GoA Pressing for Armed Pilots

Provision Faces Obstacles

by John Velleco

A law allowing commercial airline pilots to carry firearms in the cockpit has been in effect since November 2001, but pilots remain unarmed.

Judging by the legislative history of the armed pilots provision, it appeared to be an idea that would be implemented speedily.

The measure passed both chambers of the U.S. Congress overwhelmingly (unanimously in the Senate) and was signed into law by President Bush as part of the Aviation Security Act.

Continued on page 2

Gun Shows -- The Truth Comes Out

By Dr. Michael S. Brown

Times have been tough for the anti-gun lobby. Political analysts have declared gun control a dead issue, court cases are not going its way, and gun shops are crowded with liberals seeking security in gun ownership.

During hard times it is natural to fall back on proven strategies, so anti-gun groups are trying to revive an issue that was quite successful during the glory days of the gun control movement.

With the aid of a few attention-seeking senators, including John McCain, they are renewing their attack on gun shows, which their propaganda wizards once labeled “Tupperware parties for criminals.”

For several years prior to the 2000 election, clever advertising campaigns in many states convinced voters that gun shows were illegal arms bazaars where sinister dealers sold machine guns to dangerous criminals and innocent children alike. Their advertising dollars were leveraged by sympathetic media outlets, which amplified and legitimized the message.

One of the most effective sound bites ever created by the gun control propagandists is “gun show loophole.” This refers to the private-sale exemption that was deliberately placed into federal law. The purpose was to avoid the unproductive complications that would arise if gun sales between friends, relatives and collectors were forced to undergo the same background checks as sales in gun stores.

Nobody likes a loophole, as beleaguered gun owners discovered when the media repeated the misleading term ad infinitum.

Politically motivated police officials sometimes got into the act by reporting that a large number of criminals admitted to obtaining guns at shows. They neglected to mention that the last thing a crook wants to tell the police is who really supplied him with his illegally
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The measure also has the overwhelming support of pilots themselves and of the general public.

Nevertheless, it remains uncertain when, or if at all, the provision will be implemented.

An April 5, USA Today headline read: “Pilots unions’ plea to Bush: Allow guns in cockpit.”

The five largest pilots unions in the country, representing over 100,000 pilots, expressed concern that the new Transportation Security Authority is reluctant to move forward with the necessary programs to train pilots who want to carry firearms and is, at the same time, lagging behind in other security areas.

According to Al Aitken, head of the Allied Pilots Association, “all the things [the government] is trying to do — screeners, federal air marshals, bag matching — are not up to speed yet and may never be.”

“We are absolutely intent on establishing a program where the pilots will be armed to defend the American people against acts of terrorism,” Aitken said.

Still, pilots remain unarmed. Meanwhile, a host of stop-gap measures have been proposed, ranging from tighter passenger screening and reinforced cockpit doors to issuing plastic cuffs to flight attendants, the use of blankets to throw over an attackers head, and using armrests to smash fingers.

It seems that federal authorities are ignoring the fact that pilots are not suggesting that they should be encouraged to take firearms out of the cockpit to deal with disturbances in the cabin.

The pilots only argue that should all else fail and a potential hijacker gain access to the cockpit, the terrorist must be met with lethal force.

Steve Luckey, chief of security of the Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA) and himself a United Airlines captain, said, “Our area of tactical responsibility is the cockpit. We can’t go back and assist the flight attendants anymore.”

These words were echoed by American Airlines captain and spokeswoman for the Allied Pilots Association, Linda Pauwels, a self-described “anti-gun” mom.

“Barriers are broken and security systems fail,” Pauwels said. “If there is more than one person who wants to wreak havoc, it’s possible that they may be able to penetrate the cockpit barrier. If these people knew that you were armed, that would change things.”

Security lapses underscore risks

The urgency of arming pilots was underscored by reports of security lapses at airports.

According to a March 25, USA Today report, “Screeners at 32 U.S. airports failed to detect hundreds of knives, guns or simulated explosives in tests by government investigators in the months after September 11.”

Tests were conducted by the Transportation Department during a period when airports were on “high alert” after the September 11 attacks.

According to the report, 70% of knives and 30% of firearms got through screeners.

In addition, screeners failed to detect simulated explosives in 60% of the tests.

In response to the report, Captain Marc R. Feigenblatt, who is Vice Chairman of the Airline Pilots Security Alliance, wrote:

Most Americans understand the need for and support an armed-pilot program. Is there really any question about this common-sense deterrent?

We should deluge Bush administration officials with calls and letters letting them know that we, the people, want this to happen. As a career airline captain, I vow to do everything I can to prevent another 9/11-type occurrence. Others should make the same pledge.

A poll conducted by ALPA in February found that 73% of pilots supported the use of firearms to defend the cockpit.

In addition to the support of pilots, according to polls, over 75% of Americans favor allowing pilots to carry firearms.

In fact, the only voices not eager to take this safety measure seem to come from within the Administration.

Administration opposition

When President Bush appointed former Democrat Congressman Norman Mineta as Secretary of Transportation, it did little more than raise an eyebrow in the pro-gun community. Such Cabinet officials rarely, if ever, have any bearing on Second Amendment issues.

That changed on September 11.

Since that time, Secretary Mineta has voiced his strong opposition to the idea of arming pilots.

“I don’t feel we should have lethal weapons in the cockpit,” Mineta told reporters in March.

Secretary Mineta claims that he has concerns about firearms on planes, but scratching beneath the surface reveals a
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Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) was one of the chief sponsors of the anti-gun Incumbent Protection Bill.

Hypocrisy Highlight

Senator John McCain (R-AZ) was one of the prime backers of the Incumbent Protection Bill which passed this March. In stumping for this legislation, McCain claimed that, “I believe it is self-evident that contributions from a single source that run to the hundreds of thousands of dollars are not healthy to a democracy.”

Which is why political insiders were surprised to read what McCain said in a Washington Post story about billionaire Andrew McKelvey (head of Americans for Gun Safety) and his efforts to spend millions of dollars pushing gun control. McCain said: “I’m glad a guy with a billion dollars, or two billion dollars, wants to spend his money on an issue he feels strongly about.”

To this, the editors at the Wall Street Journal’s Opinion-Journal.com noted, “Isn’t that exactly what McCain, champion of campaign reform, is supposed to be against?”

Source: CEI UpDate which is published by the Competitive Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C.
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Senators in bold type are those who tried to please advocates on both sides of this issue. These eight senators first cast an anti-gun vote to end the filibuster (that is, they voted IN FAVOR of the bill on the most crucial ballot), but then turned around and voted AGAINST the anti-gun bill on final passage.

Senate votes for anti-gun Incumbent Protection Bill

Squelching the First Amendment speech of pro-gun advocates. On March 20, 2002, the Senate effectively killed all opposition to the Shays-Meehan Incumbent Protection Bill, which has erroneously been billed as campaign finance reform. President George Bush signed the bill into law on March 27. The blatantly unconstitutional legislation squelches the voice of groups like Gun Owners of America in the final days before an election and, thus, enables incumbents to more easily duck accountability for their anti-gun actions. Opponents of the bill in the Senate used a parliamentary maneuver (called a filibuster) in an attempt to kill the legislation. Because this was the best chance they had to defeat the bill, the key vote on H.R. 2356 was on whether to end the filibuster. Had Senators voted to continue debating the bill, it would have died. Instead, the filibuster was broken by a vote of 68-32. The 68 Senators who cast an anti-gun vote to end the debate are listed below.

Akaka (D-HI) 
Baucus (D-MT) 
Bayh (D-IN) 
Biden (D-DE) 
Bingaman (D-NM) 
Boxer (D-CA) 
Breaux (D-LA) 
Byrd (D-WV) 
Cantwell (D-WA) 
Carper (D-DE) 
Chafee (R-RI) 
Cleland (D-GA) 
Clinton (D-NY) 
Cochran (R-MS) 
Collins (R-ME) 
Corzine (D-NJ) 
Daschle (D-SD) 
Dayton (D-MN) 
Dodd (D-CT) 
Domenici (R-NM) 
Dorgan (D-ND) 
Durbin (D-IL) 
Edwards (D-NC) 
Feingold (D-WI) 
Feinstein (D-CA) 
Fitzgerald (R-IL) 
Frist (R-TN) 
Graham (D-FL) 
Grassley (R-IA) 
Hagel (R-NE) 
Harkin (D-IA) 
Hollings (D-SC) 
Inouye (D-HI) 
Jeffords (I-VT) 
Johnson (D-SD) 
Kennedy (D-MA) 
Kerry (D-MA) 
Kohl (D-WI) 
Kyl (R-AZ) 
Landrieu (D-LA) 
Leahy (D-VT) 
Levin (D-MI) 
Lieberman (D-CT) 
Lincoln (D-AR) 
Lugar (R-IN) 
McCain (R-AZ) 
Mikulski (D-MD) 
Miller (D-GA) 
Murray (D-WA) 
Nelson (D-FL) 
Nelson (D-NE) 
Reed (D-RI) 
Reid (D-NV) 
Rockefeller (D-WV) 
Sarbanes (D-MD) 
Schumer (D-NY) 
Smith (R-OR) 
Snowe (R-ME) 
Specter (R-PA) 
Stabenow (D-MI) 
Stevens (R-AK) 
Thompson (R-TN) 
Torricelli (D-NJ) 
Warner (R-VA) 
Wellstone (D-MN) 
Wyden (D-OR)

Gun Owners of America is preparing a legal brief in order to challenge the Incumbent Protection Bill in federal court and has established the GOA Voice of Freedom Fund.

Checks can be made out to Gun Owners of America and sent to 8001 Forbes Place, Suite 102, Springfield, VA 22151.

Please write “Voice of Freedom Fund” on the memo line. Contributions or gifts to GOA are not deductible for federal income tax purposes.
Gun Shows
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owned firearm. Saying “I got it at a gun show” is a very easy way out.

Another important factor was that very few voters had ever attended a gun show, so it was easy to portray these harmless middle-class gatherings as wretched hives of scum and villainy.

Gun haters inventing new tactics to eliminate gun shows

With such a strong hand to play, it is no wonder that anti-gun forces wish to revive this issue. However, the new offensive is marked by a distinct change in tactics. Press releases from anti-gun organizations are now claiming that gun shows are major sources of weapons for terrorists.

This wild claim is supposedly based on two isolated cases of foreign terrorists who were arrested for buying guns to be shipped to their associates overseas. But since the gun haters are constantly looking for ways to reduce the number of guns in America, it is difficult to see the problem.

It is also a very big stretch to connect gun shows with the current crop of terrorists who hijack airliners with box cutters or blow themselves up with explosives. Many observers are puzzled by this strange new theme, but there is an obvious explanation. This seemingly bizarre leap of logic is probably related to a report recently released by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

“Firearm Use by Offenders” details the results of a 1997 survey of about 16,000 inmates in state and federal prisons. The report contains many interesting facts, but the most embarrassing item for the gun controllers is related to gun shows.

Few criminals getting guns from gun shows

What percentage of criminals obtained their crime guns from gun shows? The anti-gun lobby has always been suspiciously vague about this critical number, but their emotion-charged statements have always been carefully designed to give the impression that gun shows are highly popular with criminals.

Judging by the intensity of their efforts, one would assume that the number must be high, perhaps 30 percent, perhaps 50, maybe more.

Now we find out the truth. The real number is... seven-tenths of 1 percent.


It will be interesting to see if the media take note of the remarkable fact that less than one criminal in a hundred obtained their guns at gun shows.

Restricting gun shows a mere stepping stone to greater gun control

The real reason the anti-gun lobby is trying to link gun shows with terrorism is that they know the “Tupperware party for criminals” game is over.

One might assume that the anti-gun lobby would simply move on to some new “gun safety” issues. But their objection to gun shows was never really about criminals, it was part of a cultural war.

For people who truly hate guns, the thought of all those evil guns and despicable gun owners gathered together in one place is unbearable. Better to lie and mislead the public than to tolerate such an abomination, they believe.

This is not the first time that a public opinion campaign was based on a false premise, but voters who cast ballots based on deceptive information deserve to know that they were deliberately misled.

Journalists who once wrote stories that were little more than digests of anti-gun press releases now seem to be viewing the issue with a bit more skepticism. Perhaps some even feel a bit of shame at the way they suspended their ethics and jumped on the anti-gun bandwagon.

It will be interesting to see if the media take note of the remarkable fact that less than one criminal in a hundred obtained their guns at gun shows.

Dr. Michael S. Brown is an optometrist and member of Doctors for Sensible Gun Laws. Write the author at rkba2000@yahoo.com.
U.S. Press Ignores Another Armed Citizen-Hero

by Richard Poe

“Are you guys ready? Let’s roll,” said Todd Beamer before leading fellow passengers in a suicide charge to retake United Airlines Flight 93.

The whole world knows Beamer’s story.

But another hero in the War on Terror has been ignored. He is 46-year-old Israeli shoe salesman William Hazan.

Everyone makes mistakes. It is understandable that U.S. wire services garbled Hazan’s story in their earlier reports, painting him more as victim than hero.

But it is less understandable why U.S. news outlets failed to correct the error, once the details became clear.

Perhaps the problem is that Hazan — unlike Todd Beamer — used a gun in self-defense.

The U.S. press has a long tradition of spiking stories about ordinary citizens using firearms to thwart criminals.

Americans use guns to defend themselves an estimated 2 million times each year. Yet the mass media rarely report such incidents.

Since 9-11, gun sales in America have gone through the roof.

The FBI ran 455,000 more background checks on prospective gun buyers — as well as 130,000 more checks for concealed weapon permits — in the six months following the attacks than during the same period in 2000-2001, according to the March 9, 2002, International Herald Tribune.

Israelis, too, have been arming for action. But unlike Americans, they have been doing so with the blessing and encouragement of their government.

Israel has issued 60,000 new gun permits to civilians, raising the number of guns in civilian hands by 25 percent.

“There’s no question that weapons in the hands of the public have prevented acts of terror or stopped them while they were in progress,” stated Police Inspector-General Shlomo Aharonisky.

Former Police Inspector-General Assaf Hefetz seconds the motion. “A gun owner who can get within effective range of the terrorist while keeping under cover can prevent many casualties,” he wrote in the Israeli paper Yediot Aharonot.

That brings us to William Hazan.

In a previous column, I reported that a terrorist armed with an M-16 and a knife attacked a Tel Aviv restaurant, killing three and wounding 31, and that shoe salesman William Hazan was stabbed in the back by the terrorist.

That much was true.

But then I stated — quite incorrectly — that “[Hazan] drew a gun and shot the terrorist, wounding him. Police then arrived and finished the job.”

In fact, it was not the police who finished the job. It was Hazan.

I made the mistake of relying on U.S. wire service reports — always a bad idea in matters pertaining to firearms. By repeating their inaccuracies, I inadvertently did this brave man an injustice.

An e-mail from a concerned reader alerted me to the fact that Israeli media had published a very different account of the incident.

In an article entitled “Hefetz Urges Armed Israelis to Stand and Fight,” the March 7 Jerusalem Post quotes Hazan thus:

When the windows of the restaurant burst in from the gunfire, I pushed my wife and the others toward the bathroom, and then crawled out with my gun. As I got up to my feet, I called out for everyone to stay down... suddenly the big guy stabbed me in the back.

Taking aim, I shot the terrorist three or four times, and he went down. It was easy, textbook even, as I had prepared for facing this situation one day.

And what about the police who allegedly came to the rescue? The Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz explains that a young plainclothes cop named Salim Barakat was parked outside when the attack began.

Officer Barakat shot and wounded the terrorist. But the gunman fought back, stabbing the policeman in the chest and killing him on the spot.

Only then, reports Ha’aretz, did a “civilian on the scene shoot the gunman in the head, killing him.”

That “civilian” was William Hazan.

Officer Salim Barakat died a hero. But he failed to stop the massacre. It was civilian gun owner Hazan who finished the job.

Conflicting early accounts made it tricky to get this story straight. But now that the smoke has cleared, Hazan should receive his due credit.

His name should be on every American’s lips. His coolness, courage, training and preparation should be held up as an example for us all.

Some right-leaning papers — such as the Washington Times and the New York Post — reported this story accurately from the get-go.

But where are the major networks on this one?

Perhaps Hazan is not the sort of hero our mass media wish to promote.

Richard Poe is a New York Times bestselling author and cyberjournalist. He is the author of The Seven Myths of Gun Control and can be reached at his Website, RichardPoe.com. This article first appeared on NewsMax.com.
Kennesaw: still going strong after 20 years

Another U.S. city passed an important milestone earlier this spring. It was twenty years ago this past March that city officials in Kennesaw, Georgia, embarked upon a bold experiment. They enacted a law requiring every household to own a firearm, exempting those with criminal records or religious objections.

The results of this experiment have been phenomenal, showing that armed citizens deter crime.

An early study (in 1982) found that the residential burglary rate in Kennesaw had fallen 89 percent in the seven months following the law’s enactment. That drop far outpaced the more modest 10.4 percent drop in the entire state of Georgia during that same period.

In the ensuing years, the crime rate has remained at basement levels. According to the Kennesaw Police Department, there was less than one property crime for every 1,000 people in 1998. That’s down from 11 such crimes per 1,000 residents in 1981 — the year before the gun law was enacted.

Remembering the L.A. riots, and the dangers of gun control

This spring marks the ten-year anniversary of the Los Angeles riots — an uprising that began after a jury acquitted two cops of using excessive force against motorist Rodney King.

Initially, police were very slow in responding to the crisis. Many Guardsmen, after being mobilized to the affected areas, sat by and watched the violence because their rifles were low on ammunition.

Hundreds of people were injured. More than a dozen innocent citizens were killed.

But not everybody in Los Angeles suffered. In some of the hot spots, Korean merchants were successfully able to protect their stores with semi-automatic firearms, or with what the anti-gunners refer to as “assault rifles.”

Where armed citizens banded together for self-protection, businesses were spared, while others (which were left unprotected) burned to the ground.

To be sure, the pictures of Korean merchants defending their stores left quite an impression on one group of people living in Los Angeles: those who had previously identified themselves as gun control advocates.

Press reports described how life-long gun control supporters were running to gun stores to buy an item they never thought they would need — a gun. But alas, they were surprised (and outraged!) to learn there was a 15-day waiting period for firearms.

The situation was truly outrageous. The state of California could not protect these people, but in the same breath, it was not letting those same citizens protect themselves.
Pilots Press for Guns in Cockpit
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documented history that is virulently against Second Amendment rights, not only of pilots, but all Americans.

As a United States Congressman from California, Norm Mineta was more than a consistent vote for gun control; he was a reliable anti-gun leader.

As a congressman, he cosponsored a host of gun control bills, including legislation to impose waiting periods for handgun purchases; a bill to ban certain handguns; a bill to ban certain rifles and shotguns; and other gun control measures.

In fact, Mr. Mineta was such a reliable gun control proponent that Sarah Brady’s Handgun Control group regularly endorsed him.

Homeland Security Director Tom Ridge also spoke out against firearms in the cockpit.

“I don’t think we want to equip our pilots with firearms,” Ridge told the USA Today. “That doesn’t make a lot of sense to me.”

Like Mineta, Ridge also has a congressional record.

In 1994, then-Rep. Ridge flip-flopped on the Clinton Crime Bill, first opposing then voting in favor of the bill, the cornerstone of which was the ban on many semi-automatic firearms.

Perhaps the most important person with bearing on this issue is Undersecretary for Transportation Security, John Magaw, who will have to approve any final plan to arm pilots.

Magaw is not new to the Second Amendment debate.

Magaw was appointed head of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) in the early 1990s. During his tenure with the BATF, Magaw faced numerous congressional hearings looking into the agency’s history of running roughshod over the rights of gun owners.

In addition, while Magaw was in charge of the BATF, over 100,000 federally licensed firearms dealers were put out of business.

While he has not yet publicly taken a position on this issue, it is unlikely that he will go counter to the expressed opinions of Ridge and Mineta.

GOA raised the issue of Magaw’s position on firearms in the cockpit in a letter to the Senate Transportation Committee in December of 2001. The letter urged Senators to “[C]all for Mr. Magaw’s full support of allowing pilots to carry firearms, and, if confirmed, to use the power of his office to see that this provision is implemented as quickly as possible.”

For his part, President Bush has been relatively quiet on this issue, though he has stated his reluctance to implement the armed pilots provision.

“There may be better ways to do it than that,” Mr. Bush said last fall in response to questions at the White House about allowing pilots to carry guns in the cockpit.

Ironically, anti-gun Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) actually supported the armed pilots provision on the floor of the Senate.

“[A]s someone who for a long time has taken the opposite position on guns, I think this amendment [to arm pilots] makes sense,” Sen. Boxer said on October 11, 2001.

If pilots are not allowed to carry firearms the blame cannot ultimately be placed on Mineta, Ridge or Magaw. They work under the direction of George W. Bush. The question is, who works for whom, Mr. President? Doesn’t your signature on the bill mean anything? Don’t you believe in following the law?

Media Blind to Guns
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1993 New England Journal of Medicine article, Kellerman suggested that one is 2.7 times more likely to be killed by one’s gun kept in the household than to kill an intruder.

One sleight of hand is immediately apparent. Restricting self-defense uses of guns to instances where the intruder is killed ignores the other 99 percent of the time the gun is used in self-defense without a death resulting.

For a long time, Kellerman refused to release his data. When the pressure mounted against his stonewalling and finally forced the data’s release, it became apparent why “scientist” Kellerman did not want other researchers to see his data.

It showed that his conclusions were completely wrong! The data did not show that even one homicide victim was killed with a gun ordinarily kept in that household.

“Indeed the indirect evidence presented,” Kates says, “indicates that the home gun homicide victims were killed using guns not kept in the victim’s home.”

Did you catch that? The victims in Kellerman’s study were not killed by their own guns.

For years, Sarah Brady and her media cohorts have been all too willing to swallow Kellerman’s data without even reading it, so they can scare people about the supposed danger of the guns kept in their homes.

If you hear a report in the future that some medical group or researcher has found how at risk we are if we own a gun, remember that those “researchers” quite often lie like a rug.

Fast Fact:

Over a thirty-year period, the number of firearms increased almost 300 percent and the population increased 34 percent – even while the number of fatal gun accidents decreased roughly 70 percent.

Anti-Gun Docs: Bad Medicine

by Larry Pratt

In *Armed: New Perspectives on Gun Control*, Don Kates analyzes the fraudulent science masquerading as research by militantly anti-gun doctors. This book is coauthored by Dr. Gary Kleck and is must reading for those who want to defend their Second Amendment rights.

The book contains an article that originally appeared several years ago in a law school journal. When Kates initially composed the piece, he presented it to the physicians whose research he was criticizing. None of them chose to respond.

One of the physicians was Dr. Arthur Kellermen, who is a leading practitioner of junk medical research. Kates calls him to the mat for, among other things, citing an article that he (Kellerman) claims was supportive of his gun-banning views. In reality, the article actually made the opposite point.

For those familiar with the growing scandal of the totally fraudulent work of Michael Bellesiles’ *Arming America*, Kates shows that such dishonesty is not new to the ranks of anti-gun scholarship.

Fewer deaths, even while there are more guns

A look at the crime and gun ownership data over three decades presents a devastating answer to the gun control mantra that more guns mean more gun deaths.

“In sum,” says Kates, “over the thirty-year period from 1968 through the end of 1997, a 373 percent increase in the stock of civilian handguns, and a 262 percent increase in the civilian stock of guns overall, coincided with a 68.9 percent decrease in the number of fatal gun accidents — even as population substantially increased!”

Kates reveals that, over this thirty-year period, the handgun has replaced the long gun as the self-defense weapon of choice in American homes and businesses. This trend to displace the more lethal long gun has coincided with fewer children and adults being accidentally killed.

Although Kates does not make the argument, it could also be pointed out that the decline in child deaths preceded mandatory lock-up-your safety laws requiring trigger locks and other stratagems guaranteed to render guns useless for self-defense.

Anti-gunners omit evidence that shatters their theories

Kates documents another favorite trick of the anti-gun zealots in the medical profession. When discussing the “gun scourge” within the United States, they combine the homicide and suicide figures. They get more “gun deaths” that way.

But when discussing comparisons of the U.S. to foreign countries, the anti’s become selective in two ways. They omit high-gun ownership countries such as Switzerland and Israel with their low murder rates. And, they compare only the homicide rates, because most European countries have whopping suicide rates that would ruin the “gun scourge” calumny heaped on the U.S.

One of the particularly devastating statistics that Kates dug up represents a tremendous indictment of big-city laws disarming victims. The homicide rate among young black inner-city males is 900 percent higher than their counterparts in rural areas where young blacks have much greater ownership of and access to firearms.

Kates presents a compelling case that murderers are not average folks like you or me who go berserk because we have a gun in our hands. Rather, murderers come from the criminal ranks of society.

“The great majority of murderers have life histories of violence, felony records, substance abuse, and car and other dangerous accidents,” he states.

You are NOT more likely to be killed by your own gun

A fair amount of ink was devoted to describing the details of the mendacity of Dr. Arthur Kellerman. In his infamous
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