

Gun Control Research-Wright and Rossi Department of Justice Study
(Deterrent effect of armed citizens upon criminal behavior)

Professors James D. Wright and Peter Rossi of the Social and Demographic Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts conducted a study in 1982 and 1983 paid for by the U.S. Department of Justice. (Professor Rossi was a former President of the American Sociological Association.) The researchers interviewed 1,874 imprisoned felons in ten states.

Professors Wright and Rossi initially believed that strict gun control deterred crime. The results of their research led them to the conclusion that armed citizens have a beneficial effect in reducing criminal behavior and that harsh laws, such as handgun bans could result in criminals using sawed off rifles and shotguns with more deadly results. 88% of the criminals surveyed by Wright and Rossi agreed with the statement that, "A criminal who wants a handgun is going to get one."

A 1986 review of the professors' work, *Armed and Considered Dangerous*, by Raymond G. Kessler of the Department of Criminal Justice of Memphis State University, concluded, "Although *Armed and Considered Dangerous* is not free of methodological problems, it is the best policy-oriented study of criminals and their guns available."

Wright and Rossi reported that:

81% of interviewees agreed that a "smart criminal" will try to determine if a potential victim is armed.

74% indicated that burglars avoided occupied dwellings, because of fear of being shot.

57% said that most criminals feared armed citizens more than the police.

40% of the felons said that they had been deterred from committing a particular crime, because they believed that the potential victim was armed.

57% of the felons who had used guns themselves said that they had encountered potential victims who were armed.

34% of the criminal respondents said that they had been scared off, shot at, wounded, or captured by an armed citizen.

Based on this government-funded research by Wright and Rossi, it would appear that armed citizens do have a deterrent effect on crime.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., Daly, Kathleen, *Under the Gun, Weapons, Crime, and Violence in America*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York, 1983.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., *The Armed Criminal in America*, U.S. Department of Justice, 1985.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., *Armed and Considered Dangerous, a Survey of Felons and their Firearms*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York, 1986.

Research

Professor David Kopel on Defensive Gun Uses

There is usually some discussion concerning defensive gun uses by armed defenders that stop potential spree killings. We sometimes hear that defenders have not stopped a single mass shooting. This is not the case.

Since most spree killings occur in “gun free” zones, more properly named, “criminal-safe free fire zones,” it is remarkable that defenders have been able to react at all in time to defend innocent would-be victims; however, David Kopel, Second Amendment expert, author, law professor, and Director of Research at the Independence Institute, has identified a number of cases where armed citizens have stopped spree killings. To quote Professor Kopel at length:

Over the last 25 years, there have been at least 10 cases in which armed persons have stopped incipient mass murder: a Shoney’s restaurant in Alabama (1991); Pearl High School in Mississippi (1997); a middle school dance in Edinboro, Pennsylvania (1998); Appalachian School of Law in Virginia (2002); Trolley Square Mall in Salt Lake City (2007); New Life Church in Colorado (2007); Players Bar and Grill in Nevada (2008); Sullivan Central High School in Tennessee (2010); Clackamas Mall in Oregon (2012; three days before Newtown); and Sister Marie Lenahan Wellness Center in Darby, Pennsylvania (2014).

Gun prohibitionists insist that armed teachers, or even armed school guards, won’t make a difference, but in the real world, they have- even at the Columbine shooting, where the armed school resource officer (a sheriff’s deputy, in that case) was in the parking lot when the first shots were fired. The officer fired two long-distance shots and drove the killers off the school patio, saving the lives of some of the wounded students there...

The contrasts are striking and tragic. The attempted massacre at New Life Church in Colorado Springs was stopped by a private citizen with a gun; the massacre at South Carolina’s Emanuel AME wasn’t. The mass murder at Pearl High School was stopped by a private citizen (the vice principal) with a gun; the mass murder at Newtown’s elementary school wasn’t stopped until the police arrived. The shootings at Appalachian Law School ended when private citizens (armed students) subdued the gunman; the shootings at Virginia Tech continued until the police arrived. More licensed-carry laws that reduce the number of *pretend* gun-free zones are an effective way to save lives.”

Some arguments put forth by proponents of “criminal-safe free fire zones” rest on the premise that innocents will be caught in a “crossfire” between the defenders and the criminal or terrorist involved in a spree killing. The most deadly position for an innocent adult or child is to be at the mercy of a killer without effective opposition by defenders, who has the time to select his or her victims and slay them without regard for his or her own safety. Even individuals protected by upper body armor are vulnerable to wounds to the pelvic region and legs, or to well-directed head shots. Even rounds deflected by body armor may confuse and distract the criminal or terrorist and allow potential victims to escape.

Kopel, David, *Costs and Consequences of Gun Control*, Cato Institute Policy Analysis # 784, 12-01-2015.

The Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Gun Control Research: The CDC Study

A comprehensive study done by one of the most prestigious scientific organizations in the country has found no statistically significant evidence that gun control has prevented a single violent crime.

If you believe that scientific research is the most logical way to understand the reality of the world, then you pay attention to studies done by groups and individuals. You also give weight to surveys that attempt to draw conclusions by reviewing numbers of studies.

The survey in question was done by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to determine if gun control has made a difference in the crime rate in the United States. There are some important things to remember about this study, which was published in 2003.

The CDC is a governmental organization that generally favors strict gun control laws. The panel doing the review of studies on these laws was largely made up of advocates for restricting or banning the citizen ownership of firearms in the United States.

The purpose of the survey was to evaluate gun control laws with regard to effectiveness in controlling crime and violence. Given the institutional and individual bias in favor of restrictive gun laws, the conclusions of the CDC study are remarkable.

The CDC panel reviewed 51 studies regarding the effectiveness of gun control laws. Based on that review, they could not say that gun laws had prevented a single crime. The survey included, among other issues, studies of the effectiveness of gun and ammunition bans, licensing and registration laws, child access laws, and waiting periods. There was some slight evidence that waiting periods to purchase a firearm may reduce the gun suicide rate in older persons, while not affecting the overall suicide rate.

You would think that out of 51 scientific studies there would be more evidence of the effectiveness of gun control, if gun control were effective in preventing crime and violence. It is a tribute to the honesty of the CDC panel, given their preconceived ideas that they were willing to issue this report at all. The survey did say in somewhat Orwellian fashion that "insufficient evidence to determine effectiveness should not be interpreted as evidence of ineffectiveness." (Just because a review of 51 studies failed to find a significant result, it doesn't mean that the result isn't there.)

The panel recommended additional research. This CDC survey is corroborated by the results of an even more exhaustive review done by the National Academy of Sciences.

Thacker, Steven, M.D., Dixon, Richard E., M.D., *First Reports evaluating the effectiveness of strategies for preventing violence: Firearms Laws*, Task Force on Community Preventive Services, Centers for Disease Control.
<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5214a2.htm>

Firearms Coalition of Colorado PO Box 1454 Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Gun Control Research- Gius

"Shall-Issue" Concealed Carry Laws Seem to Reduce Gun Murder Rates. So-called: "Assault Weapons" Bans Have Minimal or Detrimental Impact on Gun Violence.

A 2014 study entitled, *An examination of the effects of concealed weapons laws and assault weapons bans on state-level murder rates*, by Mark Gius of Quinnipiac University came to the above conclusions after reviewing data on murder rates from 1980 to 2009. The time line for this study is one of the longest ever employed for this type of research. The data used by the researcher was taken from the US Department of Justice Supplementary Homicide Reports.

The results of this study corroborate the findings of the seminal research published by Lott and Mustard in 1997. The extensive 1997 study looked at the effects of "Shall-Issue" concealed carry (CCW) laws in every county in the US, except those counties that had no crime before or after the implementation of such laws during the study period. Lott and Mustard came to the well-known conclusion of *More Guns, Less Violent Crime*.

The 2014 study by Gius also reinforces the conclusions drawn by Koper and Roth in 2004 that the Federal ban on certain types of semi-automatic firearms, often mistakenly called "assault weapons," had "little to no effect on homicide rates associated with firearms."

The 2014 study indicated that states with more restrictive CCW laws had a 10% higher gun-related murder rate than those that did not. This finding also agrees with the results of a study done by Wright and Rossi for the US Department of Justice, which found that criminals tend to be risk averse and are deterred by the threat of armed resistance.

Overall murder rates, as measured by Gius, were 19% higher during the time period when the Federal "Assault Weapons" Ban was in effect than at other times during the study period.

While the author of this research does not assert that his conclusions are definitive evidence, the results of the 2014 Gius study support the position that armed citizens reduce crime and that gun bans have no positive, deterrent effect on criminal behavior.

Gius, Mark, (2014) An examination of the effects of concealed weapons laws and assault weapons bans on state-level murder rates, *Applied Economics Letters*, Volume 21, No. 4, Pages 265-267.

Lott, J. and Mustard, D. (1997) Crime, deterrence, and right-to-carry concealed handguns, *the Journal of Legal Studies*, 26, Pages 1-68.

Lott, John R., Jr., "More Guns, Less Violent Crime," "The Rule of Law Column," *The Wall Street Journal*, NY, NY, August 28th, 1996.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., *The Armed Criminal in America*, U.S. Department of Justice, 1985.

Research

Professor David Kopel on Magazine Bans

David Kopel, Second Amendment expert, author, law professor, and Director of Research at the Independence Institute, has addressed the claim that magazine size limits might reduce casualties during spree killings, because potential victims might be able to overpower or escape a killer or a terrorist, while that person was reloading a firearm with smaller capacity magazines. Professor Kopel:

“Advocates of a ban on standard-capacity magazines assert that while the attacker is changing the magazine, an intended victim might be able to subdue him- yet they cannot point to a single instance where this actually happened. They cite a trilogy of events that happened in Tucson, Arizona (2011), Aurora, Colorado (2012), and Newtown Connecticut (2013). In fact, all of those events involved gun jams, not magazine changes. At Newtown, the criminal changed magazines seven times and no one escaped, but when his rifle jammed, people did escape. Clearing a gun jam takes much longer than changing a magazine. Fixing a gun jam involves all the steps of a magazine change (remove the empty magazine and insert a new one) plus all the intermediate steps of doing whatever is necessary to fix the jam. Similarly, in the Luby’s cafeteria murders (24 dead), the perpetrator replaced magazines multiple times. In the Virginia Tech murders (32 dead), the perpetrator changed magazines 17 times.

Advocates of banning magazines larger than 10 rounds call them ‘high capacity.’ (15 rounds, according to the Colorado ban) “Again, this is incorrect. The standard manufacturer-supplied magazines for many handguns have capacities up to 20 rounds; for rifles, standard magazine capacity is up to 30. This has been true for decades. Indeed, magazines holding more than 10 rounds constitute 47 percent of all magazines sold in the United States in the last quarter century. There are tens of millions of such magazines. A law that was really about high-capacity magazines would cover the after-market magazines of 75 or 100 rounds, which have minuscule market share and which are not standard for any firearm. As of 2011, there were approximately 332 million firearms in the United States not in military hands. With the rough estimate that one-third of guns are handguns, most gun owners owning at least two magazines per gun, and 47 percent of magazines holding more than 10 rounds, the number of large magazines in the United States is at least in the tens of millions. When one also takes into account rifle magazines, the number of American magazines holding more than 10 rounds could be more than 100 million. That in itself is sufficient, according to the Supreme Court’s *Heller* precedent to make the ban unconstitutional.” (*Heller* ruled that the government could not ban a firearm or related item that is in widespread common use.)

In addition, with the benefit of advanced planning, criminals and terrorists have the advantage of bringing multiple guns to the anticipated scenes of their crimes, allowing them uninterrupted firepower in the unlikely event that they decide to comply with a magazine restriction law.

Defenders, on the other hand, are constrained by the amount of ammunition that they can carry outside a firearm on a regular basis by weight factors and other considerations. Remember, the criminal or terrorist will always have the advantage of planning and surprise.

Kopel, David, *Costs and Consequences of Gun Control*, Cato Institute Policy Analysis # 784, 12-01-2015.

The Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Gun Control Research- Dr. Gary Kleck- Gun most effective way to resist robbery and assault- up to 2.5 million defensive gun uses per year by U.S. adults

Dr. Kleck, a professor of criminology at Florida State University is a registered Democrat, a member of the ACLU, does not own guns, and takes no money from anyone on either side in the debate. In 1988, Kleck published an article in the journal, *Social Relations*. This article, the first major research effort that measured defensive gun use, was based on state and national studies.

Dr. Kleck estimated that about 1 million adults per year use a gun for self-defense in the U.S. Kleck's research included studies done for the anti-gun National Alliance Against Violence, and the National Crime Victimization Surveys. Kleck concluded that gun use was the most effective and safest way of resisting a robbery or assault, safer than not resisting, running away, or using another method of resistance.

In 1991, Dr. Kleck published *Point Blank: guns and violence in America*. The book won an award in 1993 from the American Society of Criminology for an "outstanding contribution" to the field.

Not satisfied with the sources for his previous work, Dr. Kleck and his colleague Marc Gertz created a new survey with a sample size of about 5,000 individuals to better measure defensive gun use. With the new survey, Kleck and Gertz estimated between 2.2 to 2.5 million defensive gun uses per year in the U.S. Women were the defenders in about 46% of the cases reported. Less than 25% of the reporting defensive users indicated that they fired a shot during the incident under consideration. There is a less than 1% change that a defender's gun will be taken from him or her by an assailant, according to Dr. Kleck.

Dr. Marvin Wolfgang was asked to critique the Kleck/Gertz Study. Dr. Wolfgang's review included the following: "I am as strong a gun-control advocate as can be found among... criminologists... they (Kleck and Gertz) have provided an almost clear-cut case of methodologically sound research in support of something I have theoretically opposed for years... the use of a gun in defense against a criminal perpetrator... I do not like their conclusions that having a gun can be useful, but I cannot fault their methodology."

The absolute lowest estimates of about 100,000 defensive gun uses per year in this country come from the Department of Justice, using U.S. Census information. There is no question in the survey that asks about defensive firearms' use. This estimate is probably a serious undercount.

The Clinton Justice Department funded what was supposed to be a counter study debunking the Kleck/Gertz research. In 1996, anti-gun researchers Ludwig and Cook came up with about 3 million defensive gun uses per year. They then decided that it is impossible to measure the true number of persons who use guns in America for self-defense.

The research done by Kleck and Gertz indicates that defensive use of firearms by private citizens is a significant factor in stopping criminal violence. The research also lends itself to the conclusion that in the vast majority of cases where a gun is used to resist robbery or assault, no shots are fired.

Sources:

- Blackman, Paul H., Ph.D., "Armed Citizens and Crime Control," <http://www.nraila.org/issues/articles/read.aspx?id=125>.
- Kopel, David, Independence Institute, panel discussion on guns and self-defense, Warwick Hotel, Denver, Colorado, July, 2009. <http://vids.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=vids.individual&VideoID=60107462>
- "How Often Are Firearms Used in Self-Defense?" http://www.guncite.com/gun_control_gcdguse.html
- Stevens, Richard W., "Statistics and 'Gun Control,'" Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, Inc, <http://www.jpfo.org/filegen-a-m/data-docs.htm>.

Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

6

Problems with the 2012 Texas A & M Study on “Castle Doctrine/Stand Your Ground” Laws

There are problems with the study published in *the Journal of Human Resources*, which purports to demonstrate that implementation of Castle Doctrine and Stand Your Ground laws do not deter criminals, and, in fact, result in increased rates of unjustifiable homicide. The title of the work is “Does Strengthening Self-Defense Law Deter Crime or Escalate Violence? Evidence from Expansions to Castle Doctrine.” The study was done by Cheng Cheng and Mark Hoekstra, both of the Texas A & M Department of Economics.

The study looked at 21 states that passed Castle Doctrine/Stand your Ground laws from 2000 to 2010. (Colorado’s Castle Doctrine law was passed before the time period reviewed in the study.) We are not sure why this particular time period was selected and can not identify the funding source for the research.

Our perusal of this study indicates some problems with the data used to reach the researchers conclusions that self-defense laws do not deter criminals and increase the rate of unjustifiable homicide. There does not seem to be much peer review of the study. Howard Nemerov, a medical researcher at the same university, reported that, “However, there are a number of errors, assumptions, and miscalculations in their research that justify revisiting the question of whether or not Castle Doctrine laws have any impact on crime.”

The primary issue that we identified as a problem is the definition of “justifiable homicide” in FBI reporting guidelines. This issue would seem to lead to under-reporting of valid defensive gun uses in statistics that are fundamental to the conclusions drawn by the researchers. A quotation from the FBI guidelines on Page 10 of the online version of the paper illustrates this situation.

“The Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook emphasizes that by definition, justifiable homicide occurs in conjunction with other offenses, and those other offenses must be reported... An example given of ... justifiable homicide is “When a gunman entered a store and attempted to rob the proprietor, the storekeeper shot and killed the felon” (Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook, 2004). An example of what would NOT qualify as a justifiable homicide is “While playing cards, two men got into an argument. The first man attacked the second with a broken bottle. The second man pulled a gun and killed his attacker...” (Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook, 2004). We note that under expanded castle doctrine, the hypothetical shooter may have been justified as acting in self-defense. The reporting handbook ... states that this would not qualify as a justifiable homicide under the guidelines.”

By extension, if you are walking down the street and accidentally bump into a gang member who pulls a knife and tries to cut your throat, your shooting in self-defense of that individual would not be reported as a justifiable homicide. In 1998, Dr. Gary Kleck, estimated that about 80% “of legally justifiable homicides are not reported that way to the FBI.” While the authors of the study claim to adjust for this problem by looking for “*relative changes in legally justified homicide...*” questions persist.

Nemerov also pointed out that increased self-defense protection laws could result in an increase in property crimes, because muggers may become burglars, because of the reduced risk factor.

The researchers’ finding that Castle Doctrine/Stand Your Ground laws do not deter crime is contradicted by extensive research from the Lott-Mustard Study, a study done by Doctors Wright and Rossi for the US Department of Justice, and writing by Nobel Laureate Dr. Gary Baker. This body of work indicates that criminals do risk assessments before committing crimes and that increasing that risk influences their selection of victims. Virtually all spree killing in America and other countries have taken place in “gun free” zones, i.e., “criminal safe free fire zones.” The dramatic, almost 90% reduction in rape in Orlando, Florida following police armed self-defense training of about 6,000 women in 1966 also shows a deterrent effect on criminal behavior, when potential victims are armed and prepared to defend themselves.

Cheng, Cheng, Hoekstra, Mark, “Does Strengthening Self-Defense Law Deter Crime or Escalate Violence? Evidence from Expansions to Castle Doctrine, working paper forthcoming in *the Journal of Human Resources* 2012.

Nemerov, Howard Ross, *Nemerov on Castle Doctrine Laws and Violent Crime*, abstract posted on CrimProf Blog, December 28, 2012.

COUNTY SHERIFFS OF COLORADO

CONCEALED HANDGUN PERMIT INFORMATION PACKET

Please read the following information and complete the application. Return only the signed and notarized application and other required supporting documents to:

**Denver Police Headquarters
1331 Cherokee St.
Denver, CO 80204**

CONCEALED HANDGUN PERMIT INFORMATION

Carefully separate and complete the Concealed Handgun Permit Application and the Concealed Handgun Permit Information Packet. The documents must be read thoroughly, and the application printed in ink or typed and completed in full. Please use additional sheets of paper if necessary to respond to the questions. If the application is not fully completed, it cannot be processed.

An applicant shall complete the permit application form and return it, in person, to the Sheriff of the county in which the applicant resides, to the Sheriff of the county in which the applicant maintains a secondary residence or owns or leases real property used by the applicant in a business, or to the Sheriff that previously issued a permit to the applicant. The applicant shall sign the completed permit application in person, before a notary public; upon a sworn oath that the applicant knows the contents of the permit application and that the information contained in the permit application is true and correct.

An applicant who knowingly and intentionally makes a false or misleading statement on a permit application or deliberately omits any material information requested on the application commits perjury as described in Colorado Revised Statute (C.R.S.) 18-8-503. Upon conviction, the applicant shall be punished as provided in 18-1.3-501 of the Colorado Revised Statute. In addition, the applicant shall be denied the right to obtain or possess a permit, and the Sheriff shall revoke the applicant's permit if issued prior to conviction.

The Information portion of the packet should be kept for your future reference.

8

Is not subject

1. to: a restraining order issued pursuant to section 18-1-1001 or section 19-2-707, C.R.S. that is in effect at the time the application is submitted,
2. a permanent restraining order issued pursuant to Article 14 of Title 13, C.R.S., or
3. a temporary restraining order issued pursuant to Article 14 of Title 13, C.R.S. that is in effect at the time the application is submitted.

· Demonstrates competence with a handgun by submitting:

1. evidence of experience with a firearm through participation in organized shooting competitions or current military service,
2. evidence that, at the time the application is submitted, the applicant is a certified instructor,
3. proof of honorable discharge from a branch of the United States Armed Forces within the three years preceding submittal of the application, or
4. proof of honorable discharge from a branch of the United States Armed Forces that reflects pistol qualifications obtained within the ten years preceding submittal of the application,
5. a training certificate from a "handgun training class" (see definitions) obtained within the ten years preceding submittal of the application. The applicant shall submit the **original training certificate** or a photocopy thereof that includes the **original signature** of the class instructor. In obtaining a training certificate from a handgun training class, the applicant shall have discretion in selecting which handgun training class to complete.

POLICY

The issuing County Sheriff's Office will conduct criminal history background investigations on all applicants, to include queries of national, state, and local databases and issue or deny a permit within 90 days of receiving a completed application. If the applicant resides in a municipality or town, the Sheriff **shall** consult with the police department of the municipality or town in which the applicant resides, and the Sheriff may consult with other local law enforcement agencies. Regardless of whether an applicant meets the criteria in the previous section, if the Sheriff has a reasonable belief that documented previous behavior by the applicant makes it likely the applicant will present a danger to self or others if the applicant receives a permit to carry a concealed handgun, the Sheriff may deny the permit. Accordingly, a permit routinely will be denied to a person:

8A

"Background checks and security clearances for federal jobs

Everyone hired for a federal job undergoes a basic background check of his or her criminal and credit histories to ensure that all federal employees are 'reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character, and loyal to the United States.' The U.S. Office of Personnel Management, a central agency that serves as the corporate human resources organization for the federal government, performs the majority of background checks. In addition, federal positions that include access to sensitive information generally require a security clearance. This clearance must be obtained to determine the applicant's trustworthiness and reliability before granting him or her access to national security information.

Types of Security Clearances

Positions in the federal government are classified in three ways: Non-Sensitive Positions, Public Trust Positions, and National Security Positions. Each of these positions requires some level of background investigation. The elements that make up a background investigation vary depending on the level of clearance that is deemed necessary for a position. Background investigations for lower levels of security clearances generally rely on automated checks of an individual's history. For a secret clearance in a national security position, the investigation requires agents to interview people who have lived or worked with the candidate at some point in the last seven (or more) years.

There are four main types of security clearances for national security positions. These are confidential, secret, top secret, and sensitive compartmented information.

Confidential

This type of security clearance provides access to information or material that may cause damage to national security if disclosed without authorization. It must be reinvestigated every 15 years.

Secret

This type of security clearance provides access to information or material that may cause serious damage to national security if disclosed without authorization. It must be reinvestigated every 10 years.

Top Secret

This type of security clearance provides access to information or material that may cause exceptionally grave damage to national security if disclosed without authorization. It must be reinvestigated every five years.

Sensitive Compartmented Information

This type of security clearance provides access to all intelligence information and material that require special controls for restricted handling within compartmented channels."

http://www.gogovernment.org/how_to_apply/next_steps/security_clearance.php

The Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Gun Control Research

FBI Uniform Crime Report, *Crime in the United States, 2011*, Caution against ranking

(Need to examine best research available)

The Uniform Crime Report is often cited by both sides in the debate concerning the individual right to armed self-defense against crime, corruption, tyranny, and genocide. In this part of the FBI's report, released in September, 2012, the FBI discusses the complex nature of the variables that affect crime.

To quote the report, "Each year..., many entities..., use reported figures to compile rankings of cities and counties. These ranking, however, are merely a quick choice made by the data user; they provide no insight in the many variables that mold the crime in a particular town, city, county, state, region, or other jurisdiction. Consequently, these rankings lead to simplistic and/or incomplete analyses that often create misleading perceptions..."

The report goes on, "To assess criminality and law enforcement's response from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, one must consider many variables, some of which, while having significant impact on crime, are not readily measurable or applicable pervasively among all locales..."

"Historically, the causes and origins of crime have been the subjects of investigation by many disciplines. Some factors that are known to affect the volume and type of crime occurring from place to place are: population density and degree of urbanization; variations in composition of the population, particularly youth concentration; stability of the population with respect to residents' mobility, commuting patterns, and transient factors; modes of transportation and highway system; economic conditions, including median income, poverty level, and job availability; cultural factors and educational recreational, and religious characteristics; family conditions with respect to divorce and family cohesiveness; climate; effective strength of law enforcement agencies; administrative and investigative emphases of law enforcement; policies of other components of the criminal justice system (i.e., prosecutorial, judicial, correctional, and probational); citizens' attitude toward crime; crime reporting practices of the citizenry."

"... Until data users examine all the variables that affect crime in a town, city, county, state, region, or other jurisdiction, they can make no meaningful comparisons."

We believe that the above caveat strongly indicates that legislators should look at the quality of research under consideration before making public policy decisions that affect the rights of American Citizens. Anyone can pay for a study that supports the buyer's individual or institutional preconceptions.

The most interesting studies or reviews of literature are those that have conclusions contrary to preconceived notions, or which are acknowledged by ideological opponents to have merit in spite of prejudices. The CDC Study results that indicate a lack of effectiveness of gun control laws fall into the first category. The acknowledgement of the methodological precision of Dr. Kleck's study on the number of defensive gun uses per year by Dr. Wolfgang is an example of the latter.

Crime in the United States, 2011, Uniform Crime Report, U.S. Department of Justice- Federal Bureau of Investigation, Released September, 2012.

Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, Colorado 80150-1454