

Gun Control Research: The CDC Study

SB16 112
SB16 144
SB16 176

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- Results of the 1994 "Assault Weapons" Ban

"After the 1994 Ban, no discernible reduction in the lethality and injuriousness of gun violence was found."

In 1997, criminology professors Chris Koper and Jeff Roth published a study for the National Institute of Justice on the 1994 ban of "Assault Weapons" and the resulting effect on crime. ("Assault weapon" is an incorrect term to use for the firearms that were affected by the ban. A real assault weapon is capable of fully automatic fire. That is, a pull of the trigger results in the repeated discharge of the firearm until the trigger is released, or the gun runs out of ammunition. The firearms banned in 1994 were semi-automatic or self-loading firearms, requiring one pull of the trigger to fire each round.) One feature of many semi-automatic firearms is their ability to accept magazines holding numerous rounds of ammunition and to allow the firing of those rounds without reloading.

In their 1997 study on the effectiveness of the 1994 ban, Koper and Roth concluded that, "the evidence is not strong enough for us to conclude that there was any meaningful effect i.e., that the effect was different from zero)." Seven years later the two researchers published a follow-up study with criminologist Dan Woods.

The 2004 study found that, "We cannot clearly credit the ban with any of the nation's recent drop in gun violence. And, indeed, there has been no discernible reduction in the lethality and injuriousness of gun violence."

Dr. John Lott points out, that in 2003, the last full year before the end of the 1994 ban; the US murder rate was 5.7 per 100,000 people, according to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report. By 2011, that rate had fallen to 4.7 per 100,000, in spite of the earlier expiration of the 1994 semi-automatic firearms ban. According to Dr. Lott, only 2.6% of all murders are committed with any type of rifle. This 2.6% figure would include single shot, lever action, pump action, and bolt action rifles, as well as semi-automatic, or self-loading long guns.

Proponents of more gun control also often advocate the registration of firearms currently legally possessed by American Citizens. Canada dropped its long gun registry, because it was extremely expensive to set up and maintain, and because Canadian law enforcement officers "could not provide a single example in which tracing was of more than peripheral importance in solving a gun murder."

Dr. John Lott Jr. is a former chief economist of the United States Sentencing Commission and the author of the book, *More Guns, Less Crime*, University of Chicago Press, third edition, 2010.

Lott, John R. Jr, "Facts about Assault Weapons and Crime," *The Wall Street Journal*, NYC, NY, 01-18-2013, page A-14.

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% chance 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

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

CDC- Limits on Research?

David Kopel: Testimony before the Colorado House State, Veterans, and Military Affairs Committee on 02-02-2015

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) have never been prevented from doing research on gun control by the National Rifle Association, or any other group promoting individual rights. The CDC has been denied funding to advocate for gun control for a number of years by amendments to the congressional budgeting process.

David Kopel is an adjunct professor of law at Denver University, the author of several books on the Second Amendment, was at the plaintiff's table during the DC v. Heller Hearing before the US Supreme Court, and is a recognized expert in the field of law related to the Second Amendment. He is a former Assistant Attorney General for the State of Colorado.

There have been previous indications of bias against the right of individuals to own guns for self-protection from crime, corruption, tyranny and genocide on the part of individuals associated with the CDC. Two examples are included below.

In 1994, Dr. Mark Rosenberg, former head of the CDC National Center for Injury Control and Prevention, stated, "We need to revolutionize the way we look at guns, like what we did with cigarettes... Now (smoking) is dirty, deadly, and banned."

In 1993, Arthur Kellerman, in a study funded by the CDC, purported to show that possession of a gun made the resident of a domicile almost three times more likely to become a victim of violence. (This same study indicated that renting, rather than owning, increased risk factors for becoming a victim of so-called "gun violence" by almost five times.) Subsequent examination of this study casts serious doubt on its conclusions, in part, because of a lack of adequate controls on the potentially confounding variables of likely gun ownership by residents in high crime areas, drug involvement and gang membership by some study subjects, and the probable under-reporting of gun ownership during telephone surveys by members of the control group.

Kellerman, Arthur, et al, "Gun Ownership as a Risk Factor for Homicide in the Home," *New England Journal of Medicine*, October 7, 1993, Vol. 329 No. 15, pp. 1084-1091.

Rafferty, Ann P. et al. "Validity of a household gun question in a telephone survey." *Public Health Reports*. May-June 1995, Vol. 110, No. 15, p. 282.

Kleck, Gary; Hogan, Michael, "National case-control study of homicide offending and gun ownership," *Social Problems*, May, 1999, Vol. 46, Issue 2, pp. 275-293.

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

"Laws that forbid the carrying of arms ... disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes.... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man." - Cesare Bonesana, Marchese Di Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishment*, 1764. (Noted by Thomas Jefferson in his personal papers.)

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: (1) those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. (2) Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depository of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist; and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves." - Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Henry Lee, 1824.

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government." - David Davis, *Ex Parte Milligan*, 4 Wallace 2, 120-121 1866. (Justice Davis was appointed to the United States Supreme Court by Abraham Lincoln.)

**Gun Control Research- Professor Donald Kates and Professor Gary Mauser
Criminals Don't Obey the Laws**

"The people you need to control are not going to obey the gun control laws...and the people you don't need to control, those are the ones who obey. So what you get is...either nothing, or you get worse results with gun control.

Professor Donald B. Kates is co-author of "Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A review of International and Some Domestic Evidence " published in the spring of 2007 in the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, the most widely distributed law review in the US. Professor Kates served as a professor at Stanford Law School. His co-author, Professor Gary Mauser, served as a Canadian university professor.

The Kates- Mauser study looked at 18 European nations with varying levels of gun ownership. They concluded:

"Whether gun availability is viewed as a cause or as a mere coincidence, the long term macrocosmic evidence is that gun ownership spread widely throughout societies consistently correlates with stable or declining murder rates. Whether causative or not, the consistent international pattern is that more guns equal less murder and other violent crime."

Lewin, Marshall, "Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide?" *America's 1st Freedom*, National Rifle Association, Fairfax, Va., August 2007, Page 32.

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

Public Law 109-295 Prohibits Confiscation of Firearms by Agencies Accepting Federal Funds

H.R. 5441, The "Disaster Recovery Personal Protection Act of 2006" passed the US House in 2006 by a bipartisan vote of 322-99. The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 84-16. In 2007, the Vitter Amendment to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act incorporated the language of the Personal Protection Act into Federal Law. Section 557 reads:

- (a) PROHIBITION ON CONFISCATION OF FIREARMS- No officer or employee of the United States (including any member of the uniformed services), or person operating pursuant to or under color of Federal law, or receiving Federal funds, or under control of any Federal official, or providing services to such an officer, employee, or other person, while acting in support of relief from a major disaster or emergency, may-
- (1) temporarily or permanently seize, or authorize seizure of, any firearms the possession of which is not prohibited under Federal, State, or local law, other than for forfeiture in compliance with Federal law or as evidence in a criminal investigation.
 - (2) require registration of any firearm for which registration is not required by Federal, State, or local law.
 - (3) prohibit possession of any firearm, or promulgate any rule, regulation or order prohibiting possession of any firearm, in any place or by any person where such possession is not otherwise prohibited by Federal, State, or local law; or
 - (4) prohibit the carrying of firearms by any person otherwise authorized to carry firearms under Federal, State, or local law, solely because such person is operating under the direction, control, or supervision of a Federal agency in support of relief from the major disaster or emergency.

This law was passed, in part, to prevent repetition of police violations of individual rights that occurred during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. There is, however, a loophole in the law that allows State and local authorities to ban possession under current State or local law.

Colorado already restricts the State's ability to ban possession of firearms, but it is possible for State authorities to ban the sale, transfer, or transportation of firearms. There is a distinct danger that a State or local official, insulated from the actual dangers of gang activity, looting, or mob violence might invoke current Colorado law to ban the sale, transfer, or transportation of firearms by honest citizens, leaving those citizens at the mercy of the lawless elements mentioned above.

The police can not be everywhere all the time, even under the best of conditions. During an emergency situation, police protection is even less available. Citizens deserve the ability to protect themselves outside their homes to comply with evacuation orders, to obtain food, shelter in the event that their home is damaged or destroyed, and to assist their fellow citizens in recovering from the effects of a disaster.

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