



Studies show 'gun control laws' don't work, but 'concealed carry' permits do

JULY 23, 2012 By: JEFFREY KLEIN

As expected, the 'learned' Liberal elite [who are not up for reelection in November] began showing up on all of the weekend news programs, aided by their mainstream media allies, mindlessly barking about 'increased gun control,' in the wake of the theatre shooting in Aurora, Colorado early last Friday morning.

For example, New Jersey Democrat Sen. Frank R. Lautenberg boldly urged Congress, via his "Twitter" account, to swiftly address a ban on certain weapons, [according to a FOXNews article last Saturday](#), tweeting...

The shooting in Aurora is a horrific act of violence, and our thoughts go out to the innocent victims and their families. Our hearts are filled with sadness for the 12 people killed and the dozens wounded in this senseless act. We have to face the reality that these types of tragedies will continue to occur unless we do something about our nation's lax gun laws.

Let's stop wasting time and start saving lives ... Congress must prioritize a ban on high-capacity gun magazines.

A Lautenberg aide reportedly echoed the Senator's plan to the Huffington Post,

If reports are correct and a high-capacity gun magazine was used to commit these awful murders, Senator Lautenberg will absolutely renew his effort to limit the availability of this dangerous firearm attachment.

Unfortunately, these emotional sentiments, passed around freely in the wake of high profile shooting tragedies like Columbine, Virginia Tech and Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D-AZ), have only political value--as they are void of any practical value.

In fact, they operate diametrically against their stated objective of 'eliminating' mass murders, according to a rigorous study of gun control studies conducted by Wake Forest University Economics Prof. John C. Moorhouse and his graduate assistant Brent Wanner, published in the Winter 2006 edition of the Cato Institute Journal, titled "[Does Gun Control Reduce Crime or Does Crime Increase Gun Control?](#)"

The study found what simple common sense would derive--people kill people...not guns; which is akin to the popular phrase, 'If you took away all the guns from law abiding citizens--then only criminals would have guns...which would only result in having an unprotected citizenry.

The only provable correlations that were detected are also obvious and self-evident to anyone who watches the local evening news--the highest incidence of gun violence occurs in poor, minority-filled urban areas, where it is inflicted mostly upon each other.

However, an amazing, but expected correlation did appear in the research Moorhouse and Brent performed using the state statistics on per capita concealed weapon permit issuance and violent crime--an inverse correlation existed in virtually every case--meaning that where criminals 'knew' the citizens were most likely armed, violent crime occurred far less.

And, as far as making laws to thwart gun crime, they are generally asinine, useless or easily overcome by any fifth grader or action/adventure movie buff.

For example, Sen. Lautenberg's idea of prohibiting 'high capacity magazines,' can be overcome by either taping two, inverted smaller magazines together, or simply packing more magazines--if the victims are unarmed it would not make much difference in the end.

And after the above mentioned shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, Republican New York Representative Peter King, who is considered a fairly bright man, once floated the bright idea of making it a crime to have a gun within 1,000 feet of a federal employee.

This idea was fraught with ridiculousness once it left his mouth.

Even if every federal employee were required to wear the same 'lime green' jacket all the time--so they could be easily and unmistakably identified as a federal employee--they are in motion all of the time and would probably cause this statute to be violated by their own actions.

Therefore, practically speaking, the only value these type of statutes could have are as 'add-ons' to the list of gun infraction charges--more than likely used posthumously for the victim.

Clearly, gun control law statutes are, for the most part, an incredible waste of time and money, and afford no more protection against violent crime than existing statutes against murder--they have not, and cannot, prevent the random, violent acts of individuals with firearms.

President Obama's hometown of Chicago is the most glaring example, as even with some of the most restrictive gun laws in the country--they have long held the reputation for being one of the most dangerous cities in the nation.

Conversely, local TV news is replete with stories about violent criminals being stopped dead in their tracks by a properly-trained

citizen, discharging rounds into them from their own firearm--as protected under the Second Amendment of the Constitution and provided for under the 'Concealed Carry' and 'Stand Your Ground' statutes.