

The Best Rebuttal to the Gun-grabbers

Delta May Have Just Lost \$50 Million In Tax Breaks Because Of The NRA. Here's Why You Should Applaud Them

<https://www.inc.com/nicolas-cole/georgia-punishing-delta-for-distance-from-nra-is-a-brutal-lesson-in-challenges-of-leadership.html>

Comment

kcole MARCH 3, 2018 AT 8:18AM

Comments to the Delta NRA article in Inc. - A long but worthwhile read...

Guess how many people got that discount this year - 13. This is a classic case of form over function. More importantly, a true leader would not have been bullied into doing something - anything - by the vocal minority. A true leader stands on principle.

The gulf between the left and right can be boiled down to a single issue - Due Process. The NRA will support a "no gun list" as long as someone placed on the list is afforded due process to get off it.

Here are some other things to consider:

- Demonizing the millions of law-abiding gun owners and the National Rifle Association will not stop the next mass shooting.
- If anti-gun politicians and activists are truly committed to ending the violence, they must stop pointing fingers and come up with solutions that address the underlying issues – a broken mental health system, a culture of violence, a NICS system that doesn't contain every record of people who are prohibited by federal law from owning, possessing or purchasing a firearm.
- The NRA does not want felons or the violently mentally ill to have access to firearms. But to focus on guns as the only factor will not make our communities any safer. Keeping these prohibited people from obtaining weapons is only part of the solution
- Gun bans don't work. We have been down that road before it won't prevent these atrocities. The federal assault weapons ban was in place from 1994 to

2004 and a Justice Department study found it had no discernable impact on crime. In fact, it was during that ban that the shooting at Columbine High School occurred.

- Without a comprehensive strategy, our country will continue to fall short of protecting the public against these craven attacks.
- The key to preventing future tragedies is ensuring that prohibited people do not have access to any firearm, not banning one firearm for all law-abiding people.

Assault Weapons Ban

- So-called “assault weapons” are the functional equivalent of millions of commonly held rifles used in hunting, competition, and sport shooting. They are no more lethal than other rifles. What’s more, handguns have been used in the vast majority of high-profile mass shootings, but most Americans don’t know that because the media insists on focusing only on rifles like the AR-15.
- A study mandated by Congress to research the ‘94 “assault weapons” ban found it did not have an impact on violent crime – in fact, because rifles of all types are so rarely used in crime – only two percent of murders – the ban had no real chance of reducing violent crime to begin with.
- For information, see <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/204431.pdf>
- Nationally, “assault weapons” were used in 1.4% of crimes involving firearms and 0.25% of all violent crime before the enactment of any national or state “assault weapons” ban. In many major urban areas (San Antonio, Mobile, Nashville, etc.) and some entire states (Maryland, New Jersey, etc.) the rate is less than 0.1%. (Kleck & Transaction, 1997)
- State assault weapons bans “did not significantly affect murder rates” in a study covering 1980–2009. (Applied Economic Letters, Vol. 21, No.4)
- Americans own approximately 15 million AR-15s and buy hundreds of thousands of new ones every year. (Source: 2017 National Shooting Sports Foundation)
- AR-15s are the most commonly used rifle for shooting competitions, training and home defense.
- AR-15s and other semi-automatic rifles are not the fully automatic military grade firearms they are often portrayed to be by gun control supporters.

- California has some of the most restrictive gun laws in the country, yet terrorists attacked their co-workers in San Bernardino in December of 2015.
- The vicious terrorist attacks in France and Belgium also illustrate that gun bans – including those on semi-automatic firearms and standard capacity magazines – don't keep us safe. In both countries, the private ownership of firearms, including semi-automatic firearms, is severely restricted to all but a few who are granted special government permission.

Increasing Age Requirement on Purchase of Long Guns

- The murderers at Virginia Tech, Fort Hood, Aurora, Navy Yard, San Bernardino, Charleston, Orlando, Vegas and Sutherland Springs were all 21 or older – the average age is 32 -- and that's just to name the highest profile offenders. The murderer at Sandy Hook was under 21, but he stole his firearms so a law would not have prevented him from getting them.
- Federal Law prohibits adults under the age of 21 from purchasing a handgun from a licensed firearm dealer.
- Legislative proposals that prevent law-abiding adults aged 18-20 years old from acquiring rifles and shotguns effectively prohibits them for purchasing any firearm, thus depriving them of their constitutional right to self-protection.
- Passing a law that makes it illegal for a 20 year-old to purchase a shotgun for hunting or an adult single mother from purchasing the most effective self-defense rifle on the market punishes law-abiding citizens for the evil acts of criminals.
- The NRA supports efforts to prevent those who are a danger to themselves or others from getting access to firearms. At the same time, we will continue to oppose gun control measures that only serve to punish law-abiding citizens.

Universal Background Checks

- Universal background checks would not prevent the tragedies the gun control lobby exploits to push their agenda.
- The same list of murderers who were over 21 passed a federal background check. There is no point in expanding a system that isn't working effectively to begin with.

- What we need to do is make sure the system we have works and contains all of the appropriate records of persons prohibited under current law from owning, possessing or purchasing firearms.

Strengthening the Background Check System/ Mental Health

- The NRA supports improving the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) and has supported legislation that would work to make sure that the names of all persons prohibited from purchasing, owning and possessing firearms are in the NICS system. In fact, the NICS was created in the 90s with the assistance of the NRA.
- NICS is designed to keep guns out of the hands of people who are disqualified from possession by federal law.
- But it doesn't always work because its database is incomplete.
- As of the end of 2016, we can see glaring disparities between states of similar populations and the number of prohibiting mental health records submitted to the NICS database. For example,
 - Pennsylvania and Illinois have almost the same number of residents (about 12.8 million), but Pennsylvania has submitted 17 times more prohibiting mental health records to NICS than Illinois has. (Pennsylvania has submitted 794,589 records, Illinois has submitted 47,554 records).
 - North Carolina and Georgia have almost the same number of residents (about 9.5 million), but North Carolina has submitted 27 times more prohibiting mental health records to NICS than Georgia has in the system. (North Carolina has submitted 272,337 records, Georgia has submitted 10,094 records).
- Even our nation's capital appears to fail to report individuals in this category to the system.
- The president and congress can and should work to fix this failure of the mental-health system. The administration should work to complete the system's database through the administration of federal grants.

CDC/Research Talking Points

- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is NOT banned from doing research into gun violence. The 1996 rider was VERY NARROW: Congress cannot use taxpayer dollars to advocate for gun control.
- The rider simply states, "that no CDC funds "may be used to advocate or promote gun control."
- The CDC is more than able to conduct legitimate, objective research.
- Mark Rosenberg, the CDC director when the original rider was enacted, recently wrote in an op-ed that the rider DOES NOT ban research into "gun-violence prevention". https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/time-for-collaboration-on-gun-research/2015/12/25/f989cd1a-a819-11e5-bff5-905b92f5f94b_story.html
- In that same op-ed, Rosenberg advocated keeping the rider in place. Saying that it is important the rider language be included in future appropriations to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not spent on gun control advocacy.
- The NRA supports legitimate research into firearm safety and would welcome data in areas where none exists. For example, how does deterrence play a role in reducing violence? How often are firearms used in self-defense? How does the misallocation of firearms happen – how do they get into criminal hands?
- The ONLY people calling for the language to be lifted are some of the most rabid anti-gun politicians in the country, which speaks VOLUMES about the KIND of research they want to do. Currently, unbiased research is NOT banned.
- The NRA is not opposed to research that would encourage the safe and responsible use of firearms and reduce the number of firearm-related deaths. Safety has been at the core of the NRA mission since its inception. However, firearm safety is not the goal of the advocates seeking CDC funding – gun control is.
- Calls to remove the rider language stem from an effort to push a gun control agenda. Lawmakers behind this push are some of the most rabid, anti-gun politicians in the country who have a pre-determined outcome and are not seeking unbiased, objective data. We know this because they have done it before.
- Government-funded research was openly biased in the 1990s. CDC officials unabashedly supported gun bans and poured millions of taxpayer dollars into "research" that was, in fact, advocacy.

- CDC researchers are quoted stating the pro-gun control intentions of their research efforts. The problem with these conclusions is that they came before the data, which was manipulated to support their agenda.

- o One of the lead researchers employed in the CDC's effort was quoted, stating "We're going to systematically build the case that owning firearms causes deaths."

- o Another researcher said he envisioned a long-term campaign "to convince Americans that guns are, first and foremost, a public health menace."

- o Additionally, one of the effort's lead researchers was a prominent attendee at a conference called the Handgun Epidemic Lowering Plan (HELP) Network, which was "intended to form a public health model to work toward changing society's attitudes towards guns so that it becomes socially unacceptable for private citizens to have guns."

- The manipulation was so egregious that Congress acted and forbade the use of taxpayer funds for such biased, agenda-driven research.

- o A rider was included in the 1996 Omnibus bill that read "Provided further, that none of the funds made available for injury prevention and control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used to advocate or promote gun control."

- o The rider doesn't oppose funding research. Instead, it forbids taxpayer funding for research meant to drive the political gun control agenda.

- Statistics and data linked to firearm-related violence are complex and frequently skewed by those who oppose gun ownership. Firearm research generally speaks only to the alleged possible risks associated with gun ownership, never to the benefits that law-abiding gun owners provide to society as a whole.

- "Gun violence research" frequently finds only one option: More gun control, which plenty of respected researchers have found to be ineffective. In fact, the FBI, our nation's top law enforcement agency, lists 13 contributing factors for why a city or state has a high violent crime rate – weak gun laws are nowhere on that list.

- In the 1990s, the CDC frequently cited success in reducing drunk driving incidents to its ultimate goal in reducing firearm-related deaths. This is not accurate. Efforts to change drunk driving trends were focused on increasing penalties and enforcement for infractions and making it socially unacceptable to

drive drunk – not to make it unacceptable to own or drive a car.

- The CDC also omitted or ignored research when findings went against its agenda.

- o For example, a North Carolina study on handgun violence found that the vast majority of fatal handgun crimes were committed by people who had prior felony records and obtained their firearms illegally because they could not legally get them. Those findings support the NRA's longstanding position that gun control laws only inhibit law-abiding citizens and do little to nothing to prevent violent crime.

- o However, when the CDC was asked to submit talking points from that research, they refused. This is just one example; the CDC routinely rejected data that ran counter to their anti-gun agenda.

- There is much that can be done to reduce firearm-related deaths, but if we want to find solutions, we have to look at all of the facts – including those inconvenient to a gun control agenda.

- If efforts were made to do a stringent, unbiased, and all-inclusive evaluation on which laws actually work when it comes to reducing gun violence that would be a different story. However, the NRA does not – and will not – support efforts that do nothing but try to convince Americans that lawfully-owned firearms are a public health menace.

Where Americans Stand

After a week of 24-7 coverage of mainstream media advocating for more gun control the American public believes government failures are to blame not inadequate gun regulations.

- According to a new Rasmussen Poll released on Feb, 28, 2018, most Americans think government error is more responsible than a lack of gun control for the Valentine's Day massacre at a Florida high school.

- 54% of American Adults believe the failure of government agencies to respond to numerous warning signs from the prospective killer is more to blame for the mass shooting and only thirty-three percent (33%) attribute the deaths more to a lack of adequate gun control.

- Among Americans who have children of elementary or secondary school age, 61% think the government is more to blame. Just 23% of these adults fault a lack

of adequate gun control more. Ninety percent (90%) of all Americans say they have been following news reports about the Florida killings at least somewhat closely, with 53% who have been following very closely.

- Americans aren't convinced stricter gun laws will reduce crime and don't trust the government to fairly enforce those laws. Those who have been following the news Very Closely see the failure of government agencies as more to blame for the Florida killings by a 54% to 35% margin.
- Middle-aged voters are the most likely to view the government as more to blame.
- Married adults and those with children in the home are even more likely to blame the government than those who are not married and don't have children living with them.
- Seventy-five percent (75%) of Republicans and 55% of adults not affiliated with either major political party see government failure as more to blame than a lack of adequate gun control, but just 36% of Democrats agree. Fifty percent (50%) of Democrats say a lack of sufficient gun control is more at fault.
- Only 26% of Likely U.S. Voters trust the federal government to do the right thing at least most of the time.
- Thirty-two percent (32%) now think FBI Director Christopher Wray should resign or be fired because of his agency's failure to act on tips alerting them beforehand to the shooter who ultimately killed 17 at the Florida high school.
- Amid renewed calls for stricter gun control, most Americans who have guns at home say it makes them feel safer.
- Most Americans continue to believe that violent video games and movies make America a more hostile place. But just 13% feel that limits on violent movies and video games would do the most to reduce incidents like the one in Florida.