

Empty holsters on campus

P.C. leaves innocents defenseless

By W. Scott Lewis

Should you ever find yourself perusing the newspaper archives at your local library, take a few minutes to track down and compare the August 2, 1966, and April 17, 2007, editions of any American newspaper. You'll undoubtedly find that, for two papers written more than four decades apart, they tell strikingly similar stories.

In both editions you'll likely see that coverage of American soldiers fighting a publicly unpopular war overseas is pushed to the back pages by news of a mass shooting on the campus of a major university. But although the headlines suggest a classic case of "history repeats itself," the facts lurking beyond the newsprint actually tell a very different story.

On the morning of Aug. 1, 1966, few people had ever considered the possibility that they might die in an indiscriminate shooting spree. But shortly before noon on that fateful day, a 25-year-old former Marine climbed to the top of the University of Texas bell tower and created a worldwide reference point for such fears.

As police rushed to the scene, officers already on the UT campus struggled to formulate a plan. At that time, the Austin Po-

lice Department had no SWAT team. Officers were armed only with service revolvers and shotguns, both useless against a sniper firing from a fortified position high above the ground.

Seeing that something had to be done, students quickly retrieved hunting rifles from dorm rooms and fraternity houses, took up defensive positions throughout the campus and returned fire. In the August 2006 edition of *Texas Monthly* magazine, Bill Helmer, a graduate student at UT during the shooting, recalled the experience to journalist Pamela Colloff: He said he remembered thinking, "All we need is a bunch of idiots running around with rifles." But what they did turned out to be brilliant. Once the shooter could no longer lean over the edge and fire, he was much more limited in what he could do. That's why he did most of his damage in the first 20 minutes.

Flash forward 40 years, eight months and 15 days to the campus of Virginia Tech. Once again students and faculty on a college campus find themselves under fire from a madman. But this time there are no armed citizens to fend off the attack. Students and faculty are left with little recourse but to hide under their desks, as surviving victim Emily Haas told CNN, "waiting and hoping [the shooter] wouldn't

come in." Sadly, the shooter did come into Emily's room. She survived with only superficial wounds, but her professor and 10 of her classmates lost their lives to a killer whose only advantage over his victims was a complete disregard for Virginia Tech's "gun-free" policy.

Though the notion of an indiscriminate shooting spree was a foreign concept in 1966, it's now very much a part of the national consciousness. Terms like "going postal" now populate the American vernacular. Students at elementary schools now practice what to do in the event of such an attack, much the same way their grandparents practiced "duck and cover." And yet, despite this awareness of and apparent desire to prepare for such threats, any suggestion that future shooting sprees might be mitigated by armed citizens — as was the UT sniper attack — is met with scorn and ridicule.

In the decades between these two college massacres, a pervasive idea took hold in America. Many individuals, particularly those in academic circles, began to view firearms as barbaric tools of violence symbols of machismo and false bravado only carried by men with small egos and smaller anatomies. Today, anyone who advocates carrying a handgun for self-defense is called a "cow-

boy" and accused of having a "John Wayne complex."

Whenever anyone suggests that concealed handgun license holders be allowed to carry concealed handguns on college campuses, the same way they're allowed to at movie theaters, office buildings, shopping malls and most other places, laughter, not intelligent rebuttal, is the response. Whenever proponents of "concealed carry" point to the success of concealed-carry laws throughout the nation, as well as studies showing that concealed handgun license holders are significantly less likely than non-license holders to commit violent crimes, they are answered with mockery, rather than intelligent discourse. In the world of academia and intellectual free expression, some issues are apparently not open for discussion.

This week students on more than 100 college campuses throughout the United States are wearing empty holsters as they go about their daily routines, as a reminder to everyone who sees them that they are defenseless against anyone not concerned with following the rules. These students understand something that students at the University of Texas were able to take for granted in the summer of 1966. All people have an innate right to defend themselves.

W. Scott Lewis, a commercial real estate agent and freelance writer from Austin, Texas, serves as the media coordinator for the nonpartisan Students for Concealed Carry on Campus.



APPEARS IN GUN LAWS

Right-To-Carry 2012

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2012

Right-to-Carry 2012

41 RTC States – Violent Crime at 37-Year Low

Self-defense is a fundamental right. The U.S. constitution, the constitutions of 44 states, common law, and the laws of all states recognize the right to use arms in self-defense. RTC laws respect the right to self-defense by allowing individuals to carry firearms for protection.

The Supreme Court, striking down the District of Columbia's handgun ban in *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008), ruled that "the inherent right of self-defense has been central to the Second Amendment right," and that the amendment protects "the individual right to possess and carry weapons in case of confrontation. This meaning is strongly confirmed by the historical background of the Second Amendment." In *Beard v. U.S.* (1895), the court approved the common-law rule that a person "may repel force by force" in self-defense, and that, when attacked, a person "was entitled to stand his ground and meet any attack made upon him with a deadly weapon," as needed to prevent "great bodily injury or death." In the Gun Control Act (1968) and Firearms Owners' Protection Act (1986), Congress said that it did not intend to "place any undue or unnecessary Federal restrictions or burdens on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms appropriate to . . . personal protection, or any other lawful activity."

With Wisconsin's adoption of an RTC law in 2011, by landslide votes of 68-27 in the Assembly and 25-8 in the Senate, there are now 41 RTC states. Thirty-eight of them have "shall issue" laws, requiring that carry permits be issued to applicants who meet uniform standards established by the state legislature.¹ Three of the "shall issue" states also allow carrying without a permit, but maintain their permit systems for purposes of permit reciprocity² with other states. In addition to the "shall issue" states, Alabama and Connecticut have fairly-administered discretionary-issue carry permit systems. Another, Vermont, does not require a permit to carry. Eight of the nine non-RTC states have restrictively-administered discretionary-issue systems.³ Only Illinois and the District of Columbia⁴ do not have permit systems and prohibit carrying altogether.

More RTC, less crime: Since 1991, when violent crime peaked in the U.S., 24 states have adopted “shall issue” laws, replacing laws that prohibited carrying or that issued carry permits on a very restrictive basis; many other federal, state, and local gun control laws have been eliminated or made less restrictive; and the number of privately-owned guns has risen by about 100 million.⁵ The numbers of gun owners and firearms, RTC states, and people carrying firearms for protection have risen to all-time highs. Through 2010, the nation’s murder rate has decreased 52 percent to a 47-year low, and the total violent crime rate has decreased 48 percent to a 37-year low.⁶ The FBI preliminarily has reported that violent crimes decreased another 6.4 percent in the first half of 2011, translating into a seven percent decrease in the total violent crime per capita rate.⁷

RTC reduces crime: Studying crime trends in every county in the U.S., economist John Lott and David Mustard concluded, “allowing citizens to carry concealed weapons deters violent crimes. . . . [W]hen state concealed handgun laws went into effect in a county, murders fell by 8.5 percent, and rapes and aggravated assaults fell by 5 and 7 percent.”⁸

RTC success: Florida has issued the most carry permits—nearly 2 million—but revoked only 168 (0.008 percent) due to gun crimes by permit-holders.⁹ Former Colorado Asst. Atty. Gen. David Kopel: “Whenever a state legislature first considers a concealed carry bill, opponents typically warn of horrible consequences....But within a year of passage, the issue usually drops off the news media’s radar screen, while gun-control advocates in the legislature conclude that the law wasn’t so bad after all.”¹⁰ An article on Michigan’s RTC law: “Concerns that permit holders would lose their tempers in traffic accidents have been unfounded. Worries about risks to police officers have also proved unfounded.... National surveys of police show they support concealed handgun laws by a 3-1 margin....There is also not a single academic study that claims Right to Carry laws have increased state crime rates. The debate among academics has been over how large the benefits have been.”¹¹

Background: Before 1987 there were 10 RTC states: Ind. Me., N.H., N.D., S.D. and Wash. had “shall issue” laws. Ala. and Conn. had fairly-administered discretionary-issue systems. Georgia’s law was interpreted as being “shall issue” in only some jurisdictions. Vermont allowed carrying without a permit. In 1987, Florida enacted a “shall issue” law that has since become a model for laws adopted in other states. Through 1992, Florida’s murder rate decreased 23 percent, while the U.S. rate rose nine percent; thereafter, murder decreased nationally and in Florida.¹² Then-Florida Licensing Division Director John Russi noted, “Florida’s concealed weapon law has been very successful. All major law enforcement groups supported the original legislation....[S]ome of the opponents of concealed weapon legislation in 1987 now admit the program has not created the problems many predicted.”¹³ In a 1995 letter to state officials, Dept. of Law Enforcement Commissioner James T. Moore wrote, “From a law enforcement perspective, the licensing process has not resulted in problems.”

31 RTC states since 1987: 21 had prohibited carrying, nine (*) previously had discretionary-issue systems, and one (**) was interpreted varying within the state. 1989: Oregon, Penna. (Phila. added in 1995), and West Virginia (also in 1989, a judicial ruling enforced “shall issue” in Georgia**); 1990: Idaho and Mississippi; 1991: Montana; 1994: Alaska, Arizona, Tennessee, and Wyoming; 1995: Arkansas, Nevada*, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah,* and Virginia*; 1996: Kentucky, Louisiana,* and South Carolina*; 2001: Michigan*; 2003: Colorado*; New Mexico, Minnesota,* and Missouri; 2004: Ohio; 2006: Kansas and Nebraska; 2010: Iowa,* and 2011: Wisconsin.

Citizens can defend themselves: Analyzing National Crime Victimization Survey data, criminologist Gary Kleck concluded “robbery and assault victims who used a gun to resist were less likely to be attacked or to suffer an injury than those who used any other methods of self-protection or those who did not resist at all.”¹⁴ In the 1990s, Kleck and Marc Gertz found guns were used for self-protection between 2.1-2.5 million times annually.¹⁵ The late Marvin E. Wolfgang, self-described as “as strong a gun-control advocate as can be found among the criminologists in this country,” said, “The methodological soundness of the current Kleck and Gertz study is clear. I cannot further debate it. . . . I cannot fault their methodology.”¹⁶ An earlier study for the Justice Department found 34 percent of felons had been “scared off, shot at, wounded or captured by an armed victim,” and 40 percent had not committed crimes, fearing victims were armed.¹⁷

The right to self-defense has been recognized for centuries: Cicero said 2,000 years ago, “If our lives are endangered by plots or violence or armed robbers or enemies, any and every method of protecting ourselves is morally right.” English jurist Sir William Blackstone observed that the English Bill of Rights recognized “the right of having and using arms for self-preservation and defense” as intended “to protect and maintain inviolate the three great and primary rights,” the first of which is “personal security.”¹⁸ Sir Michael Foster, judge of the Court of King’s Bench, wrote in the 18th century, “The right of self-defense . . . is founded in the law of nature, and is not, nor can be, superseded by any law of society.”¹⁹

Police aren’t required to protect you: In *Warren v. District of Columbia* (1981), the D.C. Court of Appeals ruled, “police personnel and the government employing them are not generally liable to victims of criminal acts for failure to provide adequate police protection . . . [A] government and its agents are under no general duty to provide public services, such as police protection, to any particular citizen.” In *Bowers v. DeVito* (1982), the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals ruled “[T]here is no constitutional right to be protected by the state against being murdered by criminals or madmen.”

National RTC reciprocity: Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-Fla.) H.R. 822, the “National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011” proposes that a person with any state’s carry permit be allowed to carry in other states, as follows: In a state that issues permits, its laws would apply. In states that don’t issue

permits, a federal standard would permit carrying in places other than police stations; courthouses; public polling places; meetings of state, county, or municipal governing bodies; schools; passenger areas of airports; etc.

Brady Campaign (formerly Handgun Control, Inc.): Sarah Brady: “the only reason for guns in civilian hands is for sporting purposes.” The late Pete Shields: “put up no defense - give them what they want.” Dennis Henigan: self-defense is “not a federally guaranteed constitutional right.”²⁰ In 1999, HCI claimed that between 1991 and 1997, violent crime declined less in RTC states than in other states.²¹ HCI incorrectly categorized 31 states as having RTC during the period; only 17 had RTC in 1992. HCI calculated crime trends from 1992 to under-represent the impact of RTC laws; by 1992, many states had RTC for many years and had already experienced decreases in crime. HCI misclassified Alabama and Connecticut as “restrictive,” and credited restrictive laws for crime decreasing in some states, though states that had restrictive laws had them for many years, and crime did not begin declining in those states until the 1990s, when crime decreased nationally.

Violence Policy Center: In 1995, VPC claimed Florida’s RTC law “puts guns into the hands of criminals” and that “criminals do apply for concealed carry licenses.”²² However, the law permits a person to carry, not acquire, a firearm. And “to set the record straight,” then-Florida Secy. of State, Sandra B. Mortham, said, “As of November 30, 1995, the Department had denied 723 applications due to criminal history.” She added, “the majority of concealed weapon or firearm licensees are honest, law-abiding citizens exercising their right to be armed for the purpose of lawful self-defense.”²³ In 2001, VPC claimed more women are murdered with handguns, than criminals killed in self-defense.²⁴ However, the value of handguns for self-defense is not in how many criminals are killed, but in how often people use handguns to prevent crimes, and how often criminals don’t attack, fearing potential victims are armed. VPC also undercounted the number of criminals killed in self-defense by counting only those noted in police reports, thus excluding defensive homicides later determined to have been justified. VPC claims that permit-holders have committed crimes, but those listed by the group were mostly crimes not involving guns, crimes committed with guns for which a permit was not required, crimes committed in locations in which a permit was not required to possess a firearm, and instances in which no crime was committed.

McDowell Math: In 1995, anti-gun researcher David McDowell claimed that gun homicide rates increased in Miami, Jacksonville and Tampa after Florida’s RTC law.²⁵ But homicide rates had fallen 10, 18 and 20 percent, respectively, in those metropolitan areas from 1987 until 1993, the most recent data at the time.²⁶ To show an “increase,” McDowell calculated Jacksonville and Tampa trends from the early 1970s, when rates were lower than in 1993, but calculated Miami’s from 1983, since earlier rates were higher and suggested crime had decreased. None of McDowell’s homicides was committed by a carry permit holder, and he didn’t indicate which homicides had occurred in situations where a permit would have been required to carry a gun. McDowell once claimed D.C.’s murder rate decreased after its 1977 handgun ban; in fact the rate tripled.²⁷

The 43:1 claim: Based upon a small study of King’s County, Washington, gun control supporters claim a gun at home is “43 times more likely” to be used to kill a family member than a criminal.²⁸ The ratio undercounts defensive gun uses by counting only instances in which criminals were killed. Kleck has called the 43:1 ratio and its variants “the most nonsensical statistic in the gun control debate.”²⁹

Notes:

1. Ala., Alas., Ark. Ariz., Colo., Conn., Fla., Ga., Idaho, Ind., Ia., Kans., Kent., La., Maine, Mich. Minn., Miss., Mo., Mont., Neb., Nev., N.H., N.M., N.C., N.D., Okla., Ohio, Ore., Pa., S.C., S.D., Tenn., Texas, Utah, Va., Vt., Wash., W.V., Wis. and Wyo.
2. Alas., Ariz. And Wyo. “Permit reciprocity” is the term given to a law that allows a person to carry a firearm within a state, if he has a carry permit issued by another state, and such permit meets the requirements of the state in which the firearm is carried.
3. Calif., Del., Hi., Md., Mass., N.J., N.Y. and R.I.
4. D.C. had a restrictive permit system before *Heller*. Thereafter, D.C. abolished its system to avoid a legal challenge over its restrictiveness.
5. BATFE, firearm manufacturing, export, and import reports, www.atf.gov/firearms/stats/index.htm.
6. See FBI www.fbi.gov/stats-services/crimestats, BJS www.ucrdatatool.gov/Search/Crime/Crime.cfm, and NRA-ILA www.nraila.org/Issues/FactSheets/Read.aspx?ID=128.
7. FBI, Preliminary Semiannual Uniform Crime Report, January-June 2011,” table 1, www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2011/preliminary-annual-ucr-jan-jun-2011/data-tables/table-1.
8. Lott, “Crime, Deterrence, and Right To Carry Concealed Handguns,” 1996.
9. Florida Division of Licensing, Monthly Statistical Report (http://licgweb.doacs.state.fl.us/stats/cw_monthly.html).
10. David Kopel, “The Untold Triumph of Concealed-Carry Permits,” *Policy Review*, July-Aug. 1996, p. 9.
11. “Should Michigan keep new concealed weapon law? Don’t believe gun foe scare tactics,” *Detroit News*, 1/14/01.
12. Note 6, BJS.
13. Testimony before the Michigan House of Representatives Judiciary Committee, 12/5/95.
14. Targeting Guns, Aldine de Gruyter, 1997, p. 171.
15. “Armed Resistance to Crime,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Fall 1995, pp. 150-187.
16. “A Tribute to a View That I Have Opposed,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Fall 1995, pp. 188-192.
17. J. Wright and P. Rossi, *Armed and Considered Dangerous: A Survey of Felons and Their Firearms*, 1986, p. 155.

18. Stephen P. Halbrook, *That Every Man Be Armed*, The Independent Institute, 1994, pp. 17, 54.
19. Dowlut, Knoop, "State Constitutions and The Right to Keep and Bear Arms," *Okla. City Univ. Law Review*, 1982, p. 183.
20. Brady: Tom Jackson, "Keeping the battle alive," *Tampa Tribune*, 10/21/93; Then-HCI Chair Shields, *Guns Don't Die - People Do*, N.Y.: Arbor House, 1981; Henigan: *USA Today*, 11/20/91.
21. Handgun Control, Inc., "Concealed Truth." (www.bradycampaign.org/facts/research/?page=conctruth&menu=gvr).
22. "Concealed Carry: The Criminal's Companion."
23. *St. Petersburg Times*, 1/11/96.
24. "A Deadly Myth: Women, Handguns, and Self-Defense."
25. "Easing Concealed Firearm Laws: Effects on Homicide in Three States."
26. Note 6, BJS.
27. Ibid.
28. A. L. Kellermann, "Protection or Peril?", *New England Journal of Medicine*, 1986.
29. Note 12, pp. 177-178.

IN THIS ARTICLE

RIGHT-TO-CARRY

SELF-DEFENSE

NATIONAL REVIEW

The Facts about Mass Shootings

It's time to address mental health and gun-free zones.

By John Fund — December 16, 2012

A few things you won't hear about from the saturation coverage of the Newtown, Conn., school massacre:

Mass shootings are no more common than they have been in past decades, despite the impression given by the media.

In fact, the high point for mass killings in the U.S. was 1929, according to criminologist Grant Duwe of the Minnesota Department of Corrections.

Incidents of mass murder in the U.S. declined from 42 in the 1990s to 26 in the first decade of this century.

The chances of being killed in a mass shooting are about what they are for being struck by lightning.

Until the Newtown horror, the three worst K–12 school shootings ever had taken place in either Britain or Germany.

Almost all of the public-policy discussion about Newtown has focused on a debate over the need for more gun control. In reality, gun control in a country that already has 200 million privately owned firearms is likely to do little to keep weapons out of the hands of criminals. We would be better off debating two taboo subjects — the laws that make it difficult to control people with mental illness and the growing body of evidence that “gun-free” zones, which ban the carrying of firearms by law-abiding individuals, don't work.

First, the mental-health issue. A lengthy study by *Mother Jones* magazine found that at least 38 of the 61 mass shooters in the past three decades “displayed signs of mental

health problems prior to the killings.” *New York Times* columnist David Brooks and Cornell Law School professor William Jacobson have both suggested that the ACLU-inspired laws that make it so difficult to intervene and identify potentially dangerous people should be loosened. “Will we address mental-health and educational-privacy laws, which instill fear of legal liability for reporting potentially violent mentally ill people to law enforcement?” asks Professor Jacobson. “I doubt it.”

Gun-free zones have been the most popular response to previous mass killings. But many law-enforcement officials say they are actually counterproductive. “Guns are already banned in schools. That is why the shootings happen in schools. A school is a ‘helpless-victim zone,’” says Richard Mack, a former Arizona sheriff. “Preventing any adult at a school from having access to a firearm eliminates any chance the killer can be stopped in time to prevent a rampage,” Jim Kouri, the public-information officer of the National Association of Chiefs of Police, told me earlier this year at the time of the Aurora, Colo., Batman-movie shooting. Indeed, there have been many instances — from the high-school shooting by Luke Woodham in Mississippi, to the New Life Church shooting in Colorado Springs, Colo. — where a killer has been stopped after someone got a gun from a parked car or elsewhere and confronted the shooter.

Economists John Lott and William Landes conducted a groundbreaking study in 1999, and found that a common theme of mass shootings is that they occur in places where guns are banned and killers know everyone will be unarmed, such as shopping malls and schools.

I spoke with Lott after the Newtown shooting, and he confirmed that nothing has changed to alter his findings. He noted that the Aurora shooter, who killed twelve people earlier this year, had a choice of seven movie theaters that were showing the Batman movie he was obsessed with. All were within a 20-minute drive of his home. The Cinemark Theater the killer ultimately chose wasn’t the closest, but it was the only one that posted signs saying it banned concealed handguns carried by law-abiding individuals. All of the other theaters allowed the approximately 4 percent of Colorado adults who have a concealed-handgun permit to enter with their weapons.

“Disarming law-abiding citizens leaves them as sitting ducks,” Lott told me. “A couple hundred people were in the Cinemark Theater when the killer arrived. There is an extremely high probability that one or more of them would have had a legal concealed handgun with him if they had not been banned.”

Lott offers a final damning statistic: “With just one single exception, the attack on congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords in Tucson in 2011, every public shooting since at least 1950 in the U.S. in which more than three people have been killed has taken place where citizens are not allowed to carry guns.”

There is no evidence that private holders of concealed-carry permits (which are either easy to obtain or not even required in more than 40 states) are any more irresponsible with firearms than the police. According to a 2005 to 2007 study by researchers at the University of Wisconsin and Bowling Green State University, police nationwide were convicted of firearms violations at least at a 0.002 percent annual rate. That’s about the same rate as holders of carry permits in the states with “shall issue” laws.

Despite all of this evidence, the magical thinking behind gun-free zones is unlikely to be questioned in the wake of the Newtown killings. Having such zones gives people a false sense of security, and woe to the politician or business owner who now suggests that a “gun-free zone” revert back to what critics would characterize as “a wild, wild West” status. Indeed, shortly after the Cinemark attack in Colorado, the manager of the nearby Northfield Theaters changed its policy and began banning concealed handguns.

In all of the fevered commentary over the Newtown killings, you will hear little discussion of the fact that we may be making our families and neighbors less safe by expanding the places where guns aren’t allowed. But that is precisely what we may be doing. Both criminals and the criminally insane have shown time and time again that those laws are the least of the problems they face as they carry out their evil deeds.

— *John Fund is a national-affairs columnist for NRO.*

Despite Policy, Weapons Still Appear on University Campus

By EMILY SCHWING • DEC 21, 2012

Fairbanks, AK - It's not illegal to carry a concealed weapon in Alaska and the state doesn't require a permit. But according to a seventeen-year-old policy created by the University of Alaska Board of Regents, guns are amongst a number of weapons that are not allowed on University property. On December 8th, a former employee violated the weapons policy, carried a gun into the University of Alaska Fairbanks library and shot himself the incident sparked questions about how the policy is enforced.

Sean McGee is the Chief of Police at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks. His history at the school extends over nearly three decades. He began as a student in 1985. "In 85 it was not uncommon to see people cleaning their guns in the parking lots or things like that," he says. "You just don't see that kind of thing taking place in this day and age as often."

30 years ago, that kind of activity wasn't illegal. In fact, it still isn't. Guns are allowed on the UAF campus as long as they are locked in a vehicle or secured in storage at the University Police Department. In 1995, the UA Board of Regents established a policy that does not allow anyone to carry concealed guns, knives and explosives on to University property, inside University buildings and classrooms off campus or at University sanctioned events. But Chief McGee says Alaska's conceal and carry laws may keep him from enforcing that policy. "As the police chief and as a resident here in the state of Alaska, I think there's probably a greater number of firearms on campus than any of us really know about. It's just that these people aren't using their firearms to commit criminal acts," admits McGee.

On December eighth, 63 year-old Tschon Ombadykow walked into the library with a gun and shot himself in a fifth-floor study room. It's the second gun-related death on campus in 20 years. In 1993, 20-year old student Sophie Sergie was shot to death in Bartlett Hall. Her murder remains

unsolved. Since 2009, three violations of the University's gun policy have resulted in disciplinary action by the administration.

Don Foley is the Dean of Students and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Life at UAF. "Short of having some sort of airport-like TSA set up for every single building on campus," he says, "there's no real way to ensure that someone is not carrying something in a backpack, concealed on them."

In April of 2010, journalism student George Hines organized a protest on the University of Alaska campus in Anchorage. He argued that the Board of Regents' policy violated his second amendment right. When discussions between the Board and Hines broke down, he and 20 other students gathered on the Anchorage campus, weapons in hand. University police escorted the group off campus shortly thereafter.

Hines threatened to take the University to court over the issue, but three years later, he has yet to file suit.

Spokeswoman Kate Waddum says if someone did bring a case against the University system regarding the weapons policy, it would be a difficult one to argue. "The University of Alaska Board of Regents has a gun policy for our campuses and that policy doesn't violate the second amendment and doesn't break state law," explains Waddum.

Last March, Colorado's State Supreme Court ruled to allow students to carry weapons on university campuses. A similar ruling in 2011, allowed weapons on campuses in the state of Oregon. Mississippi, Wisconsin and Utah also allow weapons at post-secondary educational institutions.

It's unclear if the cases in Colorado and Oregon set a precedent for policies like the University of Alaska's, but Alaska statute also gives the Board of Regents' the authority to govern its premises.

UAF Dean Don Foley says when he speaks with parents during orientation each fall, he tries to guarantee them that their kids will be safe. "But then, I can't guarantee my safety walking across the parking lot either," he says. "However, what I can guarantee is that we are all making our best efforts to coordinate information and make sure that we are doing what we can to see that students have a safe place to study, that faculty and staff has a safe place to work and that the community has a safe place to come and make use of the university facilities," says Foley.

He and Police Chief Sean McGee are part of a behavioral intervention team. Together they address areas and individuals of concern. Foley says his challenge now is to convince people to come forward with concerns and take advantage of university resources. "I probably heard two or three people come to me and express concerns with the library incident," he says. "I think most people just scan beyond it, I'm not sure that's the best thing either."

Foley says the incident in the library and the recent shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut did prompt some discussion among University administration but there are no plans to change the campus weapons policy.

TAGS: [UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS \(/TERM/UNIVERSITY-ALASKA-FAIRBANKS\)](#)

[POLICE \(/TERM/POLICE\)](#) [GUNS \(/TERM/GUNS\)](#) [WEAPONS POLICY \(/TERM/WEAPONS-POLICY\)](#)

[SECOND AMENDMENT \(/TERM/SECOND-AMENDMENT\)](#)

<http://fm.kuac.org/post/despite-policy-weapons-still-appear-university-campus>

CRIME PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER


MURDER AND HOMICIDE RATES BEFORE AND AFTER GUN BANS


1 DEC , 2013

UPDATE: An interview that John Lott had on this post on Cam & Company is [available here](#) (SiriusXM Channel 125).


Original post: Every place that has been banned guns (either all guns or all handguns) has seen murder rates go up. You cannot point to one place where murder rates have fallen, whether it's Chicago or D.C. or even island nations such as England, Jamaica, or Ireland.

For an example of homicide rates before and after a ban, take the case of the handgun ban in England and Wales in January 1997 (source [here](#) see Table 1.01 and the column marked "Offences currently recorded as homicide per million population"). After the ban, clearly homicide rates bounce around over time, but there is only one year (2010) where the homicide rate is lower than it was in 1996. The immediate effect was about a 50 percent increase in homicide rates. Firearm homicide rate had almost [doubled](#) between 1996 and 2002 (see [here](#) p. 11). The homicide and firearm homicide rates only began falling when there was a large increase in the number of police officers during 2003 and 2004. Despite the [huge increase](#) in the number of police, the murder rate still remained slightly higher than the immediate pre-ban rate.





There are a lot of issues about how different countries measure homicide or murders differently, but that isn't really relevant for the discussion here as we are talking about changes over time within a country.






Figure 10.18. Ireland's murder rate. While murder rates in the United States and Jamaica include both murders and manslaughter, Ireland's numbers include only murder. Including manslaughter would probably roughly double the measured murder rate for Ireland for most years. (Murder rate data are not available for 1996.)



Figure 10.19. Jamaica's murder rate. (Murder rate data are not available for 1968 and 1969.)

Jamaica's crime data were obtained from a variety of sources. Its murder data from 1960 to 1967 were obtained from Terry Lacey, *Violence and Politics in Jamaica, 1960–70* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977). Professor Gary Mauser obtained the data from 1970 to 2000 from a Professor A. Francis in Jamaica and the data from 2001 to 2006 from the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (<http://www.statinja.com/stats.html>). Jamaica's population estimates were obtained from

NationMaster.com (http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/peo_pop-people-population&date=1975).

How about for DC and Chicago (Figures taken from [More Guns, Less Crime](#))?




Figure 10.14. Chicago's murder rate relative to the other nine largest cities (weighted by population)




Figure 10.7. Changes in DC's murder rate relative to the other forty-eight largest cities (excluding Chicago from top fifty list, weighted by population)

The raw data for DC over a long period of time is [available here](#) (the crime rates are available on the bottom half of the screen).

Now Australia didn't have a complete ban on guns, they didn't even ban all semi-automatic guns, but a discussion on the changes in [their crime rates from their gun buyback is available here](#) (see [also here](#)).

Much of the debate over gun control focuses on what is called "cross-sectional" data. That is crime rates are examined at one particular point of time across different places. Here are two paragraphs from John Lott's [The Bias Against Guns](#) that explain the basic problem with cross-sectional analysis.

First, the cross-sectional studies: Suppose for the sake of argument that high-crime countries are the ones that most frequently adopt the most stringent gun control laws. Suppose further, for the sake of argument, that gun control indeed lowers crime, but not by enough to reduce rates to the same low levels prevailing in the majority of countries that did not adopt the laws. Looking across countries, it would then falsely appear that stricter gun control resulted in higher crime. Economists

refer to this as an “endogeneity” problem. The adoption of the policy is a reaction to other events (that is, “endogenous”), in this case crime. To resolve this, one must examine how the high-crime areas that chose to adopt the controls changed over time—not only relative to their own past levels but also relative to areas that did not institute such controls.

Unfortunately, many contemporary discussions rely on misinterpretations of cross-sectional data. The *New York Times* recently conducted a cross-sectional study of murder rates in states with and without the death penalty, and found that “Indeed, 10 of the 12 states without capital punishment have homicide rates below the national average, Federal Bureau of Investigation data shows, while half the states with the death penalty have homicide rates above the national average.” However, they erroneously concluded that the death penalty did not deter murder. The problem is that the states without the death penalty (Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Vermont) have long enjoyed relatively low murder rates, something that might well have more to do with other factors than the death penalty. Instead one must compare, over time, how murder rates change in the two groups – those adopting the death penalty and those that did not.

More information is available in chapters 2 and 10 of [More Guns, Less Crime](#) (University of Chicago Press, 2010, third edition).

A cross country comparison and the problems with such a comparison is [available here](#).

NATIONAL REVIEW

Bogus Gun-Control Numbers

To prove that concealed handguns are dangerous, the Violence Policy Center cooks the books.

By John R. Lott Jr. — April 29, 2014

People walking the streets armed with guns are dangerous, right? With all 50 states finally allowing concealed handguns to at least some degree and with over 11 million Americans now having permits to carry them, this question ought to have been settled. In fact, despite continued attacks by gun-control organizations, permit holders almost never commit violent crimes with their guns.

Nonetheless, this past week, just in time for the NRA convention, gun-control advocates were at it again, touting ridiculous charges that concealed-carry permits were responsible for 636 deaths nationwide over the seven years from May 2007 to March 2014.

The Violence Policy Center regularly puts out these bogus charges in a report called “Concealed Carry Killers.” But how does it claim to arrive at these numbers?

The VPC collects cases of permit holders’ abusing their permitted concealed handguns for each state. For Michigan, for example, it cites state-police reports on permit holders indicating that 185 died from suicide during the period 2007 through 2012. Surely some alarm bells should have gone off, with Michigan suicides supposedly making up 29 percent of all 636 deaths nationwide the VPC attributed to permitted concealed handguns.

But more importantly, the suicides are not in any meaningful way linked to the issue of carrying a permitted concealed handgun outside of one’s home. If you look at page 2 in the latest report from the Michigan State Police, you will see that in the listing of suicides, there is no indication of specific cause of death. The report merely notes that 56 permit holders committed suicide, without saying whether any or all of them used a gun. Interestingly, the suicide rate among permit holders in Michigan in 2010 (13.3 per 100,000 permit holders) is lower than the rate in the general adult population (16.30). But

typically suicides — with or without guns — take place at home. So, again, what would these numbers have to do with the concealed-carry debate?

Now a look at the murder and manslaughter statistics as presented by the Violence Policy Center report. These cases would surely be relevant, but they are not counted correctly. This is how the Michigan State Police report the numbers:

2007–08: Pending 5, Convicted 0

2008–09: Pending 0, Convicted 1

2009–10: Pending 1, Convicted 2

2010–11: Pending 5, Convicted 4

2011–12: Pending 3, Convicted 4

Total: Pending 14, Convicted 11

In other words, during 2007–08, five cases were pending and there were no convictions. The Violence Policy Center makes several fundamental mistakes. First, it can't add simple numbers up correctly. While the VPC claims 20 pending cases and 14 convictions, the Michigan State Police report a total of 14 and 11 cases respectively.

Secondly, since it can take years for a murder case to go to trial, some of the homicides may have occurred well before 2007. In addition, the Michigan State Police report doesn't provide information on how the murder was committed, so gun murders make up only a portion of this total.

Third, and perhaps the worst mistake, the Violence Policy Center actually adds the “pending” and “conviction” numbers together. Convictions are obviously what should be counted. After all, some of the “pending” cases do not result in a conviction, and adding them more than doubles the total number.

There is even more numerical nonsense. The Violence Policy Center then adds in twelve cases that were reported in newspapers and other media over the same years. However, those cases had already been counted in the official statistics by the Michigan State Police.

It seems the Violence Policy Center piles on any numbers that it can get hold of, anything that can be related to concealed-carry holders. For instance, it counts legitimate self-defense cases in which no charges were filed or the permit holder was charged and later exonerated.

All in all, the VPC has managed to triple-count claimed cases of permit holders killing people, and the vast majority of cases it includes in its list — such as legitimate self-defense shootings or suicides not related to permitted concealed handguns — shouldn't be counted to begin with.

Yet, put aside all these problems for a moment. Assume, for the sake of argument, that the Violence Policy Center's claim that concealed-handgun permits were responsible for 636 deaths in seven years is correct. One has to note that there are over 11 million concealed-handgun permits in the U.S. right now. With an annual number of deaths of 90, that means 0.00083 percent of concealed-carry permit holders were responsible for a shooting death each year. Removing suicides from the total reduces the rate even more, to 0.00058 percent.

The conjuring up of bogus numbers like these has become a mainstay of gun-control groups. That also includes the “studies” financed by Michael Bloomberg's millions. However, a group of researchers, of whom I am one, are setting up the Crime Prevention Research Center to uncover and counter these misleading claims.

— *John R. Lott Jr. is the president of the Crime Prevention Research Center and the author of More Guns, Less Crime (University of Chicago Press, 2010, 3rd edition).*

CRIME PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER

MORE MISLEADING INFORMATION FROM BLOOMBERG'S EVERYTOWN FOR GUN SAFETY ON GUNS: "ANALYSIS OF RECENT MASS SHOOTINGS," SHOWING HOW MASS PUBLIC SHOOTINGS KEEP OCCURRING IN GUN-FREE ZONES

1 SEP , 2014

Why does anyone pay attention to Bloomberg's claims on guns? Take their previous discussions on mass public shootings. As we have previously pointed out, Bloomberg's groups have made serious errors on the [number](#) (see [also here](#)) and [trends](#) of school shootings. Well, that hasn't stopped the media from sympathetically covering Everytown for Gun Safety's [recent report on mass shootings](#) (see [also here](#)).

Everytown for Gun Safety's [recent report on mass shootings](#) contains many errors. In addition, it muddies the discussion on mass public shootings by including shootings in private homes along with ones in public places, and the vast majority of the cases they include are in private homes. But there is a distinction between what motivates mass public shooters who are committing their crimes to get media attention and those who engage in attacks in private residences.

There are only two mass public shootings since at least 1950 that have not been part of some other crime where at least four people have been killed in an area where civilians are generally allowed to have guns. These are the [International House of Pancakes restaurant in Carson City, Nevada on September 6, 2011](#) and the [Gabrielle Giffords shooting in Tucson, Arizona on January 8, 2011](#)

Thus, while CPRC's research and that by [Landes and Lott](#) looks at Mass public shootings (focusing on the killings where the point of the attack is simply to kill as many people as possible), Bloomberg's numbers overwhelmingly involve killings that have occurred within residences.

Here are some general points about how to classify mass public shootings that have occurred in gun-free zones.

1) A lot of work is involved in obtaining information on whether the attacks occurred in gun-free zones. This includes calling the [businesses](#) or [other facilities](#) involved. But many times those organizations are uncooperative and in those cases much time is spent contacting individuals in the area of the attack and asking them if they can [provide pictures](#) or other information on the facilities. Indeed, [the media virtually always refuses to mention whether the attack occurred in a gun-free zone](#).

Unfortunately, Everytown for Gun Safety/Mayors Against Illegal Guns did not do this work, and they have also inaccurately stated, ignored, or simply missed facts that are readily available in news stories.

2) What motivates mass public shootings where the killer is trying to kill or injure as many people as possible to get publicity is quite different from what motivates robbers or gang fights (see [Lott and Landes](#)). The issue of gun-free zones is particularly important for mass public shootings.

3) The word "public" is also key to these cases. Shootings that occur in people's homes will often involve killers who know if guns are owned in the home. And if there is a gun in the home, the killer will know who has access to it.

4) There is also the distinction between right-to-carry and may-issue laws. If virtually no one, especially no civilian, is allowed to get a concealed handgun permit as occurs in most may-issue jurisdictions, the area is essentially a gun-free zone.

The Bloomberg discussions are indented and put in block quotes. After the quotes there is an explanation for why they shouldn't be counted as mass public shootings. The Bloomberg report doesn't number these events, but we will assign numbers just to make them easier to reference.

1) Terrell, TX, 10/28/13: The shooter shot and killed his mother, his aunt, two acquaintances, and a store clerk in a spree of attacks before he was captured by police. He killed the first four victims in their respective homes and the final one — the clerk — at Ali's Market on W. Moore Avenue, apparently in an attempt to rob the store.

Shooter Name: Charles Everett Brownlow Jr.

Gun details: Unknown

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: The shooter had a criminal record that prohibited him from possessing firearms. He was convicted of burglarizing a vehicle in 1996, a Class A misdemeanor, and convicted of felony burglary in 1997. In 2008 he was served a three-year sentence for unlawful possession of a firearm and in 2011 he was convicted of misdemeanor assault against a family member.

Not a gun-free zone: The manager of the Ali's Market reported that customer's are allowed to carry firearms in the store.

FACTS: There was not a mass public shooting at Ali's Market. Only one person was killed at that store. Permitted concealed handguns can deter many attacks from occurring and can limit the harm that does occur. But permit holders aren't expected to limit the harm for those attacks that do occur to zero. Permitted concealed handguns deter mass shootings because they can limit the harm and take away the incentive that these killers obtain from their warped desire to get media attention.

2) Washington, DC, 9/16/13: The alleged shooter, who was a civilian contractor and former non-combat military, killed twelve and wounded three more in an attack on Building 197 at the Navy Yard.

Shooter Name: Aaron Alexis, 34

Gun details: The shooter arrived with a shotgun and also obtained a handgun from one a security guard that he killed.

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Two days before the incident the shooter passed a National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) at the licensed gun dealer Sharpshooters in Lorton, VA, and purchased the shotgun.

Prohibiting criteria: The shooter had been arrested at least three times including: in September 2010 in Fort Worth, Texas for shooting a firearm into a neighbor's apartment; in August 2008 in Dekalb County, Georgia for disorderly conduct; and in 2004 in Seattle, Washington for shooting out the tires of another man's vehicle. But court records do not indicate he was convicted in any of these cases, and this record did not prohibit him from buying guns. He had also received treatment for mental health conditions at two VA hospitals beginning in August, 2013 following an incident where he called Newport Rhode Island Policeto report hearing voices. But these incidents did not rise to the level of prohibiting from buying guns. And during his military service he was reportedly cited on at least eight occasions for misconduct ranging from traffic tickets and showing up late for work to insubordination, extended absences from work, and disorderly conduct. On account of this the Navy sought to offer him a "general discharge" but he was

ultimately honorably discharged through the early-enlisted transition program in January 2011.

Not a gun-free zone: There were armed guards at the Washington Navy Yard, and the shooter was familiar with the premises, so he did not select it as a target on the presumption he would not face armed resistance. In fact, the shooter reportedly used a gun that he took from a guard after killing him.

FACTS: Whether one is looking at the attacks at the Washington Navy Yard or Fort Hood, letting military police carry guns is much different than letting other soldiers protect themselves. While military police tend to be at the entrances to military bases, they largely patrol the rest of the base in the same way that police patrol a city. One no more expects military police to instantly arrive at the scene of a mass public shooting than one expects police to arrive at one. In Alexis' attack, since he worked at the Navy Yard, he knew what entrance to go to that would have only one guard and that is where he went. For related discussions see [here](#) and [here](#).

3) Crab Orchard, TN, 9/11/13: The shooters killed a woman and three teenagers, apparently during an attempted robbery during a marijuana exchange. The victims' bodies were discovered in a car parked along the side of the road in the Renegade Mountain resort community near Crossville.

Shooter Name: Jacob Allen Bennett, 26 and Brittany Lina Yvonn Moser, 25

Gun details: Handgun

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: Bennett was prohibited from possessing firearms. In 2010 he received a 6-year prison sentence for charges of theft, forgery, and possession of a handgun during a felony, but was paroled on March 4, 2013. The Cumberland County sheriff's office estimated they had previously arrested Bennett five times.

Not a gun-free zone: We could find no evidence that permit holders were prohibited from carrying guns in this area. In Tennessee, concealed weapons would be prohibited only if the county or municipality declared itself a gun-free zone.

FACTS: This shooting was part of another crime, a robbery of illegal marijuana (see point 2 in the introduction). It was not a mass public shooting where the point of the crime was to kill as many people as possible so as to obtain media coverage.

4) Herkimer, NY, 4/13/13: The shooter killed two people and critically wounded one at John's Barber Shop and then killed two more people at Gaffey's Fast Lube, a car care facility. He was killed by responding officers.

Shooter Name: Kurt Myers, 64

Gun details: According to the police superintendent, Myers used a shotgun.

Additional guns and ammunition were found by emergency crews after Myers set fire to the apartment.

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: There is no reason to believe Myers was prohibited him from possessing a gun. He was arrested in 1973 for drunk driving.

Not a gun-free zone: Gaffey's Fast Lube does not have a specific policy prohibiting guns and allows permit holders to carry concealed weapons on the premises.

John's Barbershop did not reopen following the shooting but the owner of a neighboring business did not recall the barbershop having any explicit firearm policy or ban, which would have been required to prohibit customers from carrying guns on the premises.

FACTS: New York is a may issue state, not a right-to-carry state. We don't yet have the number of civilian concealed carry permits, but they seem to be extremely rare. The possession of a handgun in New York State requires a NYS Pistol Permit. In 2012 there were only 154 permits issued to own a pistol in Herkimer county. Over the previous five years, there were 667 permits issued, though not all over those permits own a handgun would have been active at the beginning of 2013. When talking to the pistol permit office, Lott was told that there were zero restricted licenses that allowed people to carry for business purposes (concealed carry licenses that allow a business owner to carry in the course of doing business) and zero restricted for self defense purposes (e.g., a woman who is being actively stalked).

Report from February 2013: At this point, the Everytown for Gun Safety report mainly repeats cases previously discussed by Bloomberg's Mayors Against Illegal Guns on MASS SHOOTING INCIDENTS, JANUARY 2009-JANUARY 2013. An earlier report on the problems with their claims about the attacks not being in gun-free zones was never corrected. Here is the analysis of these previous cases.

5) Geneva County, AL, 3/10/09: The shooter killed ten, including four members of his family, before killing himself.

Shooter Name: Michael Kenneth McLendon, 28

Gun details: Bushmaster AR-15, SKS Rifle, Shotgun, and .38 Pistol

Ammo details: Police recovered additional ammunition from his vehicle after the shooting.

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: The shooter had no criminal record and there is no indication he was prohibited from owning a gun.

Not a gun-free zone: It was lawful to carry a firearm in the public intersection and gas station where two of the individuals were shot.

FACTS: Nine people were killed by McLendon. **In the first shooting in a house on Pullum Street, five people were killed.** There was also a second shooting in another home that left two people dead. Neither were public places. It is true that two individuals were killed in separate public places as McLendon was driving along, but that is not a multiple victim public shooting in which at least four are killed in a public place. However, MAIG's report implies that all these shootings occurred in a public places.

6) Lakewood, WA, 11/29/09: The shooter killed four police officers in a Tacoma Coffee shop, eluding police for two days before being killed as he fled.

Shooter Name: Maurice Clemmons, 37

Gun details: When he was killed, he was in possession of the handgun of one of the officers he had killed.

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: The shooter was prohibited from purchasing a firearm, having been charged with at least 13 felonies across two states. He had posted bail for raping a child just six days before the attack.

Not a gun-free zone: The police officers were armed at the time of the shooting.

FACTS: Lott and Landes didn't define gun-free zones in terms of whether police were allowed to carry guns, but **whether private citizens are able to readily obtain concealed handguns for their protection.** What is important is that the coffee shop **was posted to prevent concealed carry permit holders from carrying.** Presumably MAIG understood this point and that is the reason why they focused on police officers being able to carry in this venue. Obviously, however, on-duty police can carry any place. The problem for uniformed police is that they provide an easily identifiable target and it is easy to take them out. Possibly if the attacker had to worry about permit holders who he could not identify, it would have dissuaded him from attacking. While Lott had checked when this event originally occurred, he reconfirmed this information with Dave Workman who lived nearby via email on January 8, 2013.

7) Carthage, NC, 3/29/09: The shooter opened fire at a nursing home where his estranged wife worked, killing eight and injuring three before he was shot and arrested by a police officer.

Shooter Name: Robert Stewart, 45

Gun details: .357 Magnum handgun and Winchester 1300 shotgun

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: The guns were acquired legally from a local sporting good store.

Prohibiting criteria: There is no indication the Stewart was prohibited from owning a gun.

Not a gun-free zone: We could find no indication that the property-owner forbid carrying of firearms on their property.

FACTS: This facility informed Lott in April 2009 that they did not allow guns in the facility for either the people living there or the staff. He called up to ask what their policies had been before the attack.

Here are places listed by Bloomberg's group that may have allowed people with permits to carry in places but that made it extremely difficult or impossible for civilians to get a concealed handgun permit.

8) Boston, MA, 09/28/10: The shooter killed four and wounded one during a drug-related robbery.

Shooter Name: Edward Washington, 33, and Dwayne Moore, 35, were both charged in the killings. Washington was acquitted. In Moore's first trial, the jury deadlocked 11-1 in favor of his guilt, but he was later convicted in a retrial.

Gun details: 40-caliber Iberia handgun and 9mm Cobray semiautomatic. The Cobray has not been recovered, but the weapon was identified based on recovered bullets and shell casings.

Ammo details: 14 rounds fired

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: Unknown

Not a gun free zone: A person with a Massachusetts Class A license could lawfully carry a firearm in this area.

9) Buffalo, NY, 8/14/10: The shooter opened fire on a group of people outside a bar, killing four and wounding four others.

Shooter Name: Riccardo McCray, 24

Gun details: Unknown

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: McCray had been arrested earlier that year on felony drug charges and the previous year for having a loaded rifle in his car. If he was found guilty of either crime, he would have been prohibited from possessing firearms.

Not a gun-free zone: We could find no indication that it was unlawful to carry a firearm in the area.

10) Northridge, CA, 12/2/12: The shooter arrived at an unlicensed boarding house on Devonshire street, reportedly in search of his girlfriend, and after a dispute shot and killed four people outside.

Shooter Name: Ka Pasasouk, 31

Gun details: semiautomatic handgun

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: The shooter was prohibited from possessing guns, having been convicted for car theft and felony robbery. While on probation in September 2012, he was arrested again for possession of methamphetamine. According to the district attorney, a prosecutor then released him on probation over the objection of probation officials, who believed he posed a threat to the safety of the community. Not a gun-free zone: Permit holders were not prohibited from carrying guns in this area.

11) East Oakland, CA, 3/21/09: The shooter used a semiautomatic handgun to kill two police officers after they stopped his car and then fled on foot to an apartment where he killed two SWAT officers with an assault weapon and injured a third before being killed by police.

Shooter Name: Lovelle Mixon

Gun details: 9mm semiautomatic handgun and SKS assault-style rifle

Ammo details: Police said the assault weapon had a high-capacity magazine.

Gun acquired: The shooter took part in a home invasion robbery in Modesto, CA, on February 21 2009 in which a rifle was reported stolen. Police did not comment on whether the stolen rifle was the one used in the shooting.

Prohibiting criteria: The shooter had a lengthy criminal history, including a conviction for armed battery, which would have prohibited him from possessing a gun, and he was on parole for assault with a deadly weapon at the time of the shootings.

Not a gun-free zone: Two of the victims were shot on a public roadway — the 7400 block of Macarthur Boulevard in East Oakland — where no state law would have prohibited a citizen with the appropriate permit to carry a gun. All of the police officers killed in the incident were armed.

12) Medford, NY, 6/9/11: The shooter killed four people at a pharmacy, Haven Drugs, and stole thousands of hydrocodone pills before fleeing in a vehicle. During the trial he acknowledged that he and his wife were addicted to prescription medication.

Shooter Name: David Laffer

Gun details: A .45 caliber handgun was used in the shooting. Several other legally registered guns were also recovered from the shooter's home.

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: The gun was legally registered to the shooter, and there is no evidence he was prohibited from possessing a gun. But five months before the shooting, Suffolk County Detective Kenneth Ripp investigated an identity theft claim made by the shooter's mother, who said the shooter had stolen her debit card. After questioning the shooter and his mother, Ripp advised the Suffolk County Pistol License Bureau that the shooter was dangerous and that his guns should be confiscated. Despite Ripp's report, the guns were not removed.

Not a gun-free zone: We could find no evidence that Haven Drugs posted a sign or had a policy prohibiting the carrying of firearms. Current employees declined to comment.

13) Brockport, NY, 2/14/09: The shooter killed a nurse in the Lakeside Memorial Hospital parking lot and a motorist who intervened, and wounded the motorist's girlfriend. The shooter had been fired from the hospital after the nurse filed a sexual harassment complaint against him. He then drove 50 miles and killed another nurse — who had filed a similar complaint against the shooter — and her husband in their home.

Shooter Name: Frank Garcia, 34

Gun details: .40 caliber Glock handgun

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: There is no evidence that the shooter was prohibited from owning a gun. However, he had applied for concealed carry permits and been denied three times. In his 1995 application, he omitted information about his criminal record — including arrests for criminal possession of a weapon, assault, and harassment. In 2001 and 2006 he made further omissions, and was evaluated as lacking moral character. But in 2007 a judge reversed the denial and granted Garcia a concealed weapon permit.

Not a gun-free zone: We found no indication that permit holders were prohibited from carrying guns in this area at the time of the incident.

FACTS: All these cities either forbid or make it incredibly difficult for law-abiding citizens to carry concealed handguns for protection. In Boston, it is so bad that even off-duty and retired police are regularly denied unrestricted license to carry permits. Northridge, CA is part of Los Angeles County, which refuses to issue permits to regular citizens. In September 2011, there were 240 permits in all of Los Angeles County when the population was about 7.6 million adults. That equals a permit rate of 0.0032%. In addition, the attack was at a residential dwelling, not a public place.

Similarly, East Oakland, California is part of Alameda County. In 2010, Alameda County had granted concealed handgun permits to 75 people out of an 1,182,534 — a permit rate of 0.006%.

Just as with Herkimer, NY; Medford in Suffolk County, New York, and Brockport in Monroe County, New York were similarly very restrictive in issuing may issue permits. In Suffolk County, the police and sheriff's departments each handle permits in half of the permits for the county. For the sheriff's office, Robert E. Draffin (the Suffolk County Sheriff's Freedom of information officer) informed us that were 569 sportsman permits (limited to carrying to or from a shooting range or to go hunting) and 79 business permits (where a business owner is allowed to carry only in the course of doing business). For the police department, Inspector Derrocco (613-852-6000, ask for pistol permit department) noted the department "virtually never gives out permits for anything other than sportsman to carry to and from the range and for premises and dwellings." Given that there are about 1.2 million adults in Suffolk County, even assuming that the police department issued permits at the same rate as the sheriff's office, this implies a permit rate of about 0.1 percent and virtually none of these permits would have allowed a concealed handgun to be carried in the pharmacy where the attack occurred. In addition, it should be mentioned that Riccardo McCray was a gang member.

14) Oak Creek, WI, 8/5/12: The shooter killed six people at a Sikh temple and injured three others, including a responding police officer, before killing himself.

Shooter Name: Wade Michael Page, 40

Gun details: 9mm semiautomatic handgun

Ammo details: Page reportedly bought three 19-round magazines when he purchased the gun.

Gun acquired: Page acquired the gun at a local gun shop a week before the shooting.

Prohibiting criteria: Page was involved with the white supremacist movement but he does not appear to have been prohibited from purchasing a gun. Federal officials investigated Page's ties to supremacist groups more than once prior to the shooting, but did not collect enough evidence to open an investigation.

FACTS: From FoxNews.com: "No guns [were] allowed in the temple," Kulbir Singh, an attendee of the Sikh Temple of Wisconsin, told FoxNews.com. "Everyone knows that it's not allowed, anywhere in the temple."

15) Norcross, GA, 2/22/12: The shooter returned to a Korean spa from which he'd been kicked out after an altercation, where he shot and killed two of his sisters and their husbands before committing suicide.

Shooter Name: Jeong Soo Paek, 59

Gun details: .45 caliber handgun

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Police reported that he acquired the gun legally.

Prohibiting criteria: Paek does not appear to have been prohibited, although he had allegedly served two months in jail for assaulting his sister six years earlier.

Not a gun-free zone: We could find no indication that the property owner forbade possession of a firearm on their property.

FACTS: Lott spoke with someone at the spa after the attack and was told that the killer knew "nobody there had a gun." The person at the spa indicated that they were sure that neither the sisters nor their husbands had guns at the spa and that the killer who was the brother of the women knew that was the case. While the official policy at the spa isn't clear because the conversation was very short, the important thing was that the killer knew that there were no guns for people to defend themselves there. This was a small family owned establishment so it is most likely that this was the official policy of the family. Note that they have the wrong date on this event. (UPDATE: Mayors Against Illegal Guns originally claimed that this event occurred on February 22nd, but the event **actually occurred** on February 20, 2012. After Lott wrote his analysis, they corrected the data but did not update their discussion of gun-free zones.) Note also that the business has since **closed**.

16) Hialeah, FL, 6/6/10: The shooter killed four women, including his wife — who had just separated from him. He injured three others before shooting and killing himself. The shooting occurred in Yoyito-Cafe Restaurant, where the shooter's wife was employed as a waitress, and in the parking lot immediately outside.

Shooter Name: Gerardo Regalado, 38

Gun details: .45 caliber handgun

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: The shooter had a concealed weapons permit.

Prohibiting criteria: There is no evidence that the shooter was prohibited from owning a gun. However, relatives said the shooter had abused and terrorized women in the past, and had been imprisoned in Cuba for a particularly violent incident, but he did not have a criminal record in the United States.

Not a gun-free zone: We could find no indication that guns were prohibited in this area. Guns are prohibited in Florida restaurants only in areas primarily devoted to the serving of alcohol.

FACTS: Strangely, while Bloomberg's group mentions that the restaurants that get 50 percent of their revenue from alcohol, they didn't actually get an check whether that was the case for this

restaurant, which apparently was at the time [a very popular venue for parties serving alcohol](#). If Bloomberg's group had checked, they would have found that it was a gun-free zone.

17) Washington, DC, 3/30/10: Three gunmen killed four and wounded five in retaliation for an-other murder.

Shooter Name: Nathaniel D. Simms, 26; Orlando Carter, 20, and unnamed 14-year-old juvenile

Gun details: An AK-47 assault rifle and 9mm and .45-caliber handguns

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Prohibiting criteria: The adults were reported to have lengthy criminal histories, which prohibited them from purchasing guns, and the 14-year-old was too young to purchase or own a gun.

FACTS: This is one case where Bloomberg's Everytown doesn't include this as a place that allows guns (obviously DC completely bans the carrying of concealed handguns), we include it here simply as an example of one of the many cases where they are including what are pretty obviously [a drive-by](#) gang shootings. Even the DC police chief, Cathy Lanier, indicated that it was a "[gang retaliation](#)." The AK-47 was used to spray bullets into a group in another gang's territory in retaliation for another murder. We are focused on cases identified by Everytown as occurring in gun-free zones, but gang shootings, while are obviously quite different from the types of mass public shootings that garner national attention.

18) Mount Airy, NC, 11/1/09: The shooter killed four people outside a television store before eventually surrendering to the police.

Shooter Name: Marcos Chavez Gonzalez, 29

Gun details: Assault rifle

Ammo details: Unknown

Gun acquired: Unknown

Not a gun-free zone: It was lawful to carry a firearm in the area of the shooting.

FACTS: Indications are that the attack was [part of gang related crime](#). As explained above, [that would exclude it from the mass public shootings done specifically to harm people as distinct from other types of violent crime](#).

The report by John Lott and Bill Landes on gun-free zones that covers earlier years is [available here](#).

There are a few other cases that we have collected that we will link to here.

Yet another mall shooting where guns were banned: Monroeville Mall near Pittsburgh, February 8, 2015

The Melbourne Square Mall in Florida is yet another gun-free zone, January 17, 2015

Seattle Pacific University shooting took place in yet another gun-free zone, June 5, 2014

6 killed, seven wounded in Mass Public Shooting in Santa Barbara, a giant gun-free zone, May 24, 2014

Mass shooting yesterday at FedEx facility in Kennesaw Georgia took place in yet another "gun-free zone", April 30, 2014

Maryland Mall Shooting at yet another gun free zone, January 25, 2014

The Azana Salon & Spa shooting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (November, 2012).

Aurora, Colorado movie theater shooting (July, 2012).

Another shooting in a another gun free zone: Binghamton, NY (April, 2009).

Trolley Square Mall in Utah (February, 2007).

Omaha, Nebraska mall shooting (December 2007).

John Lott has about 327 postings on gun-free zones [available here](#).

CPRC original research, mass public shootings, Michael Bloomberg



Washington Post Claims 29 Mass Murders By Concealed Carriers... But They LIED.

Posted by [Bob Owens](#) on October 26, 2015 at 4:50 pm

Christopher Ingraham was apparently hired by the *Washington Post* to be the gun control propagandist for their so-called "Wonkblog," and seems to find himself debunked on our pages with boring regularity.

Today, **he attempted to assert that concealed carry permit holders have committed 29 mass murders**, using the propaganda of the Violence Policy Center.

Let's take a look at the actual claims made by VPC... something Ingraham clearly didn't do.

Known mass shootings committed by concealed carry permit holders since 2007



WAPQ.ST/**WONKBLOG**

Source: Violence Policy Center

Icons: Larisa Skosyrsk, The Noun Project

- Michael Joe Hood shot three in 2010, not 2007. This was not a mass shooting (the FBI definition of a mass shooting is four or more), and with his documented history of mental illness, Hood should not have had a concealed carry permit, and there is some dispute over whether he did. He did not use a concealed weapon.
- Jason Hamilton had a previous domestic violence conviction, and should not have been able to own any firearms. His attack did not involve concealed weapons. We can find no credible confirmation at all that Hamilton had title II weapons or a concealed carry permit, as VPC claims via a singular erroneous news report.
- Terrance Hough, a Cleveland firefighter who shot five people for setting off fireworks in the street, did not use a concealed weapon.
- Guillermo Zarabozo really did use a concealed weapon to murder four people in an act of piracy on the high seas. He is the first person on this list with a concealed carry permit who used a concealed weapon to commit mass murder.

- Charles Johnson shot three people. This was not a mass shooting.
- Aaron Jackson murdered his wife and two children before committing suicide. He did not use a concealed weapon.
- Troy Brake shot three people to death, and beat a fourth victim to death. This again, was not a mass shooting by FBI standards, although it was a mass killing.
- Frank Garcia did not have a concealed carry permit at all. He had a handgun ownership permit only.
- Michael McLendon carried out a horrific attack that killed ten people before he took his own life. None of his victims was shot by a handgun, concealed or otherwise.
- Jiverly Wong was a concealed carry permit holder who used concealed weapons to commit a mass shooting. He is the second person on this list with a concealed carry permit who used a concealed weapon to commit mass murder.
- Richard Poplowski ambushed police officers who came to his home with a rifle. He did not use a concealed weapon in his firefight with police.
- George Sodini is the third person on this list with a concealed carry permit who used concealed weapons to commit mass murder.
- Paul Michael Merhige is the fourth person on this list with a concealed carry permit who used concealed weapons to commit mass murder.
- William Maxwell murdered his wife and two children with a handgun before committing suicide. The handgun was not concealed, and his concealed carry permit was irrelevant.
- Justin Matern murdered his estranged wife and children before committing suicide. He did have a concealed handgun permit, but it was irrelevant to the crimes.
- Christopher Speight did kill eight people and injure several more. With a rifle. That he had a concealed carry permit was irrelevant to the crimes he committed.
- Gerardo Regalado “came in running” with handgun when he shot seven women in Hialeah, Florida. His handgun was not concealed prior to the attack.
- Omar Thorton was fired for theft, then returned to the job and shot eight co-workers to death before taking his life. He is the fifth person on this list with a concealed carry permit who used concealed weapons to commit mass murder.
- I cannot find any evidence that Tan Do had a concealed carry permit.
- Ian Stawiki is the sixth person on this list with a concealed carry permit who used concealed weapons to commit mass murder.
- Paul Clifford Moore shot three people; again, this is not a mass killing by FBI standards. He retrieved a weapon from inside his own home and used it inside his own home against the victims. Concealed carry played no part in the murders.

- Kevin Cleeves shot three people... once again, the VPC is adding crimes that are not mass killings. Because of a prior domestic violence conviction in Arizona, Cleeves was not eligible to possess or use a firearm, much less have a concealed carry permit.
- Andrew Engeldinger did NOT have a concealed carry permit when he committed mass murder in Minneapolis. Permit applications were found at his home, but he had not applied.
- Ferdarius Shine did not commit a mass shooting, killing three people. He opened fire in his own home, so a concealed carry permit was irrelevant, and there is some dispute as to whether or not he actually had a permit.
- Dennis Clark murdered four people with a shotgun. Again, concealed carry was not in any way relevant to the crime.
- Pedro Vargas began his attack in his apartment by committing arson, and then started shooting. Again, concealed carry was not relevant to his crimes.
- Aaron Alexis, the Washington Navy Yard killer, used a shotgun in the commission of his crimes. Concealed carry was not relevant.
- Kenneth Allen Keith killed three (again, less than the FBI minimal definition of a mass shooting... during a robbery attempt.
- Craig Hicks killed three Muslims in Chapel Hill, NC. This was not a mass shooting, and concealed carry was not relevant as Hick ambushed the family in their home.

Christopher Ingraham, an anti-gun propagandist apparently hired for that purpose by the *Washington Post*, used a propaganda report by the rabidly anti-gun Violence Policy Center (VPC) to assert concealed carriers were responsible for “at least” mass murders.

Of those 29 alleged mass murders carried out by concealed carry permit holders, precisely six mass murders (using the accepted FBI definition of a mass murder, which is four or more victims) were carried out by concealed carry permit holders using concealed handguns.

Seven of the claimed “29 mass shootings” were not mass shootings.

Between four and eight of the “concealed carry permit holders” did not have concealed carry permits.

The Violence Policy Center has a long and well-documented history of “reports” that are nothing more or less than propaganda.

Any reporter that uses such overt and unverified propaganda should be terminated, along with their editors.

Tags: [Christopher Ingraham](#), [propaganda](#), [Violence Policy Center](#), [Washington Post](#)

Author: **Bob Owens** is the Editor of **BearingArms.com**. He is an alumnus of **Gunsite Academy**, is an instructor with **Project Appleseed**, and is the author of the short e-book, **So You Want to Own a Gun**. He can be found on Twitter **@bob_owens**.

CRIME PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER

FOUR CONCEALED HANDGUN PERMIT HOLDERS USE THEIR GUNS TO STOP VIOLENT CRIMES IN THE LAST WEEK

19 DEC , 2015



Calumet City, Illinois, December 17, 2015

A Calumet City resident prevented a gunman from robbing him by pulling out his gun and firing it at the would-be robber, Midlothian police reported.

The 68-year-old man, who has a concealed-carry gun permit, told police that a man tried to rob him and his 9-year-old son Dec. 5 in the 3300 block of 147th Street.

A witness said he heard people arguing outside, heard four or five gunshots and saw a man running through back yards heading south on Turner Avenue, according to police. . . .

Salt Lake City, Utah, December 15, 2015

He "produced a firearm, pointing it at the EMT first responders," Jensen wrote.

Hunt [an EMT], who has a concealed firearms license, was carrying a gun.

"Logan City detectives and State Crime Lab technicians are still piecing together the sequence of events," Jensen wrote, "but it is believed there was an exchange of gunfire, followed by a rapid retreat of all personnel to positions of cover." . . .



Houston, Texas, December 14, 2015 (see [also here](#))

. . . It was the end to a night out that a group of people and then men who tried to rob them never expected.

"He plugged him, boom, boom, in the chest," said one of the four victims, who did not want to give his name.

The man said he, his brother and two women were about to leave a parking lot near the bars along Washington Avenue and Jackson Hill just after 2 a.m. when two men with handguns walked up to their car.

"He said 'Hey, give me your money,'" recalled the victim. "Well, I don't carry cash, I just have a card. So I put up my card and my ID, and I was like, 'Hey man this is all I have.'"

When the suspect slapped the items out of his hand, the victim says his brother got out of the car and shot the would-be robber twice in the chest. . . .

Evanston, Ohio, December 11, 2015

Cincinnati police said a robbery victim fought back by shooting and killing his 16-year-old assailant late Thursday.

Officers responded to Jonathan Avenue near Fernside Place near Walnut Hills High School about 11:30 p.m. after receiving a report of a shooting, said Captain Russ Neville, the night chief.

When police arrived, they said they a preliminary investigation determined a teen gunman tried to rob one of two contractors rehabilitating a home when the contractor walked outside to retrieve equipment from a van. The contractor turned over his wallet.

The second contractor came to the front door and saw what was occurring, Neville said.

The gunman tried to rob him of his wallet, too, but the man – who has told police he has a permit to carry a concealed gun – pulled out his firearm. . . .



Defensive Gun Use

FBI: Dearborn Heights ISIS supporter planned to attack Detroit church

By **Shawn Ley** (<http://www.clickondetroit.com/author/shawnley>) - Reporter

Posted: 6:45 PM, February 05, 2016

Updated: 9:21 PM, February 05, 2016

DEARBORN HEIGHTS, Mich. - Federal authorities arrested a Dearborn Heights resident for his allegiance to ISIS by monitoring his Twitter account and gun purchases.

The arrest comes as Twitter announced it suspended 125,000 ISIS-related accounts over the past six months.

Khalil Abu-Rayyan, 21, was being watched by the feds since May 2015.

He was even having online conversations with an undercover FBI agent.

"I tried to shoot up a church one day," Abu-Rayyan posted. "It's one of the biggest ones in Detroit. I had it planned out. I bought a bunch of bullets. I practiced reloading and unloading."

Prior to those conversations that began in December 2015, the FBI had been following Abu-Rayyan's Twitter activity.

He had been retweeting, liking and commenting on ISIS propaganda.

In conversation's between Abu-Rayyan and the undercover agent, Abu-Rayyan described his desire to commit a martyrdom operation.

The complaint filed in federal court doesn't specify which Detroit church he was allegedly planning to attack, only that it was close and could seat 6,000 members.

The complaint quotes Abu-Rayyan saying:

"It's easy, and a lot of people go there. Plus people are not allowed to carry guns in church. Plus it would make the news. Everybody would've heard. Honestly I regret not doing it. If I can't do jihad in the Middle East, I would do my jihad over here."

He had also told the undercover agent that a church would be an easy target because people are not allowed to carry guns there and that it would make the news.

The complaint also says that he told the agent he had armed himself with a large knife and would behead people if he needed to.

"It is my dream to behead someone," he told the agent.

Abu-Rayyan is being held on gun and drug charges. He was pulled over Oct. 7, 2015, for speeding when Detroit police discovered a pistol, sleeping pills and marijuana.

A detention hearing is scheduled for Monday afternoon. Terror charges could be added at a later date.

The complaint can be viewed here

(http://media.clickondetroit.com/document_dev/2016/02/05/SKM_C554e16020515520_20

Copyright 2016 by WDIV ClickOnDetroit - All rights reserved.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A Look at the Facts on Gun-Free Zones

By John Lott — October 20, 2015

Some have a hard time accepting that criminals can be deterred from committing crimes. They don't believe that potential mass shooters have second thoughts when faced with the prospect of armed citizens who can fight back. They seem to think that everyday Americans can't help stop attacks.

But it is getting hard to ignore that mass public shooters keep choosing to attack locations where victims can't defend themselves. It's little wonder that gun-control advocates resort to desperate tactics.

There have been a series of articles from *Politico*, the *Huffington Post*, *Slate*, and the *New York Daily News* with similar titles meant to cast doubt on defensive gun use, such as “the myth of the good guy with the gun.”

Since at least 1950, all but two public mass shootings in America have taken place where general citizens are banned from carrying guns. In Europe, there have been no exceptions. Every mass public shooting — and there have been plenty of mass shooting in Europe — has occurred in a gun-free zone. In addition, they have had three of the six worst K–12 school shootings, and Europe experienced by far the worst mass public shooting perpetrated by a single individual (Norway in 2011, which from the shooting alone left 67 people dead and 110 wounded).

Mass killers have even explicitly talked about their desire to attack gun-free zones. The Charleston, S.C., church shooting in June was instead almost a college shooting. But that killer changed his plans after realizing that the College of Charleston had armed guards.

The diary of the “Dark Knight” movie-theater killer, James Holmes, was finally released

just a few months ago. Holmes decided not to attack an airport because of what he described in his diary as its “substantial security.” Out of seven theaters showing the *Batman* movie premiere within 20 minutes of the suspect’s apartment, only one theater banned permitted concealed handguns. That’s the one he attacked.

Or take two cases from last year. Elliot Rodger, who fatally shot three people in Santa Barbara, Calif., explained his reasoning in his 141-page “manifesto.” He ruled out various targets because he worried that someone with a gun would stop his killing spree. Justin Bourque shot to death three people in Canada. On Facebook, Bourque posted a picture of a defenseless victim explaining to killers that guns are prohibited.

Shooters have good reason to be concerned. Here are some examples from the past few years.

— Conyers, Ga., May 31, 2015: A permit holder was walking by a store when he heard shots ring out. Two people were killed. The permit holder started firing, and the killer ran out of the store. Rockdale County Sheriff Eric Levett said: “I believe that if Mr. Scott did not return fire at the suspect, then more of those customers would have [been] hit by a gun[shot]. . . . So, in my opinion he saved other lives in that store.”

— Chicago, April 2015: An Uber driver who had just dropped off a fare “shot and wounded a gunman [Everardo Custodio] who opened fire on a crowd of people.” Assistant State’s Attorney Barry Quinn praised the driver for “acting in self-defense and in the defense of others.”

— Philadelphia, Pa., March 2015: A permit holder was walking by a barber shop when he heard shots fired. He quickly ran into the shop and shot the gunman to death. Police Captain Frank Llewellyn said, “I guess he saved a lot of people in there.”

— Darby, Pa., July 2014: Convicted felon Richard Plotts killed a hospital caseworker and shot the psychiatrist that he was scheduled to meet with. Fortunately, the psychiatrist was a concealed-handgun permit holder and was able to critically wound Plotts. Plotts was still carrying 39 bullets and could have shot many other people.

— Chicago, July 2014: Three gang members fired on four people who had just left a party. Fortunately, one of these four was a military serviceman with a concealed-handgun permit. He was able to return fire and wound the main attacker while keeping the others

at bay. The UK's *Daily Mail reported*, "The night might have had a very different outcome had the incident occurred a year earlier [before Illinois's concealed-handgun law was passed]."

— Plymouth, Pa., September 2012: William Allabaugh critically wounded one man inside a restaurant and murdered a second man on the street outside. Luzerne County Assistant District Attorney Jarrett Ferentino said that without the concealed-handgun permit holder who wounded Allabaugh, "we believe that it could have been much worse that night."

— Spartanburg, S.C., March 2012: Armed with a shotgun, Jesse Gates kicked in a door to his church. Concealed-carry permit holder Aaron Guyton drew his gun and held Gates at gun point, enabling other parishioners to disarm Gates. Spartanburg County Sheriff Chuck Wright called the churchgoers heroes. Though Gates was stopped before anyone was harmed, he was still charged with one count of kidnapping and three counts of pointing and presenting a firearm.

None of these stories received national news coverage. Many received only one or two local news stories. Yet, if a permit holder hadn't stopped these attacks, these cases would surely have received national attention.

There are some other older cases in which permit holders saved the day in remarkable fashion and gained national attention. In December 2007, permit holder and former police officer Jeanne Assam defended her church from Matthew Murray who had just killed four people; Murray carried more than 1,000 rounds of ammunition. Assam was being stalked by an ex at the time and had asked her pastor if she could carry her permitted concealed handgun. The pastor accommodated her request by allowing her and other permit holders to act as volunteer security guards.

The recent *Politico* article "The Myth of the Good Guy with the Gun," by Matt Valentine, not only misses these cases, but mischaracterizes other ones. In the case from Pearl, Miss., where Assistant Principal Joel Myrick stopped the shooter, *Politico* notes that the killer was leaving the high school but fails to mention where he was headed. In fact, the killer was heading across the street to the middle school. *Politico* makes it sound

as though stopping the attack at that point did not save lives. Concerning the Wilcox case in Nevada, the article omits the fact that while Wilcox didn't stop the killers, his intervention gave Walmart customers time to flee from the shooting.

But the deterrent and life-saving effects of concealed-handgun laws on mass public shootings aren't just anecdotal. Bill Landes of the University of Chicago and I gathered data on mass public shootings from 1977 to 1999. We studied 13 different types of gun-control laws as well as the impact of law enforcement, but the only law that had a statistically significant impact on mass public shootings was the passage of right-to-carry laws. Right-to-carry laws reduced both the frequency and the severity of mass public shootings; and to the extent to which mass shootings still occurred, they took place in those tiny areas in the states where permitted concealed handguns were not allowed.

Umpqua Community College, scene of a recent mass shooting, was yet another gun-free zone. Oregon law allows permitted concealed handguns on university property, but public educators have undermined the law by putting bans in faculty and student handbooks. For students and faculty, the threat of expulsion or termination is surely threat enough. Faculty members may lose not only their jobs but also their career. Students are unlikely to ever be admitted to another school and must live with the fact that they will never get the college degree that they were working on.

In Oregon, students and faculty are prohibited from carrying firearms on public university campuses. Only people unaffiliated with the college are allowed to carry. But even they are subject to a 2011 Oregon appeals-court decision that allows schools to ban guns in their buildings.

This ensured that no one — students, faculty, or unaffiliated bystanders — was able to defend against that deadly shooting.

As evidence that the school wasn't a gun-free zone, some have pointed out that one student, a veteran, still carried his gun despite the college's warnings. Unfortunately, the student was far removed from the attack.

But to appreciate the impact of the school rules, you have to realize how exceptionally law-abiding most permit holders are. Permit-holder firearms violations are quite literally one in a million occurrences. Indeed, it is hard to think of any other group that is anywhere near as law-abiding — not even the police. And yet, Matt Valentine in *Politico* would have us believe that “you’re more likely to get shot by an ordinary gun owner who loses his temper than by a mass murderer.”

If you’re going to shoot people, why bother going through the process of getting a permit for a concealed handgun?

Obviously, gun-control advocates don’t think that deterrence works. Despite statements from the killers themselves, they don’t think that rampage shooters factor the presence of guns into their plans. Most of these shooters want to go out with a bang and take a lot of people with them. They tend to be antisocial, attention-starved people. They want their names to be remembered.

These killers know that the more people they murder, the more media attention they will get. And they also know that the longer it takes for someone with a gun to appear on the scene, the more people they can kill.

If you still agree with gun-control advocates about deterrence, ask yourself if you would post a sign on your home announcing it was a gun-free zone. So why do we post these signs at public locations? There’s simply no good reason for it.

— *John Lott is the president of the Crime Prevention Research Center and the author of More Guns, Less Crime.*

Case the Place

- Targets random. The cruel twists of fate are unkind to the misfortunate.
- Method: Bombing X (too regulated & suspicious)
Biological Warfare X (too intricate, requires extensive knowledge, chemistry, and equipment)
Serial Murder X (too personal, too much evidence, easily caught, few kills)
Mass Murder/Spree ✓ (Maximum casualties, easily performed w/ firearms although primitive in nature. No fear of consequences, being caught 99% certain)
- Venue - Airport or Movie Theater.
Airport X Substantial security. Too much of a terrorist history. Terrorism isn't the message. The message is, there is no message. Most folks will misinterpret correlation for causation, namely relationships and work failure as causes. Both were expediting catalysts not the reason, the causation being way stre of mind for the past 15 years.