

No hard evidence on stricter gun control

By: Arnie Krause - May 23

Not another letter from William Scarbrough "Increase public safety concerning firearms" similar to his previous letter of August 2012, "America needs to craft stronger gun laws" still promoting gun control.

He chastises the Columbus City Council for not being concerned with public safety and mentions six headlines involving firearms, only one — the four murdered in Waynesville — which involved the use of real firearm(s).

The other references were for BB guns and air guns. It is obvious from the "Targeting Look-Alikes" article that Council is researching the issues to determine the appropriate action to address problems with BB guns and air guns.

I take issue with Mr. Scarbrough implying the Mayor Kristen Brown should become a member of Mayors Against Illegal Guns, a virulently anti-gun group that should be named "Mayors Against All Guns." I recommend Mayor Brown to not join this group unless she does not believe in the Second Amendment. I am confident she is completely committed to public safety and will continue to monitor this issue.

With all of the recent push for more gun control that failed in Congress, some still don't accept there is no hard evidence that stricter gun control laws, in fact, reduce murders or crimes with a firearm.

More gun control does not actually control guns, but disarms law-abiding citizens, and makes them more vulnerable to criminals, who disregard laws in general. What some that are against guns fail to realize is that guns are used to defend lives far more often than to take lives.

The Cato Institute, in studies, estimates more than 100,000 defensive uses of guns per year. The unintended consequences of gun control prevents law-abiding citizens from defending themselves and can result in more lives lost in shootings by criminals than saved.

Have you noticed that the media never mentions that some studies have produced evidence that murder rates tend to be higher in States with more gun control laws and gun free zones?

Or how many people who do not own or have fired a gun in their lives, or faced a lifethreatening situation, feel qualified in pushing legal restrictions that can be fatal to others that don't share their opinion? Maybe we can hope that some will do more to study this issue for the future.