite side of the country, an Orange County, CA. jewelry and coin dealer thwarted and armed robbery – and possible employee deaths – by defending herself with her pistol. Video surveillance footage at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZjXJBpV9YRI>. And as if this wasn't enough, the Oregon Clackamas Town Center Mall shooting – which was overshadowed by the Connecticut

school shooting a few days later – was stopped by a citizen, Nick Melti, exercising his right of concealed carry. Full details of this incident – not reported by the lamestream media – are at <http://www.examiner.com/article/media-blackout-oregon-mall-shooter-was-stopped-by-an-armed-citizen>. At the risk of overkill (pun intended), here's another video of a 65 yr. old woman thwarting FIVE armed robbers with her pistol in her store:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PoDNJQtNVoc&feature=player_embedded#t=0s

Thus, it turns out that the leftist Mother Jones article claiming to have produced its own study of all public shootings in the last 30 years, which concluded “In not a single case was the killing stopped by a civilian using a gun,” is an outright fabrication - in looking at just the most recent Oregon episode. And as Ann Coulter pointed out in an article shortly after the CT shooting, found at <http://www.humanevents.com/2012/12/19/ann-coulter-we-know-how-to-stop-school-shootings/> Mother Jones, in typical leftist fashion “...reaches its conclusion by simply excluding all cases where an armed civilian stopped the shooter: They looked only at public shootings where four or more people were killed, i.e., the ones where the shooter wasn't stopped.” Don't try this trick in a stats 101 class, or you will be flunked. Coulter's article provides some extremely enlightening examples of mass murders stopped by an armed bystander:

– Mayan Palace Theater, San Antonio, Texas, same week as the CT shooting: Jesus Manuel Garcia shoots at a movie theater, a police car and bystanders from the nearby China Garden restaurant; as he enters the movie theater, guns blazing, an armed off-duty cop shoots Garcia four times, stopping the attack. Total dead: Zero. (More details on this theatre-shooting-that-wasn't *because the shooter was stopped by someone with concealed carry* is at <http://freedomoutpost.com/2012/12/the-theater-shooting-the-main-stream-media-didnt-focus-on-why/>)

– Winnemucca, Nev., 2008: Ernesto Villagomez opens fire in a crowded restaurant; concealed carry permit-holder shoots him dead. Total dead: Two. (I'm excluding the shooters' deaths in these examples.)

– Appalachian School of Law, 2002: Crazy immigrant shoots the dean and a professor, then begins shooting students; as he goes for more ammunition, two armed students point their guns at him, allowing a third to tackle him. Total dead: Three.

– Santee, Calif., 2001: Student begins shooting his classmates — as well as the “trained campus supervisor”; an off-duty cop who happened to be bringing his daughter to school that day points his gun at the shooter, holding him until more police arrive. Total dead: Two.

– Pearl High School, Mississippi, 1997: After shooting several people at his high school, student heads for the junior high school; assistant principal Joel Myrick retrieves a .45 pistol from his car and points it at the gunman's head, ending the murder spree. Total dead: Two.

– Edinboro, Pa., 1998: A student shoots up a junior high school dance being held at a restaurant; restaurant owner pulls out his shotgun and stops the gunman. Total dead: One. (Coulter neglected to cite some other cases, such as the high school shooting by [Luke Woodham in Pearl, Miss.](#), or the [New Life Church shooting](#) in Colorado Springs, CO., where armed volunteers stopped the mayhem immediately.

Not included in Coulter's article was a shooter who opened fire two weeks after the Sandy Hill massacre. Unfortunately, he did it in a place where people were armed – the Gloucester

Township Police HQ – and, while people were wounded, no one was killed except the shooter. <http://news.yahoo.com/3-cops-shot-nj-police-station-143541945--abc-news-topstories.html>

There's one more gunman incident Coulter also missed: On Aug. 29, 2010, and armed gunman, Thomas Richard Cowan, entered Sullivan Central High School in Blountville, TN., and pointed his gun at the head of the school principal. This may well have ended up another Sandy Hook event – except for the fact that a Sullivan County Sheriff's Deputy, Carolyn Gudger, was stationed at the school, and confronted the gunman *with her own gun*. Cowan retreated from this confrontation, and was later killed when he pointed his weapon at other police who had arrived since the initial confrontation. No Sandy Hook here. That's because there was armed resistance.

The Marc J. Victor article cited elsewhere in this paper adds several more incidences to the list above, where an armed populace prevented a Sandy Hook massacre. Victor cites a 1997 high school shooting in Pearl, MS., stopped when the vice principal retrieved a handgun from his truck; a 1998 middle school shooting ended when a man living next door heard gunfire and apprehended the shooter with his shotgun; a 2002 terrorist attack at an Israeli school was quickly stopped by an armed teacher and a school guard; a 2002 law school shooting in Grundy, Virginia came to an abrupt conclusion when students carrying firearms confronted the shooter; a 2007 mall shooting in Ogden, Utah ended when an armed off-duty police officer intervened; a 2009 workplace shooting in Houston, Texas was halted by two co-workers who carried concealed handguns. What part of "guns saved lives" don't leftists get?

Let me answer the question above, if I may. Here's what leftists don't get – and which illustrates they really don't ultimately care as much about each precious life lost at Sandy Hook as they do their *precious agenda* (and yes... please *do* use your best Gollum voice from Lord of the Rings when you say the word leftist "precious agenda"; and no, our guns are *not* precious to most gun owners – rather, our *freedom and liberty* are precious, and guns are simply a guarantor of that). One story – which represents thousands of other unreported stories every year - with the headline of *Woman Hiding with Kids Shoots Home Intruder Multiple Times*, illustrates the point very simply: A quick précis of the story will suffice. *"A woman hiding in her attic with children shot an intruder multiple times before fleeing to safety Friday... The incident happened at a home on Henderson Ridge Lane in Loganville around 1 p.m. The woman was working in an upstairs office when she spotted a strange man outside a window, according to Walton County Sheriff Joe Chapman. He said she took her 9-year-old twins to a crawlspace before the man broke in using a crowbar. But the man eventually found the family. The perpetrator opens that door. Of course, at that time he's staring at her, her two children and a .38 revolver," Chapman told Channel 2's Kerry Kavanaugh. The woman then shot him five times, but he survived, Chapman said. He said the woman ran out of bullets but threatened to shoot the intruder if he moved..."* <http://www.wsbtv.com/news/news/local/woman-hiding-kids-shoots-intruder/nTm7s/>

Pam Loman of Shawnee, OK. went through the same experience a few weeks later, scaring off three men trying to break into her home. <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/01/13/Oklahoma-Woman-Stops-Robbers-With-Her-Gun> reports: *"She was cleaning her home on Friday when a man knocked on her front door, while two others stayed in the car. When she did not answer the man resorted to banging on the door. Mrs. Loman got scared and went for her gun. "So my instinct was to go get a gun. I don't know why, I never in my life felt like I needed to go get a gun," said Mrs. Loman. She had both hands on her .32-caliber pistol when the man knocked down her door. "And just all of a sudden, with one kick, he knock the door completely in. The frame came flying down. Things came flying everywhere," she said.*

“And he saw that I had the gun, and he grabbed the door handle and pulled the door shut.” Mrs. Loman said if he did not run away and came into the house she would have shot him.”

Thankfully, something like the above would never happen to gun grabbers Dianne Feinstein, Chuck Shumer or any of the Hollywood glitterati, as they are surrounded by guards, who are *armed*. In fact, Obama signed a bill Jan., 2013 that rolls back a mid-1990s law that imposed a 10-year limit on Secret Service protection for former presidents. The bill, which will cost American taxpayers millions of dollars will have Obama (and other presidents) protected for life as well as their children up to age 16, by armed guard. Hypocritically, during an [ABC Nightline interview](#) recorded before the Sandy Hook shooting, Obama said one of the benefits of his re-election was the ability “to have men with guns around at all times,” in order to protect his daughters (see <http://www.bizpacreview.com/2012/12/29/obama-admits-to-wanting-men-with-guns-guarding-his-daughters-12581>) The Sidwell Friends school attended by Obama’s daughters in Washington D.C. has no less than [11 armed security guards](#) on duty at all times (<http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/12/23/School-Obama-s-Daughters-Attend-Has-11-Armed-Guards-Not-Counting-Secret-Service>). Of course, the NRA suggestion of arming *trained* school staff for the poor unwashed masses at the common public school has been derided by the elite – that’s only for the “special” people!

Below: Sidwell Friends, another gun free school – NOT!



Sen. Diane Feinstein, who wants “[Mr. and Mrs. America](#)” to “turn in” their guns,(see http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=bIXkl9YVoHo#t=2s where she states this) admitted to availing herself of concealed carry for her own protection at one point – see http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=B1EObqM9Z0s#t=2s . Of course, our aforementioned gun control nut NY Mayor Michael Bloomberg has armed bodyguards at all times.

And let’s not forget the ever-hypocritical gun controller Michael Moore, who also maintains armed bodyguards, one of whom was arrested for carrying an unlicensed weapon at New York’s JFK airport back in 2005.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,144921,00.html#ixzz2FnQC65J3> . Yes, this is the selfsame Mikey Moore who owned shared of Haliburton (see Peter Schweizer's book *Do As I Say, Not as I Do: Profiles in Liberal Hypocrisy*) and has both an extremely expensive penthouse in NY, as well as a massive, multimillion dollar mansion on Torch Lake, MI., as seen below.



In contrast to the heavily defended Sidwell Friends school, or the latte leftists protected by gun toting guards, the shootings in gun-free zones invariably result in far higher casualty figures — the Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wis. (six dead); Virginia Tech, in Blacksburg, Va. (32 dead); Columbine High School, Columbine, Colo. (12 dead); the Amish school in Lancaster County, Pa. (five little girls killed); a public school, Craighead County, Ark. (five killed, including four little girls).

And here's one more question: What if it is not "only" a half dozen people killed, but rather something like the horrific Beslan School massacre in gun control-happy Russia in 2004? 334 people were slaughtered – over half children – by Chechnyan Islamists. Good thing everyone in the school was unarmed – right?

One might consider – dare I quote him? – Michael Moore, in perhaps the single lucid comment of his entire career. Regarding the Sandy Hook massacre, he wrote in the Huffington Post: *"The killer only ceased his slaughter when he saw that cops were swarming onto the school grounds — i.e, the men with the guns. When he saw the guns a-coming, he stopped the bloodshed and killed himself. Guns on police officers prevented another 20 or 40 or 100 deaths from happening. Guns sometimes work."* Of course, Moore goes off on another deranged tangent after this, but in this case he actually got one paragraph right. And perhaps, with the direction our society is going, a properly secured firearm on school premises, wielded by fully trained school staff, may be what is needed. Why should there be a wait be for the police to arrive as more death occurs?

Dr. Lott, the former gun control advocate turned gun supporter, documents many thousands of similar situations, but here is one woman, in her own words, discussing after the fact how her gun saved her life: <http://bcove.me/zgbghtxu>. As a matter of fact, Gun Owners of America, at <http://gunowners.org/sk0802.htm>, cites statistics indicating guns are used 2.5 *million* times a year in *self-defense*, or around 80 times a day (other statistics estimate this number could range as low as 1.5 million, but either number is a *lot!*). This includes 200,000 women a year using

guns to defend themselves against sexual abuse. As a matter of fact, as of 2008, armed citizens killed more violent bad guys than the police (1,527 vs. 606). Overall, guns in the United States are used 80 times more often to prevent crime than they are to take lives (<http://thetruthwins.com/archives/you-wont-believe-the-crazy-things-that-are-being-said-about-gun-owners>).

And what happens when people are not able to arm themselves? Just ask the citizens of Hungerford, England, where twenty years ago Michael Ryan went on a shooting spree, killing 16 people. As no one in the town was armed, he took over *eight hours* before anyone with a firearm was alerted and able to stop the rampage. While Obama used children a stage props, including plaintive letters from children asking him to ban guns in his January, 2013 anti-gun dog and pony anti-gun sales pitch, he forgot to discuss the recent cases of Kendra St. Claire, who used a gun to protect herself from a home intruder, a mother who shot an intruder to protect her two young sons, or an 18 year old widowed mother who shot two intruders to protect her baby.

GUN CONTROL SIMPLY DOES NOT REDUCE CRIME

Importantly, Dr. Lott is not alone in his opinions on gun control. As David Kupelian writes at <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/how-obamas-gun-order-will-backfire/> , during Jimmy Carter's leftist tenure, he also tried to push through draconian gun control laws. And what better way to do so than by funding a massive four year study at Univ. of Massachusetts, conducted by Drs. James Wright, Peter Rossi and Kathleen Daly, under the auspices of the National Inst. of Justice – supposed to be the most comprehensive study on the subject ever done. The study came out in in 1981, in three volumes, entitled “Under the Gun.” This work is available to the gun grabbers, but unfortunately they aren't going to read it any time soon, as the Cliff Notes version of the study is as summarized by co-author Wright, “*Gun control laws do no reduce crime,*” and the authors, who started out as gun control advocates like Dr. Lott, ended up like Dr. Lott, changing their minds .(Dr. Lott himself has also stated “*Gun control just does not work. Indeed, it makes things worse.*”) A slightly longer Cliff Notes version of the study was rendered by David Kopel, co-author of the law school textbook “Firearms Law and the Second Amendment.” Says Kopel “Carefully reviewing all existing research to date, the three scholars found no persuasive scholarly evidence that America's 20,000 gun-control laws had reduced criminal violence.” Some of the findings of the study included:

- The landmark federal Gun Control Act of 1968, banning most interstate gun sales, had no discernible impact on the criminal acquisition of guns from other states.
- Detroit's law providing mandatory sentences for felonies committed with a gun was found to have no effect on gun-crime patterns.
- Washington, D.C.'s 1977 ban on the ownership of handguns (except those already registered in the District) was not linked to any reduction in gun crime in the nation's capital.
- Polls claiming to show that a large majority of the population favored “more gun control” were debunked as being the product of biased questions, and of the fact that most people have no idea how strict gun laws already are.

Similar to the Jimmy Carter era gun laws, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of the Clinton era, signed into law in 1994, and was in place for a decade, did zilch, too, as the number of mass shootings actually increased slightly during that time., and a study by

Northeastern University, the Census Bureau and the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel showed that in the 10 years prior to the Clinton gun ban there were 173 mass shootings (as they defined them) with 766 victims, but during the decade of the Clinton ban, there were 182 mass shootings with 820 victims.

Finally, yet another 2003 study by The Centers for Disease Control, which is known as supporting gun control, published a major study in 2003 that acknowledged, "The Task Force found insufficient evidence to determine the effectiveness of any of the firearms laws or combinations of laws reviewed on violent outcomes." (Don't worry – as soon as you cough up yet some more tax dollars, the left will be back at it. Perhaps this time tying guns to global warming/cooling/change).

Would it help to hear an eyewitness account of someone who was in a shooting, and saw her parents killed because she was restricted from carrying a gun to protect herself? Watch Dr. Susan Gratia explain her personal experience, before the U.S. Congress, of being defenseless in the face of an attacker

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mMloa_eU5gA&feature=player_embedded And speaking of women, why is there a war by the left on women when it comes to guns? In 2012 CBS news reported "female participation in target shooting in the U.S. has nearly doubled in the last decade, growing to nearly five million women since 2001." Only leftists treat women as stupid. . Women know what the left is doing to this country, *and by extension, their safety*. And women are voting with their feet – by running to the nearest gun store and learning how to shoot. But gun grabbers don't seem to care one whit about the women they want to disarm. But I guess that is... you know.... the *leftists' war on women*. They talked about it a *lot* during the fall, 2012 campaign. Only now it appears they must have been referring to their *own* war against women.

The unfortunate thing about the Colorado shooting is that, while Colorado has concealed carry laws, *the theatre where the shooting occurred was a gun free zone* - despite what Roger Ebert fallaciously stated in the New York Times (as a matter of fact, Warner Houston at Breitbart.com wrote *in 2009* that an Alaskan member of a gun owner's message board had wanted to enter a Cinemark theatre, but was refused entry because it was gun free zone). So, what about other locales in Colorado where concealed carry is *allowed*, and a shooter began a rampage? We have exact, historical records: In Dec., 2007, five people were shot (two killed) when gunman Matthew Murray, packing a semi-automatic rifle and two pistols, attacked the New Life Church in Colorado Springs (he had gone to another site previously, killing two, while wounding others). This might have been a tragedy similar in scope to the recent Batman movie shooting – *except* that the gunman was shot by church security office Jeanne Assam with her personally owned concealed weapon. Similarly, on April 22nd – scant months before this tragedy, and also *in Aurora, CO.* – a convicted felon shot and killed the mother of the pastor, Delano Stephan of New Destiny Christian Center as the service was ending. We don't know how far this could have escalated – as the shooter was shot and killed by someone with a concealed gun. (See <http://denver.cbslocal.com/2012/04/22/2-shot-outside-aurora-church/>)

Incidentally, Aurora, CO., where the tragic Holmes shooting occurred, has some of the most strict gun laws in the state, including:

- "Dangerous weapons" including firearms prohibited.
- Revocation of license for furnishing a firearm to a minor or someone under the influence.
- Window displays cannot include firearms with barrels less than 12 inches long.
- Unlawful to carry concealed "dangerous weapon."
- Unlawful to discharge firearms, unless by law enforcement on duty or on shooting range.

- Unlawful to possess firearm while under the influence of intoxicant.
- Unlawful to have loaded firearm in motor vehicle.
- Unlawful for a juvenile to possess a firearm.

Of course, all the explosives in Holmes' apartment were "illegal," too. And in Sandy Hook, Adam Lanza had already broken 41 laws when his shooting stopped. Apparently adding a 42nd law will make all the difference?

Dr. John Lott also discussed the Aurora theatre killing, stating "There, you have seven movie theaters that were showing the Batman movie when it opened at the end of July. Out of those seven movie theaters, *only one movie theater was posted as banning permit-concealed handguns. The killer didn't go to the movie theater that was closest to his home. He didn't go to the movie theater that was the largest movie theater in Colorado, which was essentially the same distance from his apartment as the one he ended up going to. Instead, the one he picked was the only one of those movie theaters that banned people taking permit-concealed handguns into that theater.*" What is it about facts like this that leftists don't get?

One state to the west, Utah, saw a similar situation where on Feb. 12, 2007, Muslim Sulejman Talovic, who told his girlfriend the day before his rampage that his martyrdom would be "the happiest day of his life," opened fire in the crowded Trolley Square mall, killing five. Unfortunately for Sulejman, there was an armed bystander, off-duty Ogden policeman Ken Hammond. Officer Hammond pinned down Talovic – *preventing further deaths* - until a SWAT team arrived and provided the martyrdom Talovic wanted. Hammond was credited with saving "countless lives" – something, unfortunately, the *gun free zone* in Aurora, CO. did not experience.

And regarding the limited bullet magazine issue, a few points need to be made. First, it is common knowledge that 'stopping power' with certain calibers is questionable. William Levinson, in Why Does Anybody Need a 30-Round Magazine, in American Thinker, Jan. 3, 2013, notes this was learned by the US Army in the war in the Philippines during the early 1900s, when more than one dead US soldier was found with an empty gun by his side, a head split open by a machete, and a dead adversary not too far away who had *later* bled to death. The issue caused the Army to change calibers to a .45 caliber. Of course, not everyone carries, or is able to carry or use, something so big and powerful, and what is carried may not be able to "convince" a determined attacker who is, say, hopped up on PCP. (See http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2013/01/gov_cuomo_heres_why_your_seven_shot_gun_magazine_limit_is_already_outdated.html for a full rendering of the drugged up attacker issue – perhaps multiple attackers!) This also assumes accurate shooting – something people struggle with in the best of times under perfect training conditions with a stationary target!

I personally have a neighbor, a former Marine and retired senior Illinois state trooper, who related the story to me of one fellow Illinois policeman who was shot through the heart – and of course died – but before dying was able to continue his return attack by running approximately 50 yards and killing his attacker. This same state trooper related to me another situation where an armed attacker took some nurses hostage at the Illinois Inst. for Mental Health at 1601 W. Taylor St. in Chicago in the early 1990s, and engaged in a gunfire exchange with multiple police, led by one Lt. Ottomo of the CMS. Despite being hit by – as estimated by my state trooper neighbor - between fourteen and eighteen 9 mm rounds and three shotgun blasts, he continued to resist by shooting until he was finally jumped by the police and physically subdued. This criminal actually survived the encounter with a minimum seventeen shots to his body. And

all this with highly trained police shooters! Levinson's article outlines in detail the reasons for a larger capacity magazine, including failure to stop the aggressor and multiple aggressors – such as a home invasion scenario with four or five gang bangers. Then there is the suicide case cited by Col. Jeff Cooper, where *"the deceased shot himself amidst four times with a .380 Webley."* Cooper adds wryly, *"Presumably the first three hits did not convince him."* Perhaps in the Hollywood movies, one shot is placed perfectly every time. But if so, I suggest we then require the Learjet leftists of Hollywood, or our politicians in D.C., to have *their* armed guards allowed pistols with only a couple shots. And we should also ask why the police get to defend themselves with multiple bullet magazines, but the average citizen cannot. As Levinson asks in http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2013/01/the_antigon_movements_bridge_too_far.html, if it is true that ordinary citizens have the basic natural right to self-defense, then they "have a legitimate need for the same kind of weapons that are available to police officers. If a police officer or a civilian has to use a firearm for any non-sporting reason, he or she must use it for exactly the same application: self-protection against one or more violent individuals." What is so difficult to understand about this?

FIREARMS AND THE CONSTITUTION



Thus, it appears George Washington had it exactly right, when he said *"Firearms stand next in importance to the Constitution itself. They are the American people's liberty teeth and keystone under independence... from the hour the Pilgrims landed to the present day, events, occurrences and tendencies prove that to ensure peace, security and happiness, the rifle and the pistol are equally indispensable... the very atmosphere of firearms anywhere restrains evil interference – they deserve a place of honour with all that's good."* And another extremely explicit quote from Washington about the real purpose of arms: *"A free people ought not only to be armed and disciplined, but they should have sufficient arms and ammunition to maintain a status of independence from any who might attempt to abuse them, which*

would include their own government." James Madison felt similarly, stating in the Federalist No. 46, in 1788 *"Besides the advantage of being armed, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation, the existence of subordinate governments, to which the people are attached and by which the militia officers are appointed, forms a barrier against the enterprises of ambition, more insurmountable than any which a simple government of any form can admit of."* And George Mason, in a speech at the Virginia Ratifying Convention in 1788 state *"[W]hen the resolution of enslaving America was formed in Great Britain, the British Parliament was advised by an artful man, - who was governor of Pennsylvania, to disarm the people; that it was the best and most effectual way to enslave them; but that they should not do it openly, but weaken them, and let them sink gradually, by totally disusing and neglecting the militia."*

Yet another Founding Father, Thomas Jefferson agreed with Washington and Madison, saying *"Laws that forbid the carrying of arms... disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes. Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed one."* Jefferson also noted *"The constitutions of most of our States assert that all power is inherent in the people; that ... it is their right and duty to be at all times armed "* and *"The strongest reason for people to retain the right to keep and*

bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

Now, if you are concerned these might have been the only two founding fathers in support of the right to bear arms, I direct you to <http://cap-n-ball.com/fathers.htm>, where you will read over a dozen other quotes from founding fathers strongly encouraging the right to bear arms, including more by George Mason, co-author of the Second Amendment during Virginia's Convention to ratify the Constitution, 1788 who wrote, *"I ask, Sir, what is the militia? It is the whole people. To disarm the people is the best and most effectual way to enslave them."* Richard Henry Lee, American Statesman, 1788 penned *"To preserve liberty, it is essential that that whole body of the people always possess arms and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them."* Noah Webster himself wrote in his "An Examination of the Leading Principles of the Federal Constitution, in 1787, *"Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed; as they are in almost every kingdom of Europe. The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword; because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops that can be, on any pretence, raised in the United States."* And of course Patrick Henry hit the nail on the head when he stated to the Virginia Ratifying Convention *"O sir, we should have fine times, indeed, if, to punish tyrants, it were only sufficient to assemble the people! Your arms, wherewith you could defend yourselves, are gone; and you have no longer an aristocratical, no longer a democratical spirit. Did you ever read of any revolution in a nation, brought about by the punishment of those in power, inflicted by those who had no power at all?"* And Henry may have well sounded the same rallying cry today that he did over 200 years ago, when he asked *"Are we at last brought to such an humiliating and debasing degradation that we cannot be trusted with arms for our own defense?"* A very instructive 10 minute YouTube of Founding Father quotes on guns can be found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yx4xjxmPwQo&feature=player_embedded#t=252s

Joseph Story, who served on the Supreme Court from 1811 to 1845, and is known for his authoritative Commentaries on the Constitution, made crystal clear what the Founders thought the 2nd Amendment was about and for:

The importance of this article will scarcely be doubted by any persons, who have duly reflected upon the subject. The militia is the natural defense of a free country against sudden foreign invasions, domestic insurrections, and domestic usurpations of power by rulers. It is against sound policy for a free people to keep up large military establishments and standing armies in time of peace, both from the enormous expenses, with which they are attended, and the facile means, which they afford to ambitious and unprincipled rulers, to subvert the government, or trample upon the rights of the people. The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been considered, as the palladium of the liberties of a republic; since it offers a strong moral check against the usurpation and arbitrary power of rulers; and will generally, even if these are successful in the first instance, enable the people to resist and triumph over them."

The fact is that the Founding Fathers knew – and as was expressly stated in the Constitution – that our rights come from the Creator, not government. And because this is so, government cannot rescind them from the common man. That is, unless, the government is of, perhaps, the National Socialist persuasion – in which case you would find laws like the Nazi Weapons Law of November 11, 1938, the *Regulations Against Jews' Possession of Weapons* found at <http://jpfo.org/filegen-n-z/NaziLawEnglish.htm>

Even in modern times, Ronald Reagan understood the issue, stating *"The gun has been called the great equalizer, meaning that a small person with a gun is equal to a large person, but it is a*

great equalizer in another way, too. It insures that the people are the equal of their government whenever that government forgets that it is servant and not master of the governed" and "There are those in America today who have come to depend absolutely on government for their security. And when government fails they seek to rectify that failure in the form of granting government more power. So, as government has failed to control crime and violence with the means given it by the Constitution, they seek to give it more power at the expense of the Constitution. But in doing so, in their willingness to give up their arms in the name of safety, they are really giving up their protection from what has always been the chief source of despotism -- government." (This is the same Reagan that reminded us that "'We must reject the idea that every time a law's broken, society is guilty rather than the lawbreaker. It is time to restore the American precept that each individual is accountable for his actions" and "When dictators come to power, the first thing they do is take away the people's weapons. ... I do not believe that [our nation's leaders] have any desire to impose a dictatorship upon us. But this does not mean that such will always be the case. A nation rent internally, as ours has been in recent years, is always ripe for a 'man on a white horse.' A deterrent to that man, or to any man seeking unlawful power, is the knowledge that those who oppose him are not helpless.")

But let's leave Reagan behind as another conservative leftists hate. So... how about Hubert Humphrey, Democrat vice president under LBJ. Here's his thoughts on guns: *"The right of the citizens to bear arms is just one more guarantee against arbitrary government, one more safeguard against the tyranny which now appears remote in America, but which historically has proved to be always possible."*

In our present day, fellow conservative Allan West concurred with Reagan, noting *"An armed man is a citizen. A disarmed man is a subject."* Columnist Christopher Brownell summarized both West's and Reagan's sentiments by stating *"Turning men into slaves is not love. But that is what gun control is all about: turning men into slaves. Love for mankind is not in taking care of him, but in letting him be free to take care of himself. With gun control, liberals want to take away the means for men to preserve their liberty."* But perhaps the pithiest comments came from Sen. Rand Paul, who – when asked about Obama's gun control laws by CBN – simply stated *"I'm against having a king. I think having a monarch is what we fought the American Revolution over and someone who wants to bypass the Constitution, bypass Congress, that's someone who wants to act like a king or a monarch,"* and Gov. Rick Perry, who said *"Guns require a finger to pull the trigger. The sad young man who did that in Newtown was clearly haunted by demons and no gun law could have saved the children in Sandy Hook Elementary from his terror. "There is evil prowling in the world – it shows up in our movies, video games and online fascinations, and finds its way into vulnerable hearts and minds. As a free people, let us choose what kind of people we will be. Laws, the only redoubt of secularism, will not suffice. Let us all return to our places of worship and pray for help. Above all, let us pray for our children."*

Interestingly, even in Piers Morgan's England, Sir William Blackstone, in his 1765 Commentaries on the Laws of England, a seminal work that profoundly influenced America's founders, said that having arms for defense is a "natural right of resistance and self-preservation."

Now... as you reflect on these quotes, call to mind quotes of gun control fanatics like Rep. Jerrold Nadler (Communist – NY) who told a reporter: *"the state should have a monopoly on legitimate violence."* Of course, Nadler did not define what "legitimate violence" is, or who gets

to define it, or in what circumstances it is defined. The truth is, as Bob Livingston states, "When the state has "a monopoly on legitimate violence," Americans are no longer citizens; they are subjects. Americans will not become subjects." It is for precisely this reason that writer Robert Anderson wrote in *Gun Control and Political Correctness* "*Citizen gun ownership is ultimately a form of "insurance" for a future, unknowable risk. Switzerland, as well as our own country, has acknowledged and practiced this form of "insurance" for a long time. We all know gun ownership by citizens can impose heavy costs, but they are costs dwarfed by the greater horror of millions of future citizens being denied any means to defend themselves against an evil government slaughtering them with impunity.*"

But... just in case you are still unconvinced, let me add a few more Founding Father quotes for your reading pleasure: Richard Henry Lee wrote "*To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them*"; Samuel Adams stated "*And that the said Constitution be never construed to authorize Congress to infringe the just liberty of the Press, or the rights of Conscience; or to prevent the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens, from keeping their own arms*"; Patrick Henry added "*Are we at last brought to such humiliating and debasing degradation, that we cannot be trusted with arms for our defense? Where is the difference between having our arms in possession and under our direction and having them under the management of Congress? If our defense be the real object of having those arms, in whose hands can they be trusted with more propriety, or equal safety to us, as in our own hands?*" And finally, Thomas Jefferson stated, "*The strongest reason for people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government...When the people fear the government, there is tyranny. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.*"

You will note that the Founding Fathers envisioned the ownership of guns *not* just for hunting, or self-defense, but also to protect against tyranny. British General Howe disarmed Philadelphia in 1778, and his counterpart Gen. Gage had done the same the previous year in Boston. Tench Coxe, a lesser-known Founding Father discussed this very issue in an article in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Feb. 20, 1778, stating: "*[T]he unlimited power of the sword is not in the hands of either the federal or state governments, but, where I trust in God it will ever remain, in the hands of the people.*" Are we really that much more removed from the danger of tyranny today than back then? And if you answer in the affirmative, on what basis do you arrive at this conclusion? Certainly, modern writers like Edward Abbey, who wrote "*An armed citizenry is the first defense, the best defense, and the final defense against tyranny*" echo exactly what Founding Fathers like George Mason, a delegate from Virginia to the United States Constitutional Convention, who once made the following thought provoking statement, stated about arms allowing us to resist tyranny: "*[W]hen the resolution of enslaving America was formed in Great Britain, the British Parliament was advised by an artful man, who was governor of Pennsylvania, to disarm the people; that it was the best and most effectual way to enslave them; but that they should not do it openly, but weaken them, and let them sink gradually.*"

The truth is, as Tim Young states in *Personal Liberty*, that "*The Constitution was written with revolution in mind, not the peace that we have internally had for about 150 years now. I say 150 years, because we fought ourselves with our armed militias in the Civil War; we have been lucky to have had internal peace since then. But you can't closed-mindedly say that the 2nd Amendment was for limited weapons. It just wasn't. It was meant to keep people on the same level as the government so that they could fight for their rights if necessary.*"

<http://personalliberty.com/2013/01/07/pointcounterpoint-your-2nd-amendment-rights/> And also

of note re. the 2nd Amendment – the Constitution says it *guarantees*, *not grants*, our gun rights. There is all the difference in the world between those two verbs!

In fact, one Tiananmen Square survivor, who emigrated and moved to the US, had virtually the exact same words to say about guns, freedom and liberty as those “dead white guys,” the Founding Fathers. His six minute address is at at

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=miEmlfhfxuc&feature=player_embedded#t=0s, or, to summarize his salient points:

“The power of the government is derived from the consent of the governed.”

Chinese patriots in Tiananmen were crushed by “AK-47’s” because they could “not fight back” as they “were not armed.”

The argument “that a man with a rifle has no standing against the military technology and machine of today” is ridiculous. 20,000,000 residents of Beijing would have quickly proved that wrong had they been armed in 1989.

“When a government turns criminal, when a government turns deranged, the body count will not be 5, 10, or even 20. It will be in hundreds like Tiananmen Square, it will be in the millions...”

“When a government has a monopoly on guns, it has absolute power.”

“When a government has all the guns, it has all the rights.”

“To me, a rifle is not for sporting or hunting. It is an instrument of freedom. It guarantees that I cannot be coerced, that I have free will, that I am a free man.”

Here is a man we must listen to, unless we want to end up like oppressive China ourselves.

And let’s examine one case where guns ensured justice that will set the leftist gun grabbers’ hearts a-twitter – the 1964, desegregation of the Jonesboro High School in Louisiana. Authorities resisted the desegregation, including the use of fire hoses and similar on black citizens. Things did not look positive, *until four regular, everyday-type black men with shotguns showed up*. No shots were fired, the mob melted away, the authorities retreated, and the kids went into the school without incident. These men called themselves the Deacons for the Defense – an armed citizens’ militia in the town, which also protected black citizens from the Klan, and which spread throughout the south. Previously, if black citizens were unarmed, they could not protect themselves, nor go to the voting booths without fear and engage in their *Constitutional rights to vote*. The right to bear arms allowed blacks to protect these rights, and even. ML King even hired the Deacons to protect marches. A short video on this topic is found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=qzYKisvBN1o

A similar situation occurred with a white population, at the so-called Battle of Athens, just after WWII, when a corrupt sheriff essentially took over Athens, TN., including usurping a free and fair vote. Armed citizens forced the corrupt political machine out, and freedom was restored. A 13 minute YouTube of this episode can be found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5ut6yPrObw&feature=player_embedded#t=4s, and would be very instructive for those leftists who think “it can’t happen here.”

One final point about armed citizens. People like Piers Morgan continually make what they think is the clever point about the fact that we don't allow people to purchase tanks or 50 caliber machine guns to defend themselves from government tyranny. The answer? It is true that society has decided that people should not be able to arm themselves with an Abrams tank, or F-16. But, despite all the technological advances since the Constitution was written, society still believes the *core idea* of defense against potential tyranny applies. As noted by the Chinese dissident above, a mass number of armed citizens disbursed throughout a city would indeed be able to turn back a modern army – unless that army was prepared to level a whole city.

Essentially, the argument for allowing citizens AR-15s is the concept first advanced by France with its *Force de Frappe* or *Force de dissuasion*. A brief history lesson is in order regarding this, as it is *directly* applicable to the question Piers Morgan just doesn't get. In sum, after Charles de Gaulle's return to power in 1958, he was concerned that the US would not protect France from a Soviet invasion – by the 1960s, the US was knee deep in Vietnam, and besides, why would the US risk America for France? As Wikipedia notes – and is critical to the discussion here – “The strategic concept behind the *Force de Frappe* is one of [countervalue](#), i.e., the capability of inflicting to a more powerful enemy more damage than the complete destruction of the French population would represent. The enemy, having more to lose, would therefore refrain from proceeding any further. This principle is usually referred to in the French political debate as *dissuasion du faible au fort* (*Weak-to-strong deterrence*) and was summarized in a statement attributed to President de Gaulle himself:

“Within ten years, we shall have the means to kill 80 million Russians. I truly believe that one does not light-heartedly attack people who are able to kill 80 million Russians, even if one can kill 800 million French, that is if there were 800 million French.” Similarly, General Pierre Marie Gallois said *“Making the most pessimistic assumptions, the French nuclear bombers could destroy ten Russian cities; and France is not a prize worthy of ten Russian cities”* and French Admiral de Joybert in his book *La paix nucléaire* (1975), simply put it this way *“Sir, I have no quarrel with you, but I warn you in advance and with all possible clarity that if you invade me, I shall answer at the only credible level for my scale, which is the nuclear level. Whatever your defenses, you shan't prevent at least some of my missiles from reaching your home and cause the devastation that you know. So, renounce your endeavour and let us stay good friends.”*

This, then, is the answer to the AR-15 question. While the force that is allowed citizens is indeed still asymmetrical, both the Constitution, as well as experience from history, dictates that citizens, to remain free, must have enough force at their disposal to be a “force de dissuasion.” The above, along with the facts that the AR-15 has indeed been used multiple times for home defense (as noted in this paper), and is almost never utilized in crimes, and *is not automatic*, is the answer why we should allow so called “assault rifles” (which in fact, are not assault rifles!) to the public.

GUN CONTROL AND OTHER COUNTRIES

Of course, some readers won't like the Founding Fathers (no tolerance for “dead white guys” that gave the world the best – if not perfect – example of a free country ever in the history of man) or intimating that the Obama's government isn't perfect. So I then refer you to politically correct exhibit B, from Mahatma Gandhi's, own mouth: *“Among the many misdeeds of the British rule in India, history will look upon the act depriving a whole nation of arms, as the blackest.”* Or exhibit C: As a former policeman commented to me, *“Can you trust the United States government...sure, just ask an American Indian.”* Let's not forget exhibit D, either, from the Dalai Lama in the Seattle Times, May 15, 2001: *“If someone has a gun and is trying to kill*

you, it would be reasonable to shoot back with your own gun.” I will intentionally omit mentioning that the Obama administration’s drone attacks have most likely killed many more innocent children than the Sandy Hook shooter – that will be something you, yourself, can investigate (but to help you you can start with this story – which you never read about in the MSM – that killed children, just like Sandy Hook: “The villagers who rushed to the road, cutting through rocky fields in central Yemen, found the dead strewn around a burning sport utility vehicle. The bodies were dusted with white powder — flour and sugar, the witnesses said — that the victims were bringing home from market when the aircraft attacked. A torched woman clutched her daughter in a lifeless embrace. Four severed heads littered the pavement.



“The bodies were charred like coal. I could not recognize the faces,” said Ahmed al-Sabooli, 22, a farmer whose parents and 10-year-old sister were among the dead. “Then I recognized my mother because she was still holding my sister in her lap. That is when I cried” - full story at

<http://beforeitsnews.com/war-and-conflict/2012/12/us-kills-12-civilians-destroys-a-community-2444626.html> . Apparently certain “collateral” damage is OK?) By one account, as of Jan. 2013, in Pakistan alone, nearly 900

civilians have been reported killed, including 176 children reported killed.
<http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/2012/01/11/obama-2012-strikes/>

And then there is the petition from women in India, per the Times of India, where females in this country are demanding gun licenses from the licensing department of the Delhi Police, particularly after on brutal gang rape occurred in Dec., 2012. See, “Delhi Women gun for Licenses; Rape Triggers Big rush to Acquire Arms,” at

http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2013-01-01/delhi/36093841_1_gun-licences-inheritance-clause-delhi-cops. So much for the “dead white guys” canard.



And I ask you this: What sorrow has anyone in the Obama administration offered for the hundreds of Mexicans who were killed by the Fast & Furious scandal – for which Obama invoked executive privilege to prevent facts from coming out? Any comment on the young Mexican beauty queen, Maria Susana Flores Gomes, pictured here, who was killed by the Obama administration’s Fast and Furious guns?

Any word from the gun grabbers on this story below, which came out right after Sandy Hook on 10 January, 2013: with nary a peep from the left:

The “Obama administration defended agents of the Drug Enforcement Agency’s use of force against the 11-year-old and 14-year-old daughters of Thomas and Rosalie Avina. The “excessive” force included putting a gun to the youngest girl’s head. Attorney’s for the Obama administration defended the actions of the agents arguing that “the DEA agents’ conduct was plainly reasonable under the circumstances.” The sound from the left on this one? Crickets.
<http://freedomoutpost.com/2013/01/obama-admin-once-defended-agents-putting-gun-to-little-girls-head/#ixzz2Hcg4RIEL>

On the other hand, multiple genocidal dictators have stated their love for gun control. Here's a few: From Joseph Stalin, who established gun control in 1929: *"If the opposition disarms, well and good. If it refuses to disarm, we shall disarm it ourselves"* (a very informative, 4 minutes YouTube that includes Stalin's use of gun confiscation is found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dV1aYxCzepl&feature=player_embedded#t=5s). The USSR murdered around 61 million; Mao stated *"War can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun."* Mao may have murdered around 20 -30 million – and, like all other tyrants, he never did put down the gun. Adolf Hitler at a dinner talk on April 11, 1942 said: *"The most foolish mistake we could possibly make would be to allow the subject races to possess arms. History shows that all conquerors who have allowed their subject races to carry arms have prepared their own downfall by so doing. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that the supply of arms to the underdogs is a sine qua non for the overthrow of any sovereignty. So let's not have any native militia or native police. German troops alone will bear the sole responsibility for the maintenance of law and order throughout the occupied Russian territories, and a system of military strong-points must be evolved to cover the entire occupied country."* Idi Amin, who established gun control in 1971, killed a "mere" 300,000 (remember, to leftists, Stalin's dictum is sacrosanct: "The death of a single person is a tragedy; the death of million is a mere statistic"). And then there is the "Hero of Waco," Janet Reno, who betrayed the real goal behind the incrementalists, by stating *"Waiting periods are only a step. Registration is only a step. Prohibition of firearms is the goal."*

Heck, even the hacker group Anonymous has come out against Obama's gun control by stating: "Throughout history, authoritarian governments have used gun violence as an excuse to take people's firearms and control their population. This is exactly what Adolf Hitler did to disarm the German people and look at the atrocities his administration did. Obama has been working hard to try and ban all semi-automatic weapons and shot guns while at the same time increasing the weapons and firepower that police and government agencies have."



CONCEALED CARRY, CRIMINALS AND ENFORCEMENT OF GUN CONTROL


And exactly *how* is the Obama administration going to enforce their gun laws? Hire Janet Reno to come back and conduct a thousand Wacos around the country? And what will they do with states, such as Wyoming with its Firearms Protection Acts, which is a law being introduced that would *arrest* any federal agents who try to enforce Obama's gun laws? (see <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/01/10/Wyoming-Lawmakers-To-Federal-Gun-Grabbers-Don-t-Tread-On-Us>). In any event, as Awr Hawkings notes, in Nancy Pelosi's rush to jam Obamacare down America's throat, she, along with Obama, apparently forgot [Senate amendment 3276, Sec. 2716, part c](#) – slipped into the bill to the bill to buy off the NRA during that fight. Specifically, this section states that the government cannot use doctors to collect "any information relating to the lawful ownership or possession of a firearm or ammunition." So one more avenue is closed.

But to return from this issue to the present - what about concealed carry? Statistics from the recent past show states that passed concealed carry *reduced* their murder rate by 8.5%, rapes by 5% and robbery by 3%. Florida, which passed concealed carry in 1987, saw its higher than average homicide rate drop 52% during the following 15 years after passage, to below the national average. You are correct that correlation is not causation, but concealed carry did *not* result in chaos, as the left stated would surely happen. In fact, the average Floridian is more likely to be attacked by an alligator than by a concealed carry holder. After the law was passed, per David Kupelian, "eight of Florida's 10 largest cities experienced drastic decreases in

homicide rates from 1987 through 1995: Jacksonville, down 46 percent; Miami, down 13 percent; Tampa Bay, down 24 percent; Orlando, down 41 percent; Fort Lauderdale, down 53 percent; Hollywood, down 30 percent; Clearwater, down 21 percent; and Miami Beach down an incredible 93 percent.” As of mid-2011, there are 2,031,106 concealed carry permits issued in Florida and the last time I checked, there were zero shootouts at the OK Corral over the past two and half decades in Florida, other than ones conducted by gangs using illegal weapons. Indeed, as US Senator Orrin Hatch stated, *“The effect of that legislation on state crime rates has been astonishing. The predictions of the gun-control advocates were wrong, flat wrong.”*

And coming from a totally unexpected quarter, the Sacramento Bee – out of socialist California – noted in a Dec. 30, 2012 article that even as gun dealers sold 600,000 guns in California last year – as opposed to 350,000 in 2002 – *“gun deaths and injuries have dropped sharply in California... During that same period, the number of California hospitalizations due to gun injuries declined from about 4,000 annually to 2,800, a roughly 25 percent drop, according to hospital records collected by the California Department of Public Health. Firearm-related deaths fell from about 3,200 annually to about 2,800, an 11 percent drop, state health figures show.”* <http://www.sacbee.com/2012/12/27/5079151/california-gun-sales-increase.html> . Here are the graphs from the Bee:





As a matter of fact, the US. Dept. of Justice, in its (admittedly dated) publication, “The Armed Criminal in America: A Survey of Incarcerated Felons, Research Report July, 1985,” stated that 60% of felons they surveyed agreed that “a criminal is not going to mess around with a victim he knows is armed with a gun”; 74% agreed with the statement “one reason burglars avoid houses when people are at home is that they fear being shot during the crime”; and finally, 57% of felons agreed that “criminals are more worried about meeting an armed victim than they are about running into police.” A more recent survey found that of male felons in 11 state prisons across the USA, 34% had been scared off, wounded or captured by an armed victim of their crime; 40% of felons made a decision not to commit a crime because they feared the potential victim had a gun; 69% of felons knew other fellow criminals who had been scared off or captured by an armed victim, and 57% of felons polled agreed that “criminals are more worried about meeting an armed victim than they are about running into the police.” And how do criminals get their guns? A study about guns and felons, cited at <http://www.wnd.com/2004/12/28253/#Kfd7EWciAw0jzwQi.99>, found that, from the result of interviewing *more than 18,000 state and federal inmates conducted nationwide, almost 80 % of those interviewed got their guns from friends or family members, or on the street through illegal purchases.* It is for this reason that the head of the Illinois State Rifle Association, Richard Pearson, stated – after a 15 year old girl, Hadiya Pendleton, was shot and killed Jan., 2013, just blocks from Barack Obama’s tony home in an upscale Chicago neighborhood – that “Gun laws in Chicago only restrict the law-abiding citizens and they’ve essentially made the citizens prey.”

And as long as we are talking surveys, presumably 100% of the felons surveyed didn’t like the grub where they were incarcerated.

Statistical comparisons with other countries also show that burglars in the United States are far less apt to enter an occupied home than their foreign counterparts who live in countries where fewer civilians own firearms.

Based on a 2000 study, Americans use guns to *defend* themselves from crime and violence 989,883 times annually – generally against criminals who have no problem acquiring guns illegally. A recent nationwide survey of almost 5,000 households found that over a five-year period 3.5 percent of households had a member who used a gun to protect themselves, their family, or their property. This also adds up to about the same 1,000,000 incidents annually. During the Clinton era, the Justice Department identified 1.5 million cases per year of citizens using guns to defend themselves. Newer studies all point towards a figure of 2.5 million — that’s the new number for how many times Americans defend themselves from violent criminals each year. And when it comes to women, the old Jimmy Carter Justice Department found that

of more than 32,000 attempted rapes, 32 percent were actually committed. But when a woman was armed with a gun or knife, only 3 percent of the attempted rapes were actually successful. Today's statistics show each year about 200,000 women use a gun to defend themselves from a sexual crime or abuse.

Meanwhile as gun sales climb to record highs - 47% of American adults currently report that they have a gun in their home or elsewhere on their property, and given that many gun owners have multiple guns, there may be more guns now than Americans - 2010 FBI data shows violent crime continuing to fall (<http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010>) in the United States, with homicides dropping out of the top 15 causes of death in the country. These statistics undermine a favorite argument of anti-gun groups that "more guns equal more crime." Rather, the reverse is true. As Lawrence G. Keane, NSSF senior vice president and general counsel noted, "These statistics vividly demonstrate that the lawful possession and use of firearms by law-abiding Americans does not cause crime... There have never been more firearms in civilian possession in the history of the United States, and crime, including homicide, continues to decline throughout the country." In fact, guns cause crime about as much as cameras cause child pornography, and if it is true that guns kill, how does *anyone ever get out of a gun show alive?*

The US has the highest gun ownership rate in the world, per <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/publications/by-type/yearbook/small-arms-survey-2007.html> with 5% of the world's population owning 35–50% of the world's civilian-owned guns, so it must have the highest death by firearm rate, right? As a matter of fact, if one looks at all 178 countries in the world at the Small Arms Survey website, the US is #28. Not in the top ten, not the top dozen, not the top twenty or even twenty five. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime can also be examined to verify this data, at <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/statistics/data.html>, with a shorter summary of this data found at the UK Guardian's website at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2012/jul/22/gun-homicides-ownership-world-list>. As Yogi Berra might have said, "Who'd a thunk the UN would ever support gun ownership!"

But if you need the gun ownership vs. violent crime condensed into a simple graph, here it is, courtesy of <http://www.arcticpatriot.com/2013/01/england-safer.html> :


The truth is, when guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns. The truth is, that the Colorado shooter would still have found ways to get, or make weapons, even if they had been made illegal - certainly, Timothy McVeigh and the leftist Unibomber found a way, and the Columbine killers had set bombs that didn't go off, but police determines could have killed up to 488 students if they had gone off as the killers had planned. The truth is if guns kill people, then pencils misspell words, cars drive drunk, and spoons made Oprah fat. The truth is that one never sees gun murders at gun shows, where guns are seemingly every two steps one takes. And finally, the truth is that, as Stephen Dubner wrote, "far more children die each year in swimming pool accidents than in gun incidents." Truly, if America bans' guns, then the criminals would buy guns just as easily as they now buy illegal drugs or fake IDs. And of course, simple historical lessons like the prohibition era are totally lost of the gun grabbers. While background checks are presented as a cure all by Obama, the truth is that his executive orders will *not* "keep guns out of the hands of criminals by strengthening the background-check system." Rather, people with ill intent won't be walking into a gun shop anytime soon and submit to background checks – they will just go to the black market. Background checks are fine insofar as that goes, but to present them as a cure-all is a fraud. Besides, as a video from Defense

Distributed recently showed the world, it won't be long at all before people can simply *print* their own 30 round magazines in their local 3-D printing (see <http://alt-market.com/articles/1279-3d-printed-firearms-render-gun-control-moot> for more information.)

VERIFIABLE FACTS

As a matter of fact, as Thomas Sowell points out in his article *Invincible Ignorance*, gun control apologists are easily disproven by a number of easily verifiable facts: Gun ownership is higher in rural areas than in urban, but urban areas have a higher murder rate; legal gun ownership is higher among whites than blacks, but the murder rate is higher among blacks; and most tellingly, gun ownership doubled in the late 20th century, but the murder rate went *down*. And while liberals crow that England has stronger gun control laws than the US, with a lower murder rate, a mere scratch beneath the surface exposes serious flaws in the gun grabber argument. Long story short, England has had a lower murder rate than the US for *two centuries*, and for the bulk of that time, the laws did not differ. In fact, Sowell notes in the mid 1900s, one could buy a shotgun in London with no questions asked, while New York, which had the stringent Sullivan Law restricting gun ownership since 1911, had several times the murder rate of London. In 1954, there were only a dozen armed robberies in London, but by 2000— after stringent gun control laws were put in place — there were over one hundred times as many armed robberies. Sowell concludes by noting “Neither guns nor gun control was the reason for the difference in murder rates. People were the difference.” The short Sowell article can be found at <http://lewrockwell.com/sowell/sowell123.html>. And one point Sowell left out: if it is true that — as the left posits repeatedly — drug control doesn't work, why would gun control be any different? With the 300 million guns in the US, how effective would confiscation be? The reality is that there will be plenty of guns left — but only in the hands of criminals. But of course, gun confiscation will *not work* - even law abiding citizens indicated in a poll that 2/3rds of them would not comply with an order to turn in their guns. In a Fox poll of U.S. voters, question 46 in the survey of more than 1,000 registered voters asks if there was a gun in the household. Of the 52 % said yes, someone in their home owned a gun . But on to Question 47, addressed to those with a gun in their home: “If the government passed a law to take your guns, would you give up your guns or defy the law and keep your guns?” The response: 65 percent reported they would “defy the law.” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/blog/watercooler/2013/jan/20/two-thirds-us-weapons-owners-would-defy-federal-gu/#ixzz2IzIH2kQg>

And gun control happy England had also best not call the kettle black. While the numbers are probably massaged lower than they really are to make things look better, the UK has had a very



troubling 77% increase in violent crime recently, with 2,034 violent crimes per 100,000 residents — while what we consider crime ridden South Africa has “only” 1,677. Is CNN's Piers Morgan listening? And if so, is he intellectually honest enough to address these *facts*?

If not, the UK's Telegraph let all the cats out of the bag in a July, 2009 article, entitled UK is violent crime capital of Europe, found at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/5712573/UK-is-violent-crime-capital-of-Europe.html> . A few salient facts from this article by Richard Edwards, the crime correspondent for the paper: since around the time of England's gun ban, there has been a 77% increase in murders, robberies,

assaults and sexual offenses. In 2007, there were 927 murders (apparently, it's "gun murders bad, all other murders good" to the left), and 5.4 *million* crimes in total. In 2007. The Telegraph reported – from figures cited from Eurostat, the EU's database of statistics – that from 1998 to 2007, *"crime in the UK had increased from 652,957 offenses in 1998 to more than 1.15 million crimes in 2007.* In other words, with over 2,000 crimes per 100,000 population, the UK – per the Telegraph – is the most violent place in Europe. Interestingly, Japan – which is also disarmed – has a massively lower homicide rate, according to the UN statistics cited at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_intentional_homicide_rate#cite_note-geneva-5. In fact, for Japan, with a population of around 130 million, total homicides were 506, while the UK, with 53 million people – less than half that of Japan - had 722 homicides, per the most recent data. I.e., England has about three times the murder rate of Japan. *Clearly, there are other factors at work* – reducing violence to just firearms is grossly simplistic.


And one more truth for your consideration. Less than 48 hours after the Colorado theatre shooting, Mexican "coyote" (illegal alien smuggler) Ricardo Mendoza-Pineda lost control of his Ford F250 pickup on Hwy 59, just outside the town of Golidad, TX., and struck two trees, killing 15, and injuring eight. One of the dead was an eight year old girl. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/25/us/texas-death-toll-rises-in-crash-of-pickup-truck.html> ; this tragedy killed *more* human beings than the Colorado theatre shooting, but was buried in the back pages, and I am sure you never heard of this incident. As WND.com asked: *"Does a mass killing have to be in a hail of bullets nowadays to make the news. And illegal is illegal... and this happened during the commission of a crime, just like Colorado. Die by the gun, or die by the wheel, you're still dead, and dead because of crime."* The reality is that gun control is on an agenda by the political left, which is why you never heard about this mass death.

FAMILIES AND GUNS

The truth about gun ownership creating *more safety* is *practically* illustrated in Kennesaw, GA – where gun ownership is *mandatory* for every head of household, per ordinance [Sec 34-21], which states: (a) *In order to provide for the emergency management of the city, and further in order to provide for and protect the safety, security and general welfare of the city and its inhabitants, every head of household residing in the city limits is required to maintain a firearm, together with ammunition therefore, and (b) Exempt from the effect of this section are those heads of households who suffer a physical or mental disability which would prohibit them from using such a firearm. Further exempt from the effect of this section are those heads of households who are paupers or who conscientiously oppose maintaining firearms as a result of beliefs or religious doctrine, or persons convicted of a felony."*

Kennesaw – contrary to what the gun grabbers would have you believe - is not the Wild West, but rather was voted by Family Circle magazine as one of the nation's "10 best towns for families." (<http://www.familycircle.com/family-fun/money/10-best-towns-for-families/?page=4>) The city website also claims Kennesaw "has the lowest crime rate in Cobb County" – this in one of the most populated counties in Georgia. In fact, from 1982 through 2009, Kennesaw had only one murder, in 2007, while Mayor Bloomberg's gun control nirvana New York City in a recent 25-year period had more than 15,000 murders – 2, 245 in 1990 alone ([see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:NYC_murders.PNG](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:NYC_murders.PNG)) – in contrast to Kennesaw, Georgia's one. Yes, these are clearly different cities. not the exact same timeframes and there are a host of variables to be examined – but *fifteen thousand to one??* I, for one, am not going to even bother with doing the math for this. In 2012, Georgia had a crime rate of 4,043.8 per 100,000 population, while Kennesaw had a crime rate only 61% of that – and the violent crime rate was

even less. Per <http://www.cityrating.com/crime-statistics/georgia/kennesaw.html> here is what comparative violent crime rate is for Kennesaw:



The real truth is that it is *the inter-generational socio-pathology that the left has created* that has created this society of killers and psychopaths as PatriotPost has illustrated in a story found at <http://patriotpost.us/alexander/2936>).

Across the western nations, stories such as the following in the Five Minute Forecast abound (this story is set in France, but it could be *anywhere* from Fort Worth to Philadelphia): A “client was recently telling me about her niece, who has had three children, each from different fathers. She now has a new benefit-scrounging live-in lover. In addition to his own benefits, she provides him with free housing (which he won’t get independently) and pays him 500 Euros a month of her 1500 Euro state handout, to try, out of pathetic desperation, to persuade him to stick around. They plan a fourth child, quite openly for additional revenue generation purposes. Meanwhile the first three play truant and run free, mostly to avoid being hit by this ‘stepfather’. They are feral” (emphasis mine).

And it’s not just France. Moving across a continent, an ocean, and a culture, James Cook of Investment Rarities discusses how the nanny state is destroying a complete value system – resulting in *extreme violence*. Cook states:

“At one Minnesota reservation mothers tell their daughters to expect to be raped and to keep quiet about it. At South Dakota’s Pine Ridge reservation, population 40,000, there are 3,000 child abuse cases each year. In addition there are 20,000 arrests each year, one for every other person. A tribal officer reports, “We pick up a guy for some alcohol-related offense and are out of town for an hour taking them to jail, and in the meantime people are here clubbing and stabbing each other. Indians were once the most self-sufficient people on earth. For thousands of years they experienced none of the behavioral pathologies present on today’s reservations. What changed them? The government began to support them. They no longer had to make their own way. Idleness and boredom were powerful incentives to mischief. If our government

had never given them a penny they would have left the reservations behind and been fully integrated in our society often reaching the upper levels of achievement..."

http://www.investmentrarities.com/best_of_jim_cook12-10-12.shtml

As the family recedes (or is shoved by politics) into the background and the nanny state takes over, personal responsibility is destroyed, consciences are seared, and – as shown above – violence increases in at least in one section of society, while another section people – the aging baby boomers - just turns to white collar crime – why kill someone and steal their money, when you can have a lawyer take it, or engage in legal embezzlement a la MF Global. As Cook summarizes the issue by stating *"Sometimes it seems easier for a Muslim terrorist to leave his religion than a liberal to see the obvious mess they are making of our country...If you care about people don't give them money they didn't earn. It does not rescue them from poverty, it enhances dependence and encourages dysfunction. It is the most destructive social force on earth."* Evidence of cultural degradation? Here's a few headlines from the post-Thanksgiving "Black Friday" sales: "Gang fight at Black Friday sale"; "Shots fired outside Walmart"; "Customers run over in parking lot"; "Men steal boy's shopping bag"; and "Shopper robbed at gunpoint outside Best Buy."

As a matter of fact, a very convincing case can be made that much of the cause of "gun problems" is really caused by the dissolution of the family, as written about in Ruth Dafoe Whitehead's seminal work on this issue, *Dan Quayle Was Right* (<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1993/04/dan-quayle-was-right/307015/>). This, *mes amis*, is what really lies beneath the issue of violence, similar to the unseen part of an iceberg. To wit: As Off the Grid News points out in 2012, "Since the year 2000, there have been twenty-six cases of mass murder (four or more victims) in the United States, as opposed to twenty combined during the 1980s and 1990s. And before the 1980s, mass killing sprees were actually quite rare in this country, usually averaging no more than one or two per decade." (see <http://www.offthegridnews.com/2012/08/14/psychiatric-drugs-and-mass-murder-exploring-the-connection/>). Time Magazine lists the top mass shootings of the past 50 years at <http://newsfeed.time.com/2012/07/20/the-worst-mass-shootings-of-the-past-50-years/> You will notice the gradual increase over the years in frequency of these atrocities. In fact of the top twelve incidents, seven have occurred since 2007. And the top five prior to 2012? Except for Columbine in 1999, the top five were April 16, 2007, Feb. 14, 2008, April 3, 2009, and Nov. 5, 2009 (see <http://thebuzzcincy.com/1198585/five-of-the-worst-mass-killings-in-the-us-history/>).

Indeed, African-American Walter Williams writes in Are Guns the Problem, *"When I attended primary and secondary school – during the 1940s and '50s – one didn't hear of the kind of shooting mayhem that's become routine today. Why? It surely wasn't because of strict firearm laws. My replica of the 1902 Sears mail-order catalog shows 35 pages of firearm advertisements. People just sent in their money, and a firearm was shipped. Dr. John Lott, author of More Guns, Less Crime, reports that until the 1960s, some New York City public high schools had shooting clubs where students competed in citywide shooting contests for university scholarships. They carried their rifles to school on the subways and, upon arrival, turned them over to their homeroom teacher or the gym coach and retrieved their rifles after school for target practice. Virginia's rural areas had a long tradition of high-school students going hunting in the morning before school and sometimes storing their rifles in the trunks of their cars that were parked on school grounds. Often a youngster's 12th or 14th birthday present was a shiny new .22-caliber rifle, given to him by his father."* What has changed since William's early days? He cites statistics from the National Center for Education Statistics, where – in 2010 – there were 828,000 non-fatal criminal incidents in our schools, including almost a

half million thefts, 359,000 violent attacks, of which 91,400 were serious. As well, 145,100 public school teachers were physically attacked, and 276,700 threatened. In a similar article, Williams also writes: *"Many of today's youngsters begin the school day passing through metal detectors. Guards patrol school hallways, and police cars patrol outside. Despite these measures, assaults, knifings and shootings occur. ... For well over a half-century, the nation's liberals and progressives ... have waged war on traditions, customs and moral values. These people taught their vision, that there are no moral absolutes, to our young people. To them, what's moral or immoral is a matter of convenience, personal opinion or a consensus. ... Customs, traditions, moral values and rules of etiquette, not laws and government regulations, are what make for a civilized society. ... The importance of customs, traditions and moral values as a means of regulating behavior is that people behave themselves even if nobody's watching. Police and laws can never replace these restraints on personal conduct so as to produce a civilized society."* The war by the leftists' on moral values and absolutes is perspicaciously captured by Williams in the above quote.

And besides, if ban on alcohol didn't work, the ban on marijuana never worked, the ban on illegal immigrants didn't work, why would banning guns be followed – and by *criminals* to boot?

Dr. Pat Fagan diagnoses the family problem exactly as Williams does, writing at <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/1995/03/bg1026nbsp-the-real-root-causes-of-violent-crime> *"The real work of reducing violent crime is the work of rebuilding the family. Institutions in the community, such as the church and the school, have demonstrated their importance in helping to restore stability. Government agencies, on the other hand, are powerless to increase marital and parental love; they are powerless to increase or guarantee care and attention in a family; they are powerless to increase the ability of adults to make and keep commitments and agreements. Instead, thanks to policies that do little to preserve the traditional family and much to undermine it, government continues to misdiagnose the root cause of social collapse as an absence of goods and services. This misdiagnosis is government's own contribution to the growth of crime. Having misdiagnosed, it misleads."*

The cause of violent crime isn't gun policy--it's family policy. And until Americans step back and examine the real problem, the President will continue exploiting these tragedies to accomplish his ultimate goal: expanding government at the expense of personal freedom." Fagan also notes:

- Over the past thirty years, the rise in violent crime parallels the rise in families abandoned by fathers.
- High-crime neighborhoods are characterized by high concentrations of families abandoned by fathers.
- State-by-state analysis by Heritage scholars indicates that a 10 percent increase in the percentage of children living in single-parent homes leads typically to a 17 percent increase in juvenile crime.
- The rate of violent teenage crime corresponds with the number of families abandoned by fathers.
- The type of aggression and hostility demonstrated by a future criminal often is foreshadowed in unusual aggressiveness as early as age five or six.
- The future criminal tends to be an individual rejected by other children as early as the first grade who goes on to form his own group of friends, often the future delinquent gang.

African-American columnist Larry Elder, in his *Gun Culture' -- What About the 'Fatherless Culture?* goes even further, discussing race and the absence of fathers in the black family (the problem which is also increasing in other races – while in fact, many don't even see this as a problem!). Elder says the face of gun violence is not Sandy Hook, but Chicago. Half of the gun murders each year involve both black killers and black victims, mostly in the city and – tellingly – gang related. It has been a half century since Daniel Patrick Moynihan *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action*. When he wrote this, 25% of blacks were born out of wedlock, and it was a national scandal. Today? That number is 72%, of blacks, 36% of *white children* and 53% of Hispanic children born outside of marriage. Elder quotes Rutgers University sociology professor David Popenoe, who wrote *"Life Without Father" in 1996, "where he describes the 'massive erosion' of fathers in America. Popenoe concluded that boys raised without fathers were more likely to have problems with drugs, alcohol, behavior and social interactions. Several studies during the '90s found that disruption in family structures was a predictor of children's gang involvement"*. How many of these mass murder types came from broken homes, such as Adam Lanza did? Elder concludes with the story of Tupac Shakur, who stated before his death, "I know *for a fact* that had I had a father, I'd have some discipline. I'd have more confidence." He stated he hung out with gangs because he wanted to belong to a family structure, and it offered structure, support and protection -- the kind of thing we once expected home and from a father. In the old days, we had both fathers and lax gun laws in the culture, with almost non-existent mass shootings. Today we have no fathers and much stronger gun laws that back then. You do the math.

The above notwithstanding, who is committing the mass of gun murders, statistically speaking? Another interesting question, which again should be laid at the feet of the left, who have caused this situation, too. The fact of the matter is that, as WND reports at <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/real-gun-threat-illegal-alien-street-gangs/#FusAXftu7RZaGg4J.99>, according to the FBI, it is criminal *street gangs* – usually made up of illegal aliens with absentee fathers – that are acquiring the high powered, military-style weapons to take on both the public and the police. WND reports "*Criminal street gangs are responsible for the majority of violent crimes within the U.S. and are the primary distributors of most illicit drugs, according to a 2009 report by the Justice Department's National Drug Intelligence Center, or NDIC.*" Judicial Watch at <http://www.judicialwatch.org/blog/2009/01/illegal-immigrant-gangs-commit-most-u-s-crime/> comes to the exact same conclusion. And if you are thinking Mexican drug cartel involvement, you are exactly correct. Unfortunately, the NDIC was one government programme (perhaps the only one!) Obama didn't like, for the NDIC was shut down June, 2011, with their reports on this completely scrubbed from the Justice Department's website. (So much for that "transparent government" promise, yet again! More disappearing documentation – just like Obama's university transcripts) The FBI reported in 2011 there were 33,000 gangs, with 1.4 *million* members in street, prison, motorcycle and other types of gangs. One study in Virginia found that 90% of perhaps the most violent gangs, the MS-13, are illegal immigrants, while USA today – quoting 1 million gang members in 2009 – revealed at http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2009-01-29-ms13_N.htm that up to 80% of crime is committed by gangs. The Dept. of Justice website at <http://www.justice.gov/criminal/> is a good place to start your own research.

A few random examples are instructive: In San Francisco an MS-13 gang member murdered a father and son with an assault weapon because their car blocked his from making a turn. In Los Angeles an MS-13 member just released from prison murdered a high school football star as he walked home from the mall. In Maryland a 14-year-old honors high school student was shot to death on a crowded public bus by an MS-13 illegal Salvadoran alien. And I am positive you have never read of a single one of these incidents, unless it happened locally. Where is the

outcry to “save our children.” Oh... wait. Illegal aliens are simply “undocumented,” and part of the privileged group, so issues like this are not reported by a complicit media.

But illegal alien or not, fatherlessness draws boys to gangs. Does Tupac Shapur’s quote above, about an absent father, start to ring any bells?

Off the Grid News also attributes mass murders to psychiatric drugs, as do people like Dr. Ignatius Piazza, founder and director of Front Sight, but ultimately, this may boil down to the same issue, as the destruction of the family leads to psycho-social pathologies, which are often, in turn, treated by drugs. As if on cue, Dr. Joel Rosenberg notes in his Flashtraffic email that violent crime in the United States has surged by more than 460 percent since 1960 – you know... since the sexual revolution, no fault divorce, swinging/wife swapping and a decade later abortion - began in earnest. Yes, violent crime in general is down in the more recent decades (starting the early 1990s) – perhaps attributable to the aging population – but this is at the same time gun ownership is skyrocketing, as noted above. This may well prove the point: gun ownership isn’t the central issue in these mass murders – rather, psycho-social maladjustment is. The problem is not guns; rather it is the absence of moral conscience – aided and abetted by a corrupt, leftist Hollywood, and the lack of intact, nuclear families. As the UK’s Guardian reported Dec., 2012, at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/topics/christmas/9764688/A-dad-is-tenth-most-popular-Christmas-list-request-for-children.html>, *a dad is the tenth most popular Christmas wish for children in the UK*, while in the US, one in three children live without their father, as the number of two-parent households have fallen by 1.2 million over the past 10 years. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2253421/1-3-US-children-live-father-according-census-number-parent-households-decreases-1-2-million.html>. An interactive map of the US, showing where fathers are most absent, can be found at www.washingtontimes.com/fathers. As your own research project, do a comparison of this map to where you know the violent crime is. If one can *read*, one should be able to understand what the destroyed family means, and how it impacts *everything* – including the increase in mass murders by youth adrift both mentally morally.

As CS Lewis warned us decades ago in *The Abolition of Man*, “We make men (and now boys) without chests (hearts, morals) and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate, then bid the geldings be fruitful.” Maybe we shouldn’t be so surprised at the mass killings and violence our young men are perpetrating. One random headline illustrates the issue perfectly - the day I edited this paper, several news outlets reported this story: Woman set on fire in L.A. as she sleeps on bench (<http://news.yahoo.com/woman-set-fire-la-she-sleeps-bench-173532304.html>). How did the perpetrator come to this point in his life? The story doesn’t say – but perhaps it doesn’t need to... and I would wager good money on what his probable personal history was.

Don’t believe that the dissolution of the family is an issue? In *Society Muck Up: Why 6-Year-Old Girls Want to Be Sexy*, Regis Giles cites studies indicating “Most girls as young as 6 are already beginning to think of themselves as sex objects, according to a new study of elementary school-age kids in the Midwest.” Story at (<http://girlsjustwannahaveguns.com/2012/12/society-muck-up-why-6-year-old-girls-want-to-be-sexy/>) 6 year old sexual objects? Really? If you think this is “normal” or “OK,” or think this will lead to well-adjusted young women (in this case) I suspect there is a “Yes we can” chant in you need to be at.

Meanwhile, the organization Childhelp, which assists children affected by violence released a report stating that 3.3 million reports of violence, affecting over about 6 million children are received annually. Every day in the country more than five children die for reasons related to violence. 14% of men in U.S. prisons have experienced childhood abuse, as well as 36% of

female prisoners. This violence is a result of parent who, in many cases, were themselves often parentless, unchurched and undisciplined. Five children a day dying is the equivalent of almost 100 Sandy Hooks per year – but still we ignore what Moynihan warned of, and add to it yet more.

In 2011, BBC conducted an investigation and discovered over the last 10 years, over 20,000 children have died in the U.S. in their own homes at the hands of family members. Perhaps outrage over Sandy Hook ought to be replaced by outrage over what the left has done to our families.

Still not convinced? Still blaming guns? Try this on for size: There is a video game, Kindergarten Killer, that you, dear reader, can play. Here is the description of the game:

“As a hitman for hire, you were recently given orders to take out the headmaster of a kindergarten school. Your job is to not ask questions, so you carry on with the job and head to the school. One thing leads to the next and you accidentally kill a teacher. The kids saw it and they get riled up. The children rise up in arms and open fire at you at every chance they get. But despite everything that happened, your target still roams alive so you head back to the office and kill your target before heading back to the office. Enjoy a crazy shootout in Kindergarten Killer.” There are hundreds of other, similar games out there. Did the Connecticut shooter play



them? Had he watched – and been desensitized – by the garbage Hollywood puts out? It has been said a child growing up in the US today will see 16,000 murders and 20,000 acts of violence before he reaches age 18. Why has no one in the media been asking questions on this issue nature, rather than just focus on guns themselves? And dare anyone in the media take on the Hollywood Industrial complex?

Ben Stein summarizes the issue of the Sandy Hook mass shooting at Spectator.org, stating *“I read that the killer was socially awkward (putting it mildly) and “reserved.” I know what that often means. He spent much of his miserable life playing shoot ‘em up video games on line or on machines. I see a troubled young man doing that often. Up close and personal. In these games, the “player” just spends his whole day attempting to exercise and exorcize his loneliness and low self-esteem by shooting imaginary creatures and creating damage all day long. At a certain point, just “killing” on the console blurs into doing it in real life. “Killing” is just what the kid does all his life. How much of a stretch is it for him to shoot into a movie theater or a political gathering or a kindergarten in “real life” if his life is so pitiful that he does not know what’s real and what is not? If you are looking for a villain, try shoot ‘em up games.”* <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/12/17/god-help-us>

Pulitzer Prize winner Dave Grossman, the famed author of the highly acclaimed “On Killing,” a heavily referenced, Marine Corps commandant *required* reading, historical study on training U.S. soldiers to learn to kill has some observations about our video violence saturated society. In a Human Events article at <http://www.humanevents.com/2013/01/24/killology-against-violence/>, Grossman notes that we can understand mass murders the same way we learned to increase the firing rate for US infantrymen from 15-20% in World War II to 90% or better in Vietnam, by using one simple explanation: Skinnerian, operant conditioning – or put more baldly, simply *desensitizing* soldiers to taking a human life. Examples of this would be shooting life-like figures, or using rhythmic shooting exercises, etc. Grossman’s thesis is that today we

are doing the same to our young with our video games, as well as (leftist!) Hollywood movies and TV. The Human Events article noted in 2000, the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry made this joint statement for a Congressional health summit.

“At this time, well over 1,000 studies, including reports from the Surgeon General’s office, the National Institute of Mental Health, and numerous studies conducted by leading figures within our medical and public health organizations—our own members—point overwhelmingly to a causal connection between media violence and aggressive behavior in some children,” they wrote. “The conclusion of the public health community, based on over 30 years of research, is that viewing entertainment violence can lead to increases in aggressive attitudes, values and behavior, particularly in children.”

Grossman has a more recent book, Stop Teaching Our Kids to Kill, that explores this issue more fully. Says Grossman *“The killers, they all had one thing in common: they dropped out of life, and they immersed themselves in the culture of violence.”* Ring a bell for anyone? And regarding the video angle, he adds *“No one should be talking book banning. The research doesn’t support that. What the research tells us is we’ve got to stop violent visual imagery inflicted upon children and we’ve got to treat it like automobiles, or firearms, or sex.”* Grossman adds that we also restrict things such as tobacco, pornography, and alcohol by age, as children are not yet physically or mentally mature enough to deal with these things safely. If we don’t, Grossman warns : *“This generation is going to give us evil like nothing we’ve seen before, Grossman said. “Sandy Hook is just the beginning.”*

To which I add: Just don’t tell Learjet leftists of Hollywood any of the above – they are too busy making good money off all of this, while at the same time shedding crocodile tears over massacres while going everywhere with armed bodyguards and full time security around their Learjet leftist mansions.

THE DRUG AND VIOLENCE CONNECTION

As the Illinois State Rifle Association notes, the Sandy Hook CT. shooter, Adam Lanza, not only came from a divorced family, but was “apparently a mentally ill young person *whose wealthy family insulated him from reality* until he decided to create his own reality – at the expense of more than two dozen innocent people. Laurie Higgins in the Illinois Family Association concurred with this report, noting that Lanza’s father (as well as an older brother) left when Adam was 16, and remarried a few years later. Reportedly, Adam Lanza had *no* contact with his father or brother since 2010. How did this affect Adam, and why is *this* not part of the “national debate” on violence? Even more importantly, a few days after the shooting, it was reported that Adam Lanza was on a violence-linked anti-psychotic drug called Fanapt, as reported at <http://www.businessinsider.com/adam-lanza-taking-antipsychotic-fanapt-2012-12> or <http://naturalsociety.com/predictions-confirmed-shooter-adam-lanza-was-on-violence-linked-anti-psychotic-fanapt/>. The Fanapt story was later retracted, but family friend of the Lanzas, Louise Tambascio, stated during an interview with 60 Minutes that *“I know he was on medication and everything, but she homeschooled him at home cause he couldn’t deal with the school classes sometimes, so she just homeschooled Adam at home. And that was her life.”* [http://newyork.cbslocal.com/2012/12/16/friends-newtown-gunmans-mother-home-kept-arsenal-of-guns/](http://newyork.cbslocal.com/2012/12/16/friends-newtown-gunmans-mother-home-schooled-son-kept-arsenal-of-guns/) Tambascio also told ABC News, *“I knew he was on medication, but that’s all I know.”* [http://newyork.cbslocal.com/2012/12/16/friends-newtown-gunmans-mother-home-](http://newyork.cbslocal.com/2012/12/16/friends-newtown-gunmans-mother-home-kept-arsenal-of-guns/)

[schooled-son-kept-arsenal-of-guns/](#) Lanza's old babysitter, Ryan Kraft, also went on record as stating Lanza was taking medications of this sort early as age 10. Maybe it's time Obama had a national discussion about his cronies and lobbyists in Big Pharma, who seem to push kids into the latest drug du jour at the drop of a hat? Or doesn't that fit his political agenda and his "never let a crisis go to waste" attitude? It is already on the labels themselves that drugs, like Prozac, Zoloft, Paxil, and Ritalin are causing people to commit violent acts. Read the documentation in the drug packages, or online, yourself – it's right there in black and white. The top ten psychiatric prescription drugs linked to violence – as listed by Time Magazine - in a Jan. 7th, 2011 article at <http://healthland.time.com/2011/01/07/top-ten-legal-drugs-linked-to-violence/#ixzz2FNH7YyEI> - are the antidepressant/anti-anxiety drugs desvenlafaxine (Pristiq), venlafaxine (Effexor), fluvoxamine (Luvox), paroxetine (Paxil), fluoxetine (Prozac), sleep aid Halcion, ADHD drug Strattera, several brands of amphetamines used to treat ADHD, the anti-malarial Lariam, and the anti-smoking medication Chantix. See also <http://healthland.time.com/2011/01/07/top-ten-legal-drugs-linked-to-violence/#ixzz2G16Hp6aG>. Of course James Holmes in the Colorado massacre was also on psychotropic drugs. Yet a further analysis of the association of prescription drugs with violence and shootings, from Brandon Turbeville, is at http://www.thedailysheep.com/psychiatric-drugs-school-violence-and-the-big-pharma-cover-up_012013, while internationally known psychiatrist Dr. David Healy agrees with the summary that these drugs cause violence – a Cliff Notes version of Healy's sentiments is simply this: Psychotropic drugs "prescribed for school children cause violent behavior." The non-Cliff Notes, detailed version of his rationale behind this may be found at <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/top-psychiatrist-meds-behind-school-massacres/>.

If anyone is wondering why the US leads in school gun murders, perhaps you might want to explore the relationship between drugging our kids and violence. Note that not only are school gun murders up, but youth suicides are up dramatically as well. This shouldn't be surprising, of course, as both are cut from the same cloth – disinhibition, messing with brain function, disturbing the level of self-control, and more. Granting that correlation is not causation, Dr. Bertram Karon from Michigan State Univ. notes the US has six times as many children on Ritalin, around four million, as any other country, and *all of France* only has 8,000 kids, in total, on Ritalin, while his home city of Lansing Michigan, alone, has around that many. In fact, the US accounts for around 90% of Ritalin prescriptions in the world. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ujuDvwSOFto&sns=fb>


We must fully consider the question of Todd Walker in his article, found at

http://www.thedailysheep.com/how-many-pills-until-pharmageddon_012013:

"Can prescription drugs cause you to kill someone?" And the answer is "Absolutely", per Dr. David Healy, author of [Pharmageddon](#), and quoted in the paragraph above.

"Violence and other potentially criminal behavior caused by prescription drugs are medicine's best kept secret... Want to find out if the drugs you or a loved one are taking might cause violent behavior? Enter the name of the drug over at the [Violence Zone](#).

Even if it's 'just a pill' to help you quit smoking, side effects can be deadly. Don't expect to hear about this on major media outlets. Pharmaceutical companies have a vested interest in keeping journalists in line."



David Kupelian at WND also documents a horrifying number of shootings associated with psychotropic drugs at <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/the-giant-gaping-hole-in-sandy-hook-reporting/>, including not only Columbine killer Eric Harris, who was on Luvox, but also: Patrick Purdy, who killed five children and wounded 30 in 1989, who was on amitriptyline and Thorazine, Kip Kinkle, who killed his parents, and 22 other fellow students, who was on Prozac and Ritalin; the 1988 Winnetka, IL. shooting by Laurie Dann, who killed one and wounded six while taking Anafranil and lithium; the 1997 Paducah KY school shooting by Michael Carneal, who shot and killed three while on Ritalin; the 2005 Jeff Wiese shooting, which killed nine and wounded 5 on the Red Lake Indian Reservation, which occurred while Wiese was on Prozac; the 1989 shooting of 20 co-workers, killing nine, by Joseph Wesbecker in Louisville, KY, while he was on Prozac – and which Eli Lilly settled a lawsuit by survivors; a 1996 shooting of his father by Kurt Danysh while on Prozac; or the horrible case of a mother one town over from where I currently live, Naperville, IL., who killed all five of her children while on antidepressant Effexor. The case of the Virginia Tech murder of 32 people by Cho Seung-Hui may also have been prescription drug related, too, as Kupelian discusses in this article. As if further evidence were needed, the Luvox label *itself* states that 4% of children in one study went manic – out of control behavior.

To what degree is the “prozac-ing” and “ritalin-ing” of our young contributing to these shootings? As noted above, these prescriptions state on their warning labels that violent behavior is one possible outcome of taking their *drugs*. *Yet, there is nary a peep from the media. Why?* Jason Charles the Truth Alliance notes “At least fourteen recent school shootings were committed by those taking or withdrawing from psychiatric drugs. There have been 109 wounded and 58 killed. Of these 14, seven were seeing either a psychiatrist (five of them) or psychologist (two of them). It is not known whether or not the other half were seeing a psychiatrist, as it has not been published.” Details of this issue are at CCHR, <http://www.cchr.org/school-shooters/>)

Not to push the issue, but, as Obama has said, we must ensure a school shooting like Sandy Hook never happens again, so let’s examine some other links on gun and non-gun related violence related to psychotropic prescription drugs like Zoloft, Prozac, and the like. The list is not pretty:

Per

www.blacklistednews.com/Mental_illness%2C_medications_and_school_shootings%3A_Preventing_another_Sandy_Hook/23220/0/38/38/Y/M.html, “There have been 31 school shootings since Columbine, in which Eric Harris, age 17 and Dylan Klebold, age 18, killed 12 students and one teacher, and wounded 23 others. (An assault weapon ban (1994-2004) was in effect at the time – lot of good *that* did). Harris was known to be taking Zoloft, then Luvox. Klebold’s medical records have never been made available to the public.

A website called [SSRI Stories](http://www.ssristories.com/index.html) (<http://www.ssristories.com/index.html>)has compiled a sortable database that lists over 4800 incidents of suicide, violent crimes and other incidents between 1988 and 2011, including school shootings that involve people that were prescribed SSRI medications. Here is one more short list of a few more [school shootings](http://www.ssristories.com/index.php?sort=date&p=school) (see <http://www.ssristories.com/index.php?sort=date&p=school> for more details) that involved SSRIs:

- Steve Kazmierczak, age 27, inexplicably went on a shooting rampage on Feb. 15, 2008 in a Northern Illinois University Lecture Hall before taking his own life. He had been on Prozac, Xanax and Ambien, but had stopped taking Prozac a few weeks before the shootings. Toxicology reports showed traces of Xanax in his system. Five dead, 20 wounded.

- Jeff Weise, age 16, had been prescribed 60 mg/day of Prozac (three times the average starting dose for adults) when he shot his grandfather, his grandfather's girlfriend and many fellow students in Red Lake, Minnesota on March 24, 2005. He then shot himself. 10 dead, 12 wounded.
- Cho-Seung-Hui, age 23, [showed signs of anger](#) before he went on a shooting rampage on the Virginia Tech campus that ended only after a police officer shot him dead. Officials said prescription medications related to the treatment of psychological problems had been found among Mr. Cho's effects, but no details of his treatment or the medications have been released to the public. 33 dead, 17 wounded.
- Michael Carneal (Ritalin), age 14, opened fire on students at a high school prayer meeting in West Paducah, Kentucky on Dec, 1, 1997. Three teenagers were killed, five others were wounded.

Not mentioned in this article is Jared Loughner, whose aberrant psychological state has been amply chronicled, including one email by fellow student Lynda Sorensen, who emailed her friends "We have a mentally unstable person in the class that scares the living cr** out of me. He is one of those whose picture you see on the news, after he has come into class with an automatic weapon. Everyone interviewed would say, Yeah, he was in my math class and he was really weird." Loughner was just a "regular" drug user, of course.

Of course, violence involving SSRIs does not always involve firearms:

- Jeff Franklin (Prozac and Ritalin), Huntsville, AL, killed his parents as they came home from work using a sledge hammer, hatchet, butcher knife and mechanic's file, then attacked his younger brothers and sister.
- Jarred Viktor, age 15, (Paxil). After five days on Paxil he stabbed his grandmother 61 times.
- John Odgren, age 16, stabbed a 15-year-old student to death at Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School in MA on Jan. 19, 2007. Odgren was being treated for Asperger's syndrome, a form of autism, as well as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, depression and anxiety. The defense said changes in Odgren's clothing habits, as well as changes in his sleep and speech pattern, may have indicated a problem with his medication that could have lead to a manic, paranoid state.

The list of incidents like the above on SSRI stories is seemingly endless and all of the circumstances are different except for one – all of them involve a mentally ill patient on some sort of SSRI medication. Some have claimed that up to 90 percent of school shootings have involved a shooter on prescription medications (<http://www.wnd.com/2012/12/psych-meds-linked-to-90-of-school-shootings/>) While that is impossible to verify without the release of medical records in all cases, enough have been confirmed to establish a link between SSRIs and violence, especially when the black box warnings on the medications mention the potential."

Maybe we need to ban SSRI's to stop the slaughter? Martha Rosenberg at <http://www.theepochtimes.com/n2/health/prescription-drugs-are-often-behind-mass-shootings-327408.html> also cites a number of cases that would certainly support this, as does Jeanne Lenzer in the BMJ June 7, 2012 (BMJ 2012:344:e3989), which refers to a report by the Institute for Safe Medication Practices stating: "It calculated that in 2011 prescription drugs were associated with two to four million people in the US experiencing 'serious, disabling, or fatal



At least 14 school shooters were under the influence of psychiatric drugs documented to cause mania, psychosis, hostility, aggression and homicidal ideation.

injuries, including 128,000 deaths.” Have we *really* come full circle to the point where we now accept again Stalin’s dictum that “a single death is a tragedy, but a million is just a statistic?” That we are comparing the death of 20 innocents to 128,000 – many of whom are children –only makes Stalin’s statement *slightly* less apt.

An exceedingly important article by Lawrence Hunter in Forbes, entitled *Psychiatric Drugs, Not a Lack of Gun Control, Are the Common Denominator in Murderous Violence*, is found at <http://www.forbes.com/sites/lawrencehunter/2013/01/14/psychiatric-drugs-not-a-lack-of-gun-control-are-the-common-denominator-in-murderous-violence/> In this article, Lawrence discusses a large body of evidence from peer

reviewed publications, such *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *The Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, and *The Journal of Forensic Science*, discussing this very issue. Lawrence also cites the article *School Shooters Under the Influence of Psychiatric Drugs*, found at <http://www.cchrint.org/school-shooters>, , which found that between “2004 and 2011, there were 12,755 reports to the U.S. FDA’s MedWatch system of psychiatric drugs causing violent side effects including: 1,231 cases of homicidal ideation/homicide, 2,795 cases of mania and 7,250 cases of aggression. Since the FDA admits that only one to ten percent of all side effects are ever reported to it, the actual occurrence of violent side effects from psychiatric drugs is certainly nine or ten times higher than the official data suggest.”

An eight minute video on the subject is here for those who prefer a YouTube presentation on the topic http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=1XHNJyti1gE . As psychiatrist Peter Breggin observes in the video: “*One of the things in the past that we’ve known about depression is that it very, very rarely leads to violence. It’s only been since the advent of these new SSRI drugs that we’ve had murderers even mass murders taking these antidepressant drugs.*”

The question is this: Instead of Piers Morgan, Obama and Joe Biden taking the NRA to task, as Lawrence points out, why hasn’t the White House asked the heads of the pharmaceutical companies to the White House to discuss the issue? After all, *aren’t the kids worth it?*

Lawrence concludes by asking some very perspicacious questions:

Why aren’t there bills being introduced in Congress and state legislatures to tighten down on the indiscriminate, unmonitored use of these killer drugs?

Why is the government still suppressing information about the shooters’ psychiatric drug use at Sandy Hook and Virginia Tech?

Why is the government turning America into a police state in the name of protecting us against nonexistent “reefer madness” while it turns a blind eye to

the real, deadly med madness created by psychiatric drugs and the uncontrollable violent rages they produce in some people?

Could it be there is a quiet conspiracy afoot among pharmaceutical companies, the government and the gun grabbers to make Mr. and Mrs. Gun Owner of America the patsies for the violence and to blame lone-wolf violence on guns rather than psychiatric drugs?

Could it be that power-hungry politicians and gun snatchers are out to exploit rare tragedies such as Sandy Hook and use the blood of innocent children to scare America into giving up its constitutional rights to own and bear arms and use them as a deterrent against tyranny?

Could it be that big pharma is today's big tobacco?

Could it be there is an intentional effort underway in the centers of power in Washington, DC to hide the truth from the American people about the strong connection between psychiatric drugs and violence and to protect the pharmaceutical companies from civil and criminal charges for their responsibility in these heinous crimes?

Could that be the explanation for why there continue to be lawsuits against gun manufacturers — not for defects in their products but rather for the misuse of their products by drug-addled individuals — and why there are few lawsuits against pharmaceutical companies for the obvious flaws in their products, which are producing violence and mayhem?

Could it be the Gun Control movement is simply a blind; just an effort by the triple alliance of left-fascists, big-government politicians and big-pharma prescription-drug dealers to dose and oppress the American people in the name of public safety, "officer safety" and social order?

The fact is, the kinds of guns used by mass shooters are far less relevant than the kinds of drugs they were prescribed.

We also need to examine the issue of deinstitutionalization of the truly mentally ill. Perhaps the ACLU might be the real reason behind so many mass killings, given their hyper-aggressive legal acts they engage in in this area. James Simpson, cited elsewhere in this paper addresses this issue by noting "*In the Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry Law (2008), Jason C. Matejkowski and his co-authors reported that 16% of state prisoners who had perpetrated murders were mentally ill ... today, while government at most every level has bloated over the past half-century, mental-health treatment has been decimated. Moreover, a 2011 paper by Steven P. Segal at the University of California, Berkeley, ... found that a third of the state-to-state variation in homicide rates was attributable to the strength or weakness of involuntary civil-commitment laws*"(See <http://joemiller.us/2013/01/study-gun-ban-lobby-in-bed-with-mainstream-media-others/#ixzz2JQWH9Fhu>)

Another reason mass shootings are occurring more frequently is that the left has destroyed the last vestiges of personal responsibility honour and respect; while so-called "Hollywierd" pushes

filth, violence and the demeaning of fellow humans down the throats of the vulnerable young and the easily suggestible - as they, themselves, make millions on the Faustian bargain.

Here's one story illustrating this very issue, that came out one month after Sandy Hook: *Four Young Adults — One the Son of a Police Sergeant — Lured Two Friends to a House, Robbed and Strangled Them and then Played Video Games* (See <http://www.cryptogon.com/?p=33202> or <http://news.yahoo.com/illinois-double-slaying-called-brutal-heinous-223037767.html> for details on this horrific one). No shooting, no mass press coverage. Police Chief Mike Trafton said: "This is one of the most brutal, heinous and upsetting things I've ever seen in my 27 years of law enforcement." However, it is very indicative of what is happening to the culture, be it prescription drugs, the dissolution of the family, the reduction in religious faith, and more.

FOR SAFETY, BAN HANDS AND FEET

There is a place for psychiatric drugs. However, there is not a place for wholesale, mass drugging of our children. But, leaving this issue aside, if we are to ban guns instead of drugs, may I humbly suggest that we also ban hands and feet, as well as knives (and let's include butter knives – you can never be *too* careful... and besides, someone might sharpen one with a whetstone). Within a month of the Aurora, Colorado tragedy, *nine* people were killed and others wounded in a *knife* attack in China (see <http://news.yahoo.com/chinese-teen-kills-eight-knife-attack-reports-102629246.html> - this is a *different* Chinese knife attack from the one that occurred the same week as the Connecticut shooting, where around two dozen were stabbed). There are a multiplicity of fatal knife attacks I could choose from in the US, but to choose a recent one at random, there was one in Flint, Michigan, where five were killed and eight injured by a knife wielding assailant. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/07/us/07brfs-SERIALKILLER_BRF.html?_r=0. Thankfully, race-baiter Al Sharpton has already indicated knives are a possible target for the U.S. – hear him say so himself at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nssQETWpf10&feature=player_embedded. Of course, once we are done banning knives, perhaps we can ban vehicles, too. In case you don't remember, there have been mass killings with cars where people drove into crowds in both NYC and Chapel Hill, NC., just to name a couple. The fact of the matter is, that, per the FBI, the number one weapon used in homicides is a baseball bat: in 2005, there were 445 murders with rifles, but 605 with hammers and clubs; the next year the figures were 438 and 618 respectively, and this trend continued through 2011 with 323 murders committed with a rifle, and 496 with hammers and clubs (and I am omitting the other years for brevity's sake, not to play the usual leftist game of leaving out inconvenient facts, such as what Al Gore does with his faux global warming charade). Breitbart.com correctly concludes from this that "if more people had a gun, less people would be inclined to try to hit them in the head with a hammer."

And one more point: a handful of men with no guns, only boxcutters, murdered over 3,000 people over a decade ago, and Timothy McVeigh before that murdered hundreds with no guns in Oklahoma City. Maybe we should be banning other farm implements and warehouse tools!

Personal Liberty.com, at <http://personalliberty.com/2012/08/01/time-to-ban-hands-feet-and-the-fda/?eiid=> cites similar figures with non-firearm murders. In 2010 alone, 742 people were killed by hands or feet, with 540 people killed by blunt objects. (and let's not forget the 82,724 people who died last year as a result of FDA approved drugs). There were similar statistics exonerating rifles for 2011 from the FBI: Out of approximately 8,500 gun related homicides, only 3% used rifles of *any* kind. Meanwhile, knives killed 1,694, blunt objects a few under 500, and hands and feet 728. In 2010, only 0.1% of all gun homicides involved five or more victims. Even the Brady

Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence admits that, since 2010 up to the time of the Connecticut shooting, a grand total of 35 people had been killed in 9 separate incidents in which an assault weapon was involved (even if the gun was not the murder weapon). There is very little evidence the assault gun laws will actually do anything, as prior to the federal assault weapon ban, the type of firearms banned were used in a mere 2% of gun crimes (and these were mostly pistols), per a National Institute of Justice study found at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/204431.pdf>. Regarding the assault gun ban, University of Pennsylvania criminologist Christopher Koper and his co-authors concluded, "*Should it be renewed, the ban's effects on gun violence are likely to be small at best and perhaps too small for reliable measurement.*" Too small for "reliable measurement!?"

Here are the 2011 statistics from the FBI page itself:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE • FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION • CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION



CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES 2011

Criminal Justice Information Services Division

Feedback | Contact Us | Data Quality Guidelines | UCR Home

[CIUS Home](#) | [Offenses Known to Law Enforcement](#) | [Violent Crime](#) | [Property Crime](#) | [Clearances](#) | [Persons Arrested](#) | [Police Employee Data](#) | [About CIUS](#)

Expanded Homicide Data Table 8

Murder Victims
by Weapon, 2007–2011

[Download Excel](#)

Weapons	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total	14,916	14,224	13,752	13,164	12,664
Total firearms:	10,129	9,528	9,199	8,874	8,583
Handguns	7,398	6,800	6,501	6,115	6,220
Rifles	453	380	351	367	323
Shotguns	457	442	423	366	358
Other guns	116	81	96	93	97
Firearms, type not stated	1,705	1,825	1,828	1,933	1,587
Knives or cutting instruments	1,817	1,888	1,836	1,732	1,694
Blunt objects (clubs, hammers, etc.)	647	603	623	549	496
Personal weapons (hands, fists, feet, etc.) ¹	869	875	817	769	728
Poison	10	9	7	11	5
Explosives	1	11	2	4	12
Fire	131	85	98	78	75
Narcotics	52	34	52	45	29
Drowning	12	16	8	10	15
Strangulation	134	89	122	122	85
Asphyxiation	109	87	84	98	89
Other weapons or weapons not stated	1,005	999	904	872	853

And regarding automatic weapons, as Natural News points out they “... are highly regulated, extremely expensive (\$15,000+) and VERY difficult to acquire. They're also extremely rare and have NEVER been used in any school shooting in America. Just to acquire an "automatic weapon," you must go through extensive background checks and fingerprinting. You must apply to the federal government (ATF) for permission, then wait six months or longer to be "approved" by the ATF.”

www.naturalnews.com/038443_gun_myths_assault_weapons_background_checks.html#ixzz2G7kpy5w1. Per this article, a true “assault rifle” must have a selector switch between single, three round burst, and full auto fire. Importantly, not a single one of the civilian AR-15s actually have these features, and thus there are virtually no “military” assault rifles on the street today. Besides, the military seldom uses automatic fire themselves, as it is generally is not of value by virtue of being inaccurate. If you would like a factual description of what an assault rifle is, see the article by former peace officer Earl Griffin at <http://www.infowars.com/regarding-gun-control->

[what-is-an-assault-rifle/](#) Meanwhile, the whole ban on high capacity magazine to prevent mass killings is a logical non-sequitur. Why? Because the average reload time on an AR-15, or similar, is *two seconds*. Most mass murders take *minutes*, or more. In the case of Sandy Hook – if in fact the gunman really did use the assault rifle as claimed and fired 150 rounds – he obviously changed his 30 round magazine at least four times, and only stopped when armed police closed in on him. Worse, if a criminal shooter is carrying multiple guns, they simply swap guns and reload when possible. In other words, the Feinstein law banning high capacity magazines will do zilch. Except take away on one more liberty. If you wish to verify how quickly it takes to reload, see the videos of people doing so at

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yHYARkMZiig&feature=player_embedded#t=23s

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EjHjur-dho&feature=player_embedded#t=39s or

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IVeFmHNzVk&feature=player_embedded#t=59s

But, the simple proof is in the pudding. The deadliest mass murder in US history was at Virginia Tech in 2007, with 32 people killed. Was a machine gun used? A vilified AR-25?

Nope.

The shooter simply used two vanilla handguns, supplied with a backpack full of Feinstein-approved 10 round magazines. Similarly, at Columbine, one of the two boys simply carried 13 ten round magazines with him. The math is not hard to do. Unless you have a leftist agenda, and are willing to sacrifice lives for that agenda – as the left has always been wont to do.

A letter signed by 1,100 Green Berets and Special Forces veterans also spelled out the difference between an automatic (in this case a M4A1) and semi-automatic AR-15, in a letter to Washington, DC found at <http://www.professionalsoldiers.com/forums/showthread.php?t=40772> they note the AR-15 is a *rifle that “cosmetically looks like the M4A1 carbine assault rifle, but it is impossible to configure the AR-15 to be a fully automatic assault rifle. It is a single shot semi-automatic rifle that can fire between 45 and 60 rounds per minute depending on the skill of the operator. The M4A1 can fire up to 950 rounds per minute.”* And regarding high capacity magazines, they decry the gun grabbers uninformed comment that “just a few seconds of changing magazines could have saved the lives of people. Rather, the letter notes “*As experts in military weapons of all types, it is our considered opinion that reducing magazine capacity from 30 rounds to 10 rounds will only require an additional 6 -8 seconds to change two empty 10 round magazines with full magazines. Would an increase of 6 –8 seconds make any real difference to the outcome in a mass shooting incident? In our opinion it would not.”* As Exhibit A of this fact, the letter cites the Columbine massacre, noting “*When the Federal Assault Weapons Ban became law in 1994, manufacturers began retooling to produce firearms and magazines that were compliant. One of those ban-compliant firearms was the Hi-Point 995, which was sold with ten-round magazines. In 1999, five years into the Federal Assault Weapons Ban, the Columbine High School massacre occurred. One of the perpetrators, Eric Harris, was armed with a Hi-Point 995. Undeterred by the ten-round capacity of his magazines, Harris simply brought more of them: thirteen magazines would be found in the massacre’s aftermath. Harris fired 96 rounds before killing himself.*”

A summary of this Green Beret article is found at <http://freedomoutpost.com/2013/01/special-forces-take-on-domestic-enemies-of-gun-control-in-letter/#ixzz2JbyJBsoD>

In any event, fully automatic weapons have been banned since the 1934 National Firearms Act (before which even children could order guns through the mail, with parental permission) – though of course media either doesn’t know this, or doesn’t know the difference between an automatic and semi-automatic, or for the few that do have a modicum of knowledge, think it is

ok for the police to have them – witness the Salt Lake City Tribune, which published an editorial stating *“Assault weapons that can fire numerous times in seconds are designed for only one thing: killing large numbers of people. The military and law enforcement officers need that ability; ordinary law-abiding citizens do not,”* (<http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/opinion/55677972-82/law-constitution-federal-gun.html.csp>). Yes, you read that correctly - apparently the police need to be able to kill “large numbers of people” in their routine of daily law enforcement in Obama’s America. What? To polish off Joe Businessman who was doing 10 miles over the speed limit as he was late to Johnny’s basketball game? Maybe take out a few 10 year olds skateboarding where they shouldn’t be? Did anyone at the newspaper even *read* what this persone wrote? As the Examiner concludes about this inimitable piece of ignorance, *“If there is any conceivable scenario in which law enforcement officers need to kill “large numbers of people,” then “large numbers of [we the] people” need as much firepower as we can possibly acquire.”* <http://www.examiner.com/article/government-prepares-for-war-with-the-people-and-mass-media-approves>

But here is a question for you: As columnist Jacob Sullum writes, if large capacity magazines are *not* useful for self-defense or defense of others, *why not impose the same limit on police and bodyguards?* And if the capacity for additional rounds do provide more protection, why should law-abiding citizens be denied that protection? The reality is that a larger magazine allows a defender to engage multiple assailants – not uncommon in today’s gang filled world – in a situation where there often can be “the fog of war.” In any event, the assault rifles the left wines about – which only fire one bullet per pull - means they are no more automatic their a “standard” pistol which does the same thing. Of course, the Feinstein amendment rushed to ban cosmetics like pistol grips, which Ben Crystal points out are about the same thing as banning car spoilers to stop car accidents. And, oh yes – the car accident total, as of 2009, saw an average of four children under age 14 killed *every day*, with 500 injured. A total of 31,000 people in total were killed. No frantic outcry from the media there.

One more details needs to be said re. assault rifles. To get more exact about the figures cited above relative to rifles and crime, according to the FBI’s CIUS report on Murder Victims by Weapon, the grand total of firearms used in 2011 to commit murder was 8,583 (see <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010/tables/10shrtbl08.xls>). Of the 8,583 murders, only 323 rifles were used, or exactly 3.76% of the total, of which only a smaller portion of that 3.76% were “assault rifles.” Too small for reliable measurement indeed. Perhaps, if the gun grabbers really want to keep us safe, they could ban the FDA with the tens of thousands who have died from their sanctioned drugs. (Now you know why Dr. Marcia Angell, MD., former editor of the New England Journal of Medicine, stated – regarding the FDA and the like - in the New York Review of Books, January 15, 2009: *“It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as an editor of The New England Journal of Medicine.”*). And I am not alone. Dr. Barbara Starfield of the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health a dozen years ago published *Doctors Are The Third Leading Cause of Death in the U.S.*, in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA). Starfield’s documented how 225,000 Americans die from iatrogenic causes – including 12,000 deaths per year due to unnecessary surgery, 7,000 per year due to medication errors in hospitals, 20,000 due other hospital errors, 80,000 due to hospital infections, and 106,000 due to negative drug effects. <http://www.health-care-reform.net/causedeath.htm> . Should we count the dead in Aurora and Sandy Hook among those deaths? Other doctors *may* concur, such as Dr. Joseph Mercola who cites a study by Dr. Bruce Pomerance of the University of Toronto who concluded that *properly prescribed and correctly taken* pharmaceutical drugs were the fourth leading cause of death in the U.S. Mercola also cites an article authored in two parts by Gary

Null, PhD, Carolyn Dean, MD, ND, Martin Feldman, MD, Debora Rasio, MD, and Dorothy Smith, PhD, that come to similar conclusions. However, it is not the point of this article to take issue with the FDA, other than to question the association between massacres not with guns, but rather due to psychotropic drugs.

The upshot of all this? Intellectual honesty, as well as respect for the dead, *demands* that we examine *all* possible causes of these massacres. But, of course, that would not match with the agenda of the left and the gun grabbers.

But lets leave the drug angle behind. There are other bad reasons behind the gun controllers. Another reason to support the availability of guns is that – contrary to the leftists' fondest wishes, mankind is fallen. As Jeff Jacoby has *noted* "*[Wars are not] caused by nuclear missiles, or al-Qaeda terrorism by box cutters. We fool ourselves if we imagine that by fixating on missiles and box cutters we can avoid reckoning with the cruel side of human nature. ... The desire to believe ... that 'people are truly good at heart' is powerful. Sadly, history refutes the idea that human nature alone will make a good world. Controlling bad things may sometimes be prudent. But it is above all by controlling ourselves -- by fortifying the better angels of our nature -- that the struggle against evil progresses.*"


LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Then, there is the legal side of the equation. Columnist Harry Binswanger lays bare the intellectual and legal fraud behind the gun grabbers by noting: "*[T]he government may not descend to the evil of preventive law. The government cannot treat men as guilty until they have proven themselves to be, for the moment, innocent. No law can require the individual to prove that he won't violate another's rights, in the absence of evidence that he is going to. But this is precisely what gun control laws do. Gun control laws use force against the individual in the absence of any specific evidence that he is about to commit a crime. They say to the rational, responsible gun owner: you may not have or carry a gun because others have used them irrationally or irresponsibly. Thus, preventive law sacrifices the rational and responsible to the irrational and irresponsible. This is unjust and intolerable. The government may coercively intervene only when there is an objective threat that someone is going to use force. ... Statistics about how often gun-related crimes occur in the population is no evidence against you. That's collectivist thinking. The choices made by others are irrelevant to the choices that you will make. ... The government may respond only to specific threats, objectively evident. It has no right to initiate force against the innocent. And a gun owner is innocent until specific evidence arises that he is threatening to initiate force.*" And in any event, guns are already one of the most heavily regulated products in America. As if that has done a lot of good!

But, what do the "professionals" say about strong gun laws and the reduction of firearm homicides? Attorney Marc. J. Victor summarizes it succinctly at <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig3/victor7.1.1.html> , noting "*In 2004, the National Academy of Sciences reviewed 253 journal articles, 99 books and 43 government publications evaluating 80 gun-control measures. Researchers could not identify a single regulation that reduced violent crime, suicide or accidents. In 2003, the Centers for Disease Control analyzed ammunition bans, restrictions on acquisition of firearms, waiting periods, registration, licensing, child access prevention and zero tolerance laws. After their analysis, the Centers for Disease Control concluded there was no conclusive evidence that any gun control laws reduced gun violence. Foreign researchers have also come to the same conclusion. In Australia in 2008, a peer reviewed study at the University of Sydney reached virtually the same conclusions as both the National Academy of Sciences and the Centers for Disease Control. Gun control measures simply do not reduce gun violence.*"

And as we discuss “professionals,” what does the FBI say? In their “Uniform Crime Reports, found at <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s>, in 1992 the US had a violent crime rate of 757.7 per 100,000, with a murder and non-negligent manslaughter rate of 9.3 per 100,000. When you consider the numbers, we are talking an extremely small percentage. 20 years later – and with the large increase in the number of guns – what was the same rate at the end of 2011? Well, if you listen to the leftist media, your answer will be wrong. *According to the FBI site above, the violent crime rate dropped to half of what it was in 1992, or 386.3 per 100,000 in population (vs. the 2.034 in gun control nirvana England). Similarly, murder dropped almost 50% to 4.7 per 100,000.* Ever hear anyone at a news outlet broadcast that after a shooting spree? Of course, this same report illustrates it is certain urban areas – in most cases the cities having the stricter gun control laws such as Chicago – that have the higher murder rates.


One twist to the gun control cities needs to be noted, however. Washington DC instituted strict gun control several decades ago. Here is how that played out:



Compare the chart above to the National Inst. of Justice chart below, which graphs the whole of the United States. :

Homicide by weapon type, 1976-2005

Number of victims



Did the handgun ban in D.C have any significant effect, compared to other states that did not? Look at the two blips in the graphs, and draw your own conclusion. But if you need help. Jeffrey Shapiro at [economicpolicyjournal.com](http://www.economicpolicyjournal.com), in his article "*What I Saw as a Prosecutor in Washington, D.C., Makes Me Wary of Strict Firearms Laws*," at <http://www.economicpolicyjournal.com/2013/01/what-i-saw-as-prosecutor-in-washington.html>, noted that the DC ban on firearms in 1976, which even prohibited people from keeping guns in their homes for self-defense, had – surprise, surprise – unintended effects. Violent crime *increased* after the ban was enacted, with homicides going from 188 in 1976, to 369 in 1988, to 454 by 1993. Correlation is not causation, it is true. But if you wish to take the risk, good luck to you. Even worse, the D.C police department was mandated to create a special "Gun Recovery Unit," which meant the police were forced to spend resources checking otherwise law abiding citizens with meager returns for the investment. In 1997 Police Chief Charles Ramsey disbanded the unit and re-assigned them to patrol duties.

AMERICAN HISTORY AND FIREARMS

On a broader level, as noted above, of course guns also have historically ensured American freedom, both from internal tyranny as well as external invasion. Bill Bonner wrote "*When King George sent troops to put down the revolution a letter appeared in the London paper. It came from a man who had lived in the colonies. He told his countrymen that if they were shipping out to fight the Americans they should be sure to write their Last Wills and Testaments before they left. Because the Americans all had guns and knew how to use them.*"

And King George wasn't alone: Isoroku Yamamoto, Commander-in-Chief, Imperial Japanese Navy, killed in action, April 1943, reportedly said "*You cannot invade the mainland United States. There would be a rifle behind every blade of grass.*" And now you know why, perhaps, after the Sandy Hook shooting, China called for the American population to be disarmed, just like the Chinese population is, in a Xinhua article entitled *Innocent Blood Demands No Delay for U.S. Gun Control* (really, China? Tell us more, then, about your enforced abortion policy against

women who do not want it after they have had a single child). This is the same China where the founder of the current government, Mao Zedong, stated “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.” (Full quote is *All political power comes from the barrel of a gun. The communist party must command all the guns, that way, no guns can ever be used to command the party.*) The Chinese fellow below was lucky. Estimates of the death toll at Tienanmen Square in 1989 of people who *weren't* so lucky range from several hundred to several thousand. No one really knows, as the socialists running the government wouldn't release the figures.

But, assuming guns, themselves, are the problem, let's look at the government, and all the *assault weapons and ammunition* it has assemble just in the past year: In April 2012, the DHS purchased 450 *million* rounds of hollow point bullets, which Natural News says is enough to wage a seven year war with the American people. The purchase order is here, for your own examination http://www.naturalnews.com/files/DHS_ammunition_buy.pdf . DHS then went on to purchase another 750 million more rounds of ammunition as well, in addition to the following “goodies”: Over 1 million rounds of hollow-point .223 rifle ammo (you know... the Adam Lanza Connecticut shooting rounds); over half a million rounds of non-hollow-point .223 rifle ammo; 220,000 rounds of 12 gauge shotgun #7 ammo (target ammo); over 200,000 rounds of 12 gauge shotgun #00 buckshot ammo (tactical anti-personnel ammo); 66,000 rounds of 12 gauge shotgun slugs (tactical anti-personnel, anti-vehicle rounds); over 2 million rounds of hollow-point



.357 Sig JPH (hollow-point) pistol ammo (anti-personnel); Over 4 million rounds of .40 S&W JPH (hollow-point) pistol ammo (anti-personnel); over 60,000 rounds of .308 match grade anti-personnel sniper rounds (BTHP); Plus, hundreds of thousands of additional rounds of .38 special, .45 auto, 9mm, 7.62x39 (AK rifle) ammo, and others. And then in January, the hypocrites at the DHS had the temerity to announce they were buying 7,000 assault rifles – with the

“clever” (for a bureaucrat!) idea that they would call them “personal defense weapons” and fool the public. See the actual request by the General Service Administration (GSA) [request for proposal](#) (RFP) by the Department of Homeland Security on the [Federal Business Opportunities website](#) at

<https://www.fbo.gov/?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=d791b6aa0fd9d3d8833b2efa08300033&tab=core&cvview=0>

And one more question posed at Natural News,

http://www.naturalnews.com/035607_government_checkpoints_Martial_Law.html and

<http://lewrockwell.com/adams-m/adams-m27.1.html> : What is behind this? The DHS does not fight foreign wars – it only operates in the U.S. Worse, *hollow point ammunition is banned by the Geneva convention, and not used by the U.S. military, per* <http://lewrockwell.com/adams-m/adams-m27.1.html> . In total, 1.6 billion rounds were purchased in just 2012 alone, meaning every single man, woman and child has *five* bullets with their name on it. So, if guns are the cause of crime, well, I'll let you draw your own conclusions. Of course, the leftist media has said little to *zilch* about all of this either. (And yes, I realize we are talking government here, so many of the shooters may well be horribly inept –but still... 1.6 *billion* bullets?!)

Ah, but you say... “this is the *government* with the guns, so it is OK.” The reality is that those who maintain this have neither listened to the Founding Fathers’ statements noted above, nor have they still, after 2,000 years, answered the question the Roman satirist Juvenal posed: *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* (Who will watch the guards, or more colloquially, who controls the controllers)? Perhaps some of the 500 TSA (as of 2011) agents who have been arrested for stealing passenger goods could answer that question? And this number is probably just the tip of the iceberg, as, for example, a 2008 investigative report conducted by Pittsburg’s [WTAE](#) station found that despite over 400 reports of baggage theft, about half of which the TSA reimbursed passengers for, not a single arrest had been made. Of course, the TSA does not, as a matter of policy, share baggage theft reports with local police departments, so it could be much worse.

OK, you say... “but gun control - it’s *for the children*.” To which I only ask, *which* children? The 60 children who were murdered in gun-free Chicago in 2012, as noted above? The ones the left has zero compunction about leaving trillions and trillions of dollars of debt to pay off? The ones that escaped partial birth abortion? The kids that currently have one *trillion* dollars in student debt, all so the their Marxist professors can retire at age 52, after having every summer off and only twenty hours of contact time, or less, with the students each week?

OTHER COUNTRIES

But what about other countries? I’m glad you asked!

For England, as the article *Barbarians Within the Gates*, Part III, Schwarz Report, Oct. 2011, p. 5 noted, “*The UK’s ban on handguns in 1997 “...did not stop actual crimes committed with handguns. Those crimes rose nearly 40% according to a 2001 study by King’s College London’s Centre for Defense Studies, and doubled by a decade later, according to government statistics reported in the London Telegraph in October 2009.*” Joyce Lee Malcolm corroborates this information a Dec. 26, 2012 article at http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323777204578195470446855466.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop, nothing that “Within a decade of the handgun ban and the confiscation of handguns from registered owners, crime with handguns had doubled according to British government crime reports. Gun crime, not a serious problem in the past, now is. Armed street gangs have some British police carrying guns for the first time. Moreover, another massacre occurred in June 2010. Derrick Bird, a taxi driver in Cumbria, shot his brother and a colleague then drove off through rural villages killing 12 people. In fact, James Simpson, in his must-read article found at <http://joemiller.us/2013/01/study-gun-ban-lobby-in-bed-with-mainstream-media-others/#ixzz2JQWH9Fhu>, notes that “*After the handgun ban, gun crime, including handgun crime, skyrocketed. In 1997/98, there were 2,636 crimes committed with handguns in England and Wales. By 2001/02, handgun crimes had increased to 5,871. Overall, firearms were used in 9,974 crimes. (“Gun crime soars by 35%,” Daily Mail, Jan. 9, 2003).* *Firearms crime in the U.K. peaked in 2005/06 and has declined since. In 2010/11, firearms were used in 7,024 crimes, and 3,105 of these were handgun crimes, down from the earlier peak, but still well above its 1997/98 level. In 2010/11, 9.3 percent of all homicides were committed with a firearm. U.K. firearms crime and violent crime in general remain well below U.S. levels, but both have increased dramatically despite a century of gun control. (Press release, Home Office, Jan. 19, 2012).*”

But, as they say in the old Ronco commercials – Wait! There’s more! Summarizing from <http://freedomoutpost.com/2013/01/pulling-back-the-lefts-demonizing-of-the-modern-musket-real-numbers-of-violent-crime-in-the-us/#ixzz2GshnLp3F>, the UK’s Home Office Statistical Bulletin, which provides crime figures for England and Wales, ex Scotland and Northern Ireland

(which thus skews the numbers slightly down) show that in 2011, there were 762,515 violent crimes in a population of 56 million, including approximately 125% more rape victims per 100,000 people each year than the United States does (<http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/crime/crime-rape-victims>) and 133% more assault victims per 100,000 people each year than the United States does (<http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/crime/crime-assault-victims>). In sum, there were 1,361 violent crimes per 100,000 population in the UK – or 3.5 times the rate of the U.S. The UK murder rate is lower, at 1.3 per 100,000 population. However, it is not noted what weapons are used to commit murders or violent crimes in the UK. The net of this is that the UK has a higher rate of violent crime than armed Americans, and that more guns do not mean more violent crime.

As evidence of the above, two charts on rape and assault victims in Piers Morgan's safe, merry olde England, cited from <http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/crime/crime-rape-victims> and <http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/crime/crime-assault-victims> are shown below:

Crime Statistics > Rape victims (most recent) by country



Crime Statistics > Assault victims (most recent) by country

Like 5

VIEW DATA: Totals

Definition

Source


Printable version

Bar Graph

Map

Correlations

Showing latest available data.



Ben Swann of Fox News also concentrated on this UK gun issue when he addressed the Piers Morgan/Alex Jones debate of early Jan., 2013. Morgan incorrectly cited 35 gun deaths in UK in 2011 vs. 11,000 in the US. Not true at all. FBI crime stats show there were 12,664 homicides in the US., with 8,583 were firearm related, not 11,000. Of those, 400 were listed as justifiable killings by law enforcement, 260 in the same category by private citizens. England does have a lower homicide rate, but with a population of 62 million, the UK actually had 59 homicides in 2011. Adjusted for population, that would equate to roughly 300 or so murders. But that's basic math, which you cannot expect the left to do. The reality is, that as Dr. John Lott has noted, *"the overall number of gun murders in Britain being low does not prove that the gun ban worked, considering that the figure was already comparably low BEFORE the ban as well, i.e., the ban did not cause a decrease in gun murders, even according to the official numbers."* In a nutshell, as theendrun.com notes, *"...gun murders in Britain being low does not prove that the gun ban worked, considering that the figure was already comparably low BEFORE the ban as well, i.e., the ban did not cause a decrease in gun murders, even according to the official numbers."* See <http://www.theendrun.com/larry-pratt-british-gun-crime-stats-a-sham>. Even more importantly, the anti-gunners in general have no clue that, as Lott states, *"...total homicides are the most important concern, rather than how a homicide was committed."*

Worse, the violent crime rates are most likely *under reported* (gotta them tourists pouring in, y'know!). The UK's Independent reported a few years ago that there may be up to 2 million violent crimes "missing" from the official data!

<http://web.archive.org/web/20080706191657/http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article2710596.ece> . See also the very enlightening article at <http://www.theendrun.com/larry-pratt-british-gun-crime-stats-a-sham> that has a very highly documented discussion on the massaged UK crime rate numbers. Even more disturbingly, in the most recent report I have, 2006, there was one knife crime committed for every 374 people in England, while in the US it was one gun crime for every 750 people the same year. As Bob Livingstone points out, "In other words, a person was twice as likely to be a victim of a knife crime in the U.K. as he was a gun crime in the United States." There...does *that* make you feel more safe?

One other point of interest about British gun laws need to be made: According to Fernando Aguirre, a resident of Northern Ireland (see his web site of <http://ferfal.blogspot.com/>), handguns in fact are allowed in one part of the UK, and allowed to be used in self-defense as well – *Northern Ireland*. And, of course, you know what is coming next, don't you? *The part of the UK that has the lowest firearm homicide is.... no, I won't make you guess... Northern Ireland.* According to UK government statistics, Northern Ireland has 20% fewer gun related murders per year than the rest of England, Scotland and Wales, in spite of obviously much higher gun ownership. Yes, there could be multiple explanations for this. But suffice to say, the simplistic, unscientific propaganda of the left about guns needs some serious examination. See the Ferfal blog for further documentation on this.

Still, what of the delta between the US and UK murder numbers? Do fewer guns actually mean less crime? But you know the answer to this. The UK has the second highest overall crime rate, the fifth highest robbery rate, the fourth highest burglary rate, in the EU and – most importantly – *England has the highest violent crime rate in the EU, with 2,034 violent crimes per 100,000, far ahead of even South Africa at 1,609 per 100,000. The US has a rate of 466 violent crimes per 100,000 – not even in the top 10.* (See Telegraph article *The most violent country in Europe: Britain is also worse than South Africa and U.S* at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1196941/The-violent-country-Europe-Britain-worse-South-Africa-U-S.html#ixzz2HQDkC3re>) And Piers Morgan wants us to be more like the UK?

Following leftist "logic," the US has the world's highest gun ownership rates, so it should have the highest gun murder rates, correct? Actually, Honduras, Jamaica and El Salvador, along with 24 other countries. The US – with the highest gun ownership rate - is #28, with a rate of 2.97 per 100,000 population. The full story is at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tRJ0Is_W9XM&feature=player_embedded#t=72s which also references sources for this data at the Fox19 site. Of course, England has always had a much lower gun crime rate – even before the gun control implementation – which the gun grabbers never mention. Also not mentioned is the fact that gun crime has almost doubled in England since the gun ban went into effect.

But, when it comes to knives, just for good measure, England has proposed a 10 year sentence for possession of "any knife with a blade more than three inches long" (I literally have no idea if this includes butterknives!). When researchers from West Middlesex University Hospital found that kitchen knives were used in as many as half of all stabbings, the BBC reported on the move to ban kitchen knives, stating ""*The researchers said there was no reason for long pointed knives to be publicly available at all. They consulted 10 top chefs from around the UK, and found such knives have little practical value in the kitchen. None of the chefs felt such knives were essential, since the point of a short blade was just as useful when a sharp end was needed. The researchers said a short pointed knife may cause a substantial superficial wound if*

used in an assault – but is unlikely to penetrate to inner organs. In contrast, a pointed long blade pierces the body like ‘cutting into a ripe melon.’” <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/4581871.stm> . Another UK paper, the Inquisitor, justified the ban by invoking Middlesex again, stating *““A West Middlesex University Hospital group contends that violent crime is increasing in Great Britain and kitchen knives are used in approximately half of all stabbings. The team claims that many of the knife attacks are impulsive acts and that a kitchen knife is too convenient of a weapon.”* No word yet if England has banned running with scissors or people using pencils with sharp points. And it is singularly unfortunate that England did not think to ban knives like ones under the current ban one thousand years ago during the Viking invasions (“I’m sorry Mr. Svensson, but before you do any looting, raping or pillaging in England, you’ll have to check your blades in with the customs officials... Next in line!!)

Across the English Channel, Holland’s draconian gun laws certainly haven’t helped – witness the recent report at http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-202_162-20052416.html , entitled *7 Killed 15 Wounded in Dutch Mall*. And of course, across the border and going back a few decades to Germany, Nazi guns laws against Jewish firearm owners 60 years ago, as Stephen Halbrook has written, *“played a major role in laying the groundwork for the eradication of German Jewry in the Holocaust. Disarming political opponents was a categorical imperative of the Nazi regime”* (a full rendering of Nazi gun control laws, including ones against the Jews, is found at <http://constitutionalistnc.tripod.com/hitler-leftist/id14.html>). As if any further clarification were needed, Hitler himself reportedly stated in 1935 “For the first time a civilized nation has full gun registration. Our streets will be safer, our police more efficient. The world will follow our lead.” (Note: the authenticity of this quote is hotly debated, but even if apocryphal, it certainly captures Hitler’s political zeitgeist, as the Nazi gun control summary at http://www.conservapedia.com/Gun_Control_in_Nazi_Germany points out). And just for good measure, Hitler later added after his conquests “The most foolish mistake we could possibly make would be to allow the subjected people to carry arms; history shows that all conquerors who have allowed their subjected people to carry arms have prepared their own downfall.” The experience with Hitler outlined above was anticipated by the wisdom of the Second Amendment, which declares: “A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.” This right reflects a universal and historical power of the people in a republic to resist tyranny, which *was not recognized in the German Reich* – and led to a holocaust. One would do very well to google the Nazi Weapons Act of 1938 and compare to the United States Gun Control Act of 1968, as well as more recent laws. But I’ll leave that sobering research to you.

Perhaps one might also care to examine Russia, which also has relatively strict gun control laws, under their Federal Weapons Act of 1996 (see <http://www.gunlab.com.ru/excerpts.html>). Did their laws prevent the 2002 theatre siege by Chechen militants, which over one hundred killed? See <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/oct/28/chechnya.russia6> or YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pbvKhdVGOoo> if you need to refresh your memory of this atrocity. But Russians have already lived through what happens under a tyranny. This is why Pravda published an article by Stanislav Mishin in Dec., 2012, entitled “Americans, Never Give Up Your Guns.” See http://english.pravda.ru/opinion/columnists/28-12-2012/123335-americans_guns-0/ for the story, but here is the one critical takeaway quote from it: *“Moscow fell, for example, not from a lack of weapons to defend it, but from the lying guile of the Reds. Ten thousand Reds took Moscow and were opposed only by some few hundreds of officer cadets and their instructors. Even then the battle was fierce and losses high. However, in the city alone, at that time, lived over 30,000 military officers (both active and retired), all with their own issued weapons and ammunition, plus tens of thousands of other citizens who were armed. The Soviets promised to leave them all alone if they did not intervene. They did not and for that were*

asked afterwards to come register themselves and their weapons: where they were promptly shot.” Mishin concludes his article by noting the real agenda of the left, both in Russia and elsewhere: “Do not be fooled by a belief that progressives, leftists hate guns. Oh, no, they do not. What they hate is guns in the hands of those who are not marching in lock step of their ideology. They hate guns in the hands of those who think for themselves and do not obey without question. They hate guns in those whom they have slated for a barrel to the back of the ear.” In fact, this reflects precisely what Joseph Stalin said: “If the opposition disarms, well and good. If it refuses to disarm, we shall disarm it ourselves.” But let’s leave the 61,911,000 dead under Soviet tyranny and move on to other countries...

Moving to Mexico, per the UN, gun controlled Mexico (guns are technically legal, but are *extremely difficult to qualify for, as well as to find a gun shop*) has a homicide rate of 22.7 per 100,000, while the “gun happy” US rate is 4.8 – and significantly, the *global average is 7 homicides per 100,000.*

In Australia after they banned guns in 1997, by one report armed robberies went up 69%; assaults with guns up 28%, gun murders up 19% and home invasions up 21% (except the Australian government still refuses to define what a “home invasion” is (no word if they have defined what the meaning of “is” is, either). Full details at http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=p8RDWltHxRc or see article by attorney Marc J. Victor at <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig3/victor7.1.1.html> . In the Joyce Lee Malcolm WSJ article cited above, she also addresses the Aussie gun ban of 1997. The result of it? According to Malcolm, “... *the impact of the National Firearms Agreement was “relatively small,” with the daily rate of firearms homicides declining 3.2%. According to their study, the use of handguns rather than long guns (rifles and shotguns) went up sharply, but only one out of 117 gun homicides in the two years following the 1996 National Firearms Agreement used a registered gun. Suicides with firearms went down but suicides by other means went up. They reported “a modest reduction in the severity” of massacres (four or more indiscriminate homicides) in the five years since the government weapons buyback. These involved knives, gas and arson rather than firearms. In 2008, the Australian Institute of Criminology reported a decrease of 9% in homicides and a one-third decrease in armed robbery since the 1990s, but an increase of over 40% in assaults and 20% in sexual assaults.*” Malcolm concludes that the gun laws of England and Australia have *not* made the population any noticeably safer nor prevented massacres. A revealing six minute video of this imbroglio can be found here <http://www.brasschecktv.com/videos/government-corruption-1/what-happens-after-gun-bans.html> Of course, the Aussie laws *did* chew up a cool half billion dollars in taxpayers’ money – exactly similar to the Canadian experience noted a few paragraphs below. But not to disparage the Aussies completely - Peter Reuter and Jenny Mouzos from leftist Brookings Inst.published a 2003 study which found homicides “continued a modest decline” after the gun ban, concluding the effect of the National Firearms Agreement was “relatively small,” with the firearm homicide rate declining 3.2%. Of course, this decline was already in progress *before* the ban.

Ann Coulter – working off yet another inane NY Times article entitled “More Guns = More Killing,” particularly has fun with the goofy leftist commentary on gun control in Australia by noting that “*according to the Australian Institute of Criminology, the homicide rate has been in steady decline from 1969 to the present, with only one marked uptick in 1998-99 — right after the gun ban was enacted.*” Meanwhile, Coulter notes while suicides by firearms dropped after the ban, *so did suicides by all other means.* (And you are correct, no one on the left appears to have done the math on that one, either. Apparently banning guns stopped people from doing a

Marilyn Monroe or jumping off the local bridge.) But... as you might expect with the left, it gets worse, and Coulter nails it: After the ban on guns in the Oz, “accidental deaths” by firearms skyrocketed, despite mandatory gun training requirements for those few remaining souls who owned guns. As always, the legerdemain of the left factors in again, as until a coroner certifies a death as suicide, it’s categorized as “unintentional.” So, Coulter summarizes, either mandatory gun training led to more gun accidents – an abject failure of big government – or suicides are being counted as “accident.” As Al Gore might say, how convenient. Coulter article is found at <http://www.humanevents.com/2013/01/09/coulter-doing-the-research-the-new-york-times-wont-do/>

Could the Australia legerdemain get any worse? Mais oui! Unknown to the left, there are things called “control groups.” Coulter’s article simply went and found a country unknown to liberals... New Zealand. Similar demographics, similar history, similar socio-economics (and after sharing a house while doing graduate work with a massive cadre of both Kiwis and Aussies, no, I am not dumb enough to confuse the two). Here’s the basic math that even a junior researcher should have found: Mass murder in Australia, from 1980 up to 1996 was 0.0042 incidents per 100,000; the Kiwi rate was 0.0050 per 100,000. Australia, as noted, banned arms in 1997, and – viola! There were no more mass shootings subsequent to that! Not mentioned, of course, was that fully armed New Zealand *has also has not a single mass murder either since 1997*. So much for research integrity from the Gray Lady of New York – with apologies to Walter Duranty... or not.

Indeed, it is true, as one internet wag put it:
Government regulating housing = people ended up losing their houses.
Government regulating commerce = people ended up losing their jobs.
Government regulating firearms = ?
Do the math yourself.....

Moving to Jamaica, which instituted total gun control in the 1970s, this country has had one of the highest murder rates in the world for many years, according to the U.N. – approximately 60 per 100,000 population. Only El Salvador and Honduras, as noted above, have higher murder rates in the world. <http://www.caribjournal.com/2012/02/08/jamaicas-murder-rate-falls-to-seven-year-low-but-still-caribbeans-highest/>.

But it gets even more embarrassing. Fareed Zakaria – he of plagiarism fame – pulls off a Piers Morgan disinformation gambit in his Aug. 2012 Time Magazine article, where he claims the gun homicide rate in the U.S. is 30 times that of England or Australia. Summarizing from Henry Percy’s “Gun Violence in America is Off the Chart” article in American Thinker, here are several issues: Why does Zakaria cite gun murders instead of total homicides? Does it really make that much of a difference, Percy asks, is someone is killed with a gun or a blunt instrument? (“Well, on the plus side, at least Tom was only murdered with a blunt instrument rather than a gun...”)
Actually, quoting from the 2011 Global Study on Homicide, conducted by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the *total* homicide rate for the US was 4.1 times that of the UK, and 4.5 times that of Australia. Not “30 times.” But close enough, I guess, for the leftist media. Of course, as mentioned elsewhere in this paper, *gun crime was higher in the US even when England had almost identical gun laws*. That is, gun laws haven’t changed anything. Overall, the U.S comes in a paltry #99 worldwide – 5.4 homicides per 100,000 - with over half the countries of the world having a higher homicide rate – even though the US has the most guns per person in the world. Mexico has a rate 2.4 times greater than the US, and Brazil, which requires extensive background checks and strict registration that even a Massachusetts liberal would love, 4.2 to 5 times greater. Socialist Venezuela, which bans all semi-automatic rifles, pistols and shotguns,

has a rate 11 times that of the US. Significantly, Chile has laws similar to the US, including open carry, yet has a gun homicide rate *lower* than the US (examining these statistics, one could be forgiven for surmising it perhaps is *socialism* that is the central principle behind gun crime!) And most likely, the numbers around the world are under-reported, as there are not centralized databases, people may not report murders to corrupt police, or countries may not want to scare away tourists. Another question Percy raises: Mr. Zakaria found a “blindingly obvious causal connection” between easier access to guns and homicides. Perhaps so – if you are part of the leftist media that cannot do statistical analysis. In 2009, Washington DC – which has stricter gun laws – had a murder rate of 24.2/100,000, while “Live Free or Die,” open carry without license/concealed carry license for \$10 New Hampshire’s rate was 0.9. Gun loving states like Idaho and Utah have rates not much higher, while socialist, gun control-freak Rahm Emmanuel-infested Illinois has a rate 9 times that of New Hampshire. .

But let’s look at another socialist “country” – the blue states in the U.S. As the Canadian site The Poog notes at <http://thepoog.com/?p=4435>, in an interactive chart titled [Crime vs Gun Ownership](#), produced from a site called [Data Masher](#), Poog lists the top 15 rankings states and notes that they are all - based on the last 4 elections – states that are blue (4/4), light blue (3/4) and purple (2/4) - i.e., Democratic states. In the table below, Poog then adds in parentheses, the state rankings in terms of number of guns purchased based on background checks by the FBI as presented by the [Daily Beast](#).” (There is no data available for Illinois or California so gun stats for Chicago and Los Angeles are not captured.)

1. Massachusetts (blue) (46)
2. New Jersey (blue) (50)
3. New York (blue) (48)
4. Hawaii (blue) (49)
5. Maryland (blue) (45)
6. Delaware (blue) (43)
7. Connecticut (blue) (19)
8. Iowa (light blue) (31)
9. Michigan (blue) (37)
10. Nevada (purple) (32)
11. Rhode Island (blue) (47)
12. Ohio (purple) (39)
13. Florida (purple) (42)
14. Minnesota (blue) (22)
15. Pennsylvania (blue) (25)

Poog concludes that “11 of the 15 are solidly Democratic based on the last four elections, three are 50/50 and one is mostly Democrat (3/4). The heavy concentration is in the Northeast When we look at the number of guns purchased by state there is a curious inverse relationship. *The top six ranked states in terms of gun crime were in the bottom eight ranked states in terms of number of guns purchased.*” So, it appears that Democrats less guns, but use them to commit more crimes!

Closer to home, as a dual US/Canadian citizen, who has spent half my life in both countries, Canada very strict gun control legislation. From having a very close friend having a neighbor murdered right outside her front door in a suburban area of Ottawa, to my brother in law telling me about a knife murder at a mall down the street, to the week we moved from Canada, when someone with an *illegal* gun committed murder on Elgin St. in Ottawa, the whole gun grabber thing is a disaster in Canada. The results of strict Canadian gun control laws?

On Jan. 13, 2011 the *Ottawa Citizen*, even acknowledged that Canadian gun legislation is an abject failure:

“As strict as Canadian gun laws appear, they do not prevent the movement of illegal firearms in or out of this country, nor their possession, and only cover those firearms that have been registered. Last year, Canadian police services reported some 8,000 victims of violent gun crime, ranging from assault to robbery and homicide — a rate of almost one person per hour victimized by violent gun crime. On average, more than 1,200 Canadians are killed and more than 1,000 injured with firearms each year.”

And if you thought the Representative Giffords shooting in Arizona was bad (and it was!) in 2006 a Canadian gunman uploaded pictures of himself posing with a rifle. He bragged on his blog that he loved the Internet game based on the Columbine shootings. One day he decided to stop playing. He went to a Montreal college and, when all was said and done, he killed one person and seriously wounded another 19 before he shot himself. Less than 10 days after the Colorado theatre shootings, Toronto had a shooting that killed two and wounded 21 (<http://www.torontosun.com/2012/07/17/one-dead-several-injured-in-scarborough-shooting>); in turn, this had been preceded a month earlier by a Toronto mall shooting at the Eaton Centre, which killed one and injured seven (<http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/02/world/americas/canada-mall-shooting/index.html>). The stories in Canada go on, but I won't.

Canada's stringent gun laws, in the form of Bill C-68, apply to handguns and rifles. This has been universally acknowledged as an abject failure, including over \$1 billion dollars lost on something that didn't work. Here's the details:

There are nearly 7 million registered long guns in Canada. Since 2003, when mandatory long gun registration was introduced, of the 2,441 homicides in Canada, less than 2% (47 to be exact) have been committed by those registered guns (figures cited from Canadian Centre of Justice Statistics). According to Statistics Canada, in 2008 there were around 23,500 victims of violent crime committed with a knife, with homicides and attempted murders about 1/3rd of such incidents (cited from Lawyers Weekly, 21 May, 2010). No word yet whether leftists will introduce a “long butterknife” or “dinner settings” bill - you know, you can never be too careful about those doggoned table settings, including possible strangulation by napkins!! It really is the fact that, as one wag wrote the Canadian Broadcasting Company, “Banning the legitimate ownership of handguns to prevent the *illegitimate* use of handguns is equivalent to the idea that banning sexual relations between a husband and wife will prevent rapes in dark alleys.”

DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO

Lets examine other leftists, and what they do for personal protection. For the sake of brevity, I won't even *begin* to cover all the politically correct Hollywood types like Michael Moore who are for gun control – but use armed guards for their own protection – other than provide one example of the hypocrisy du jour: David Gregory on CNN mocked the NRA's Wayne LaPerrier after the Sandy Hook shooting for proposing armed guards at schools. But of course, as yet another latte liberal, Mr. Gregory sends *his* kids to the uber-luxe Sidwell Friends school in Washington, DC, which – if you scan the school's online staff directory - you will find a security department of at least 11 people, of which many are former police officers (and you can bet they ain't totin' just yellow pads to issue detentions to would-be bad guys!) And of course, Obama's children go to this school as well, so there's also Secret Service personnel at the institution. But that returns us to Orwell's dictum about socialists, which we see put in practice everywhere and every time socialism is put in place – there's one rule for the “special” folks, and another rule for

the hoi polloi. And if you don't believe that, maybe you need to check out one of Michelle Obama's seemingly monthly uber-luxe vacations. (I won't bother to remind you that Sen. Dianne Feinstein, as exposed by Mark Levin, had a concealed carry permit, and once stated "If somebody tries to take me out I'm going to take them with me" <http://bungalowbillscw.blogspot.com/2012/12/diane-feinstein-carries-concealed.html>) Then there is another liberal hypocrite from the Washington Post, the late Carl Rowan, who wrote in 1981 that anyone who wasn't a law enforcement officer who committed a crime with a handgun should be sent to prison for ten years without parole - while in 1988, as Aaron Goldstein wrote, "Rowan shot and wounded an intruder at his D.C. home with an unregistered .22 caliber pistol. Well, Rowan didn't acquire a badge in the intervening seven years." <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/12/27/liberals-who-cling-to-their-gu>. But anyway you cut the above, we need to remember, as Martin Luther King warned us, "Never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was legal."

Basically, the attitude of these leftists is explained in a nutshell by Jon Rappoport "I'm a limousine liberal. I don't believe in owning a gun. I wouldn't know how to shoot a gun if my life depended on it. But I do have fourteen men who work for me who carry weapons..." (<http://jonrappoport.wordpress.com/2013/01/10/this-what-i-want-to-hear-obama-say-about-guns/>)

Incidentally, here is gun "expert" Feinstein, compared to a smart 6 yr. old:



Let me conclude with an anecdotal story to help reify the matter. Canadian John Myers writes about a personal experience in Alberta (and which is borne out by Dr. John Lott's aforementioned book, "More Guns, Less Crime") at [http://www.personalliberty.com/conservative-politics/civil-liberty/with-gun-control-canadian-criminals-are-making-a-killing/?eiid=&rmid=2011_01_26_PLA_\[PIZ0411C\]&rriid=238494331](http://www.personalliberty.com/conservative-politics/civil-liberty/with-gun-control-canadian-criminals-are-making-a-killing/?eiid=&rmid=2011_01_26_PLA_[PIZ0411C]&rriid=238494331). Myers writes:

"I never imagined that a time would come where I would have to level my shotgun at a person; that I would take deadly aim with it. But that happened when I as a senior at the University of Calgary and was cramming for a final. Around midnight I heard a car screech to a stop outside my parent's home which sat on an isolated street. I was home alone with the family dog, Elsa, a Great Dane with a gentle disposition.

In the news had been reports that two men were terrorizing women on Calgary streets. Two young women, Laurie Boyd and Debbie Stevens, had been dragged from their cars at night and murdered. I heard pounding at the front door. I knew something was seriously wrong when I opened the door to find my girlfriend Angela standing before me crying. Before I could even ask her what was happening a second car pulled into our driveway with the high-beams on.

I took Angela inside and went outside to see what the commotion was about. I brought the family dog with me and kept her leash wrapped tightly around my hand. Two men were walking straight towards the door; neither one saying a word and neither showing any regard for me or our dog which was growling and barking.

I dragged the dog back inside and gave her to Angela. I remembered the Remington that I kept in the front closet. I found it and then fumbled for the single target load shell that I kept in the corner of the hat shelf. It was all the ammunition I had, but I was damn happy to have it. I was shaking, but I loaded the shell. I slipped back outside. I was surprised at how close these strangers were to me; perhaps fewer than 20 paces. I remember the taller of the two had his hand reached inside his coat. It was dark so at first I don't think they noticed my shotgun. But they knew it was there when I raised it to my shoulder and pumped the fore-end, chambering the shell. In a split second they spun and ran to their car, roaring off into the darkness.

More than a year later two men, Jim Peters and Rob Brown, were charged and convicted on multiple charges of murder. My girlfriend Angela later became my wife. To this day we don't know if those men were the Calgary serial killers. All these years later we remain certain of two things: These men had evil intentions and we were damned lucky to have that shotgun."

The fact is, the left doesn't really want "dialogue" about guns. That's just a gambit for the "Yes we can" chanters. They want to triangulate those in the middle out of the discussion, then continue the process of propagandizing more to their side, until they hold the *political* high ground. The real attitude of many – though not all - leftists is illustrated by the darkened mind of Donald Kaul, columnist for the Des Moines Register. Kaul wrote Dec. 29, 2012 about the NRA that they should be branded a terrorist organization, and we should *"tie Mitch McConnell and John Boehner ... to the back of a Chevy pickup truck and drag them around a parking lot until they saw the light on gun control."* Now, *there* is one enlightened, dialogue-seeking, non-violent soul!

The truth is, there's more to gun ownership and gun rights in America than meets the eye, as I have shown above. Don't let the leftists take the *moral* high ground on this one - that belongs one hundred percent to the gun owners.