

[Free read ebook] Control: Exposing the Truth About Guns

Control: Exposing the Truth About Guns

Glenn Beck

DOC | *audiobook | ebooks | Download PDF | ePub

Copyrighted Material


#1 BESTSELLING AUTHOR OF *COMMON SENSE*

GLENN BECK

CONTROL

EXPOSING THE TRUTH
ABOUT GUNS

Copyrighted Material

 Download

 Read Online

#67991 in Books Glenn Beck 2013-04-30 2013-04-30 Original language: English PDF # 1 8.25 x .70 x 5.311, .38 #File Name: 1476739870189 pages Control Exposing the Truth About Guns | File size: 55.Mb

Glenn Beck : Control: Exposing the Truth About Guns before purchasing it in order to gauge whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised Control: Exposing the Truth About Guns:

1 of 1 people found the following review helpful. It's a Good-Looking Book By J. Pizzuto Oh, Glenn. I have enjoyed Glenn Beck's media since the late 2000s when I would watch his show on Fox after work. Lately, I've been listening to his radio show in the morning while at work. That's probably where I first heard about this, and it's certainly where I heard Glenn hype the book to no end (how cheaply he printed it so that we could all buy more copies and give them to

our open-minded friends, how small and compact it is so that we can carry it around in our pockets). Classic entrepreneurial Glenn. Anyway, I agree with Glenn about 95% of the time. That should not matter here, though, as this is not an opinion piece, and in it Glenn attempts to lay out all of the objective facts in support of our Constitutional right to bear arms. Naturally, within these pages those facts are flavored by his wit and often tangible disdain for bleeding-heart "controlists". The format is succinct bold-font quotations from gun control advocates--peddling the sort of so-called "common sense" proposals and convenient half-facts you might hear on Meet on the Press or MSNBC--followed by 1-3 page rebuttals from Glenn and his researchers. The final quarter of the book focuses on what lies behind the MINDS of school murderers, tracing some of their impetus to our media and violent video games. In this section Glenn repeatedly references and espouses our "personal responsibility" (a sort of antithesis to collectivist control). I enjoyed this for its easy readability. Again, as the sections are so short, I was able to read one here or there throughout my workday without it feeling choppy. The book includes a few charts and table capsules, but it more or less follows the outline mentioned above. I was, however, surprised to find so many typographical errors, some of them even in the opening pages. Considering its short length and publicity, I'm surprised nobody bothered to proofread it before it went to press. In that sense I suppose this is a rush job, but as far as those go it's readable, entertaining, and informative.

1 of 1 people found the following review helpful. Control: A Book of Facts that Some May Find Dangerous By RJ Daleigh Glenn Beck's new book, "Control: Exposing the Truth About Guns," does just that. This is not just an opinion piece, though he (or the staff who wrote it) has included opinions throughout the book. Not only does it present current and specific pro-gun control statements and arguments, it takes them apart and, using facts and studies, disproves them. But rather than just state the pro-gun side, the book ends with 27 pages crammed with end notes, in much smaller font than the rest of the book, giving specific references for the statements and studies from both sides, so the sincerely interested can go through, do his or her own homework and see if Beck really does have support. And that homework will show that he has. Why would anyone find this book dangerous? If it is read from a neutral position, with an open mind, it will convince the unsure of the danger of the current drive to control the ownership of firearms in this country. That would not be a good thing for those who are intent on disarming the American people. Those will be the ones who will try to discourage you from reading this book, and who may even ridicule or shame those they know who are reading it. I have done some research before into the gun issue, having my own concerns for what I saw as too many guns in private hands. My own research convinced me that the situation was quite the opposite. So I already had seen some of the things Beck's book says. But there were many things here that I didn't know. And I DID seek out several of those sources listed in the notes. And found them all legitimate and disturbing. If you are sincerely interested in the issue, particularly if you don't know which side to take, this book is a must-read. It should be required reading in high school and college.

5 of 5 people found the following review helpful. A must read for pro gun advocates By Neal A. Williams This is a common sense publication that not only gives information about the efforts of our government to control our second amendment rights but it documents with footnotes each and every fact it presents. Easy read though you may find it a bit upsetting that there are some in our Country that seem to think the Constitution is no longer a viable document and say so. Each and every time they do Glenn Beck has documented it and gives you the reference if you want to go back and read their entire speech in context

Dont miss the #1 bestselling book Control from radio and TV personality Glenn Beck, a passionate, fact-based case for guns that reveals why gun control isnt really about controlling guns at all; its about controlling us. When our founding fathers secured the Constitutional right of the people to keep and bear arms, they also added the admonition that this right SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED. It is the only time this phrase appears in the Bill of Rights. So why arent more people listening? History has proven that guns are essential to self-defense and liberty but tragedy is a powerful force and has led many to believe that guns are the enemy, that the Second Amendment is outdated, and that more restrictions or outright bans on firearms will somehow solve everything. They are wrong. In Control, Glenn Beck takes on and debunks the common myths and outright lies that are often used to vilify guns and demean their owners: The Second Amendment is ABOUT MUSKETS...GUN CONTROL WORKS in other countries...40 percent of all guns are sold without BACKGROUND CHECKS...More GUNS MEAN more MURDER...Mass shootings are becoming more common...These awful MASSACRES ARE UNIQUE TO AMERICA...No CIVILIAN needs a weapon of war like the AR-15...ARMED GUARDS in schools do nothing, just look at Columbine...Stop FEARMONGERING, no one is talking about TAKING YOUR GUNS AWAY. Backed by hundreds of sources, this handbook gives everyone who cares about the Second Amendment the indisputable facts they need to reclaim the debate, defeat the fear, and take back their natural rights.

About the Author Glenn Beck, the nationally syndicated radio host and founder of TheBlaze television network, is a thirteen-time #1 bestselling author and is one of the few authors in history to have had #1 national bestsellers in the fiction, nonfiction, self-help, and childrens picture book genres. His recent fiction works include the thrillers Agenda 21, The Overton Window, and its sequel, The Eye of Moloch; his many nonfiction titles include Conform, Miracles

and Massacres, Control, and Being George Washington. For more information about Glenn Beck, his books, and TheBlaze TV network, visit GlennBeck.com and TheBlaze.com. Excerpt. Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved.

CONTROL PART ONE The Truth about Guns After the Newtown massacre in December 2012 it quickly became obvious that gun control was again going to take over the national dialogue. The president, who had barely used the word gun over his first four years in office, was about to rearrange his second-term agenda. Gun control would now be right near the top of the priority list. Sensing a once-in-a-generation opportunity, controllist politicians and groups began to pounce. News programs devoted full hours to the issue. Opinion hosts like Piers Morgan, sensing an issue to make their mark with, began virtual crusades, discussing the topic nightly. Hollywood celebrities, brought together by the progressive group Mayors Against Illegal Guns, demanded a plan to end gun violence via YouTube videos and television commercials. This, of course, despite that fact that many of those who appeared in the videos had made their careers and their millions depicting intense gun violence in movies. It was during this time that I realized the need for this part of the book, something that would answer all the lies about guns that are repeated again and again and often go uncontested. But instead of making up arguments which would inevitably result in critics saying that no one really makes those claims, or that I misrepresented them I wanted to use actual quotes. So we started a little project. Each night my staff and I watched countless hours of cable news and read hundreds of newspaper columns and articles. We listened for the quotes about guns and the Second Amendment that seemed to come up most often, the stuff that is so pervasive that its barely even questioned anymore. It wasnt difficult. Before long we had enough for not only one book, but several of them. We whittled the quotes down to those that seemed to be repeated the most often and then we sat down with a team of economists, criminologists, and other gun experts and answered each of them with the truth.

ITS TIME FOR AMERICA TO HAVE A CONVERSATION ABOUT GUNS. Leaders in Washington from both parties and groups like the NRA all say that now is not the time to talk about how gun safety laws can save lives in America. I agree, now is not the time to talk about gun laws. The time for that conversation was long before all those kids in Connecticut died today.

REPRESENTATIVE CAROLYN MCCARTHY (D-NY), December 14, 2012 If theres one thing about the gun debate that everyone seems to agree on, its that were going to have a national conversation on the subject. Great news!

CINDY HANDLER (Huffington Post columnist), January 11, 2013 Actually, weve had a national conversation about guns for the last two centuries; you just dont like the way it turned out. You may not have noticed, but the so-called gun debate was settled quite a while ago. In 1791. **WE SHOULD START DRAFTING A BILL TO ENSURE NEWTOWN NEVER HAPPENS AGAIN.** [My bill] will ban the sale, the transfer, the importation, and the possession, not retroactively but prospectively. And it will ban the same for big clips, drums, or strips of more than ten bullets. So there will be a bill. Weve been working on it now for a year.... Itll be ready on the first day.

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D-CA), December 16, 2012 Hang on, youve been working on this bill for a year? Was it just sitting in a desk drawer waiting for a terrible massacre that you could leverage for political expedience? Wait dont answer that.

GUNS ARE LETHAL. [T]he point about guns is that they are so much more lethal than anything else you have around. I mean, that is why the American military arms its troops not with knives, but with automatic weapons.

NICHOLAS KRISTOF (New York Times columnist), January 8, 2013 When [a .223-caliber round] hits a human body, the effects are devastating.

GENERAL STANLEY MCCHRYSAL, January 8, 2013 I know this might be breaking news to Nicholas Kristof, but guns being more lethal than anything else you have around is sort of the whole point. The issue should not really be the lethality of the gun, but the psychology of the person holding it. If we are teaching people how to respect their weapons and use them safely, then the times when theyre lethal are the times when we want them to be. Outside of hunting and sport shooting, guns serve as equalizers. With a gun, even an elderly grandmother might well be able to fend off an attacker. Violent criminals are, after all, overwhelmingly young, strong males. To them, anything from a knife to their bare hand could easily serve as lethal weapons. And it is not just Grandma. The equalizer argument applies to most women, to older men, and especially to the disabled a group that is a particular target for robberies. Guns provide the only effective way for them to defend themselves. The evidence and there is plenty of it points to the exact opposite of what Kristof claims: cutting access to guns mainly disarms law-abiding citizens, making criminals lives that much easier. Guns allow potential victims to defend themselves when the police arent there. Besides, guns may be the most lethal weapon around thats easily accessible, but if were just talking about overall ability to kill a lot of people, its hard not to include explosives, which are used by the military and mass killers alike. The first attack on the World Trade Center, in 1993, was a bombing. The Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 killed 168 people and was caused by bombs created from such easily available items as fertilizer (ammonium nitrate), a common cleaning solvent (liquid nitromethane), and diesel fuel. And the worst school massacre in U.S. history, in which thirty-eight people were killed, occurred in 1927 and was carried out with a bomb.

NO ONE WANTS TO TAKE YOUR GUNS AWAY. No one is saying that peoples guns should be taken away, or that taking the Second Amendment rights away. No one is saying that [is the answer]...

DON LEMON (CNN anchor), July 22, 2012 Nobody questions the Second Amendments right to bear arms.

MAYOR MICHAEL BLOOMBERG (New York City), December 16, 2012 Guys, gals, now hear this: No one wants to take away your hunting rifles. No one wants to take away your shotguns. No one wants to take away your revolvers, and no one wants to take away your automatic pistols, as long as said pistols hold no more than ten rounds.

STEPHEN KING,

Guns I dont want to change the Second Amendment. I dont want to change an Americans right to bear an arm in their home to defend people. I want to get rid of these killing machine assault weapons off the street. PIERS MORGAN, January 7, 2013 Gun grabber is a mythical boogeyman. No serious person, including Obama, is even proposing taking away owned guns. #StopFearmongering. TOUR, February 16, 2013 (via Twitter) Anyone whos closely watching the bullying from the controllist crowd, and knows their history, has good reason to be concerned. The environment thats been created is eerily similar to what nations like the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada experienced just before introducing severe private gun ownership restrictions or banning them altogether. Here in the United States, the Second Amendment has seemingly gone from being a God-given natural right to a privilege that must be defended. Yet the moment anyone dares voice those concerns they are usually met with mockery and dismissed as a bloodthirsty, paranoid freak who is bitterly clinging to their guns even as the mainstream of society passes them by. Gun rights advocates are thought by the elite controllists to be creatures with the intelligence of a Neanderthal, stubbornly unwilling to accept commonsense gun control measures that would allegedly save the lives of countless American children. The mere mention of a slippery slope, with the Second Amendment itself being the real target, is brushed off as laughably preposterous conspiracy theory. The truthwhich, as youll soon see, is not a conspiracy or a theoryis that there are many controllists who want nothing more than to ban guns. They admire Australia and the United Kingdom and Japan and believe that the civilized nations of the world have evolved and left America behind. Those countries are the grown-ups while we Americans are the toddlers throwing temper tantrums in a corner. But controllists have a major problem: the Bill of Rights. Americans have a constitutional right to bear armsand lots of people want to keep it that way. According to a December 2012 Gallup poll, 74 percent of Americans oppose a ban on the possession of handguns. So that leaves controllists in a bind: They believe that guns have no place among civilians, but they cant really say that. So they carefully parse their language. Instead of talking about handgun bans they focus on military-style assault weapons or high-capacity magazines or laws that make it more difficult to purchase a weapon or ammunition. But what do you think happens once they get these initial laws passeddo they just stop? Do they pat themselves on the back for getting clips limited to ten bullets, or do they start a new push for eight or five? Do they celebrate getting the sale of new semi-automatics banned, or do they now start to go after all of the ones currently in circulation? That question can easily be answered for anyone willing to listen to what the controllists actually say. Last we left Senator Dianne Feinstein the author of the 1994 and 2013 federal assault weapon bansshe was explaining to 60 Minutes in 1995 that she wouldve liked to have gotten rid of all so-called assault weapons (not just the specific guns included in the ban), but she just couldnt get it through that pesky Congress: If I couldve gotten 51 votes in the Senate of the United States for an outright ban, picking up every one of themMr. and Mrs. America turn em all inI would have done it. President Obama and Vice President Joe Biden have also given strong assurances about their commitment to the Second Amendment, but then they put Attorney General Eric Holder in charge of crafting Obamas executive orders on gun control in the wake of the Newtown massacre. Why is that an issue? Because youd be hard-pressed to find someone more anti-gun (except, of course, when it comes to handing them to Mexican drug cartel members) than Holder. In a 1995 talk before the Womans National Democratic Club, Holder said that he hoped we could one day make gun owners feel as ostracized as the smokers who cower outside of buildings: What we need to do is change the way in which people think about guns, especially young people, and make it something thats not cool, that its not acceptable, its not hip to carry a gun anymore, in the way in which weve changed our attitudes about cigarettes. You know, when I was growing up, people smoked all the time. Both my parents did. But over time, we changed the way that people thought about smoking, so now we have people who cower outside of buildings and kind of smoke in private and dont want to admit it. And later, in the same speech: We have to be repetitive about this. We need to do this every day of the week, and just really brainwash people into thinking about guns in a vastly different way. (emphasis added) Eric Holder may have been smart enough to not use the word ban, but others havent been so careful. Remember the quote at the beginning of this section where CNN anchor Don Lemon claimed that no one is saying we should take peoples guns away? Well, just five months later, he was contradicted by someone he knows very well: Don Lemon. We need to get guns and bullets and automatic weapons off the streets, Lemon said. They should only be available to police officers and to hunt al Qaeda and the Taliban and not hunt elementary school children. So we should get rid of guns and bullets but no one is saying we should take peoples guns away? Same guy. Same year. Incredible. In case Don Lemon isnt impressed by his own inconsistency, here are a few more concrete examples of people openly calling for gun bans: How can we possibly have assault weapons? And frankly, why do we need guns? We dont need guns. We have 10,000 murders a year. BUZZ BISSINGER, Pulitzer Prizewinning author and Daily Beast columnist But the logic is faulty, and a close look at it leads to the conclusion that the United States should ban private gun ownership entirely, or almost entirely. JEFF MCMAHAN, professor of philosophy at Rutgers University, writing in the New York Times And this banning mind-set isnt just a reaction to Newtown; its been around for a while. The editors of the Los Angeles Times, in an editorial from 1993 titled Taming the Monster: Get Rid of the Guns, wrote: No guns, period, except for those held by law enforcement officials and a few others.... Why should America adopt a policy of near-zero tolerance for private gun ownership? Because its the only alternative to the present insanity. Without both strict limits on access to new weapons and aggressive efforts to reduce the supply of

existing weapons, no one can be safer. Six years later the Washington Post got into the act. No presidential candidate, the paper editorialized, has yet come out for the most effective proposal to check the terror of gunfire: a ban on the general sale, manufacture and ownership of handguns as well as assault-style weapons. In other words, the most effective plan, according to these editors, is a ban of all handguns and assault weapons. A more recent editorial in the Economist seems to agree: I personally dislike guns. I think the private ownership of guns is a tragic mistake. But a majority of Americans disagree with me, some of them very strongly. And at a certain point, when very large majorities disagree with you, a bit of deference is in order. ... I am pretty sure that the sort of gun control that would workbanning all guns is not going to happen. Is it possible these opinions dont count because, like corporations, progressives dont consider editorial boards to be people? Back in the present day, Piers Morgan, who claims with a straight face, I totally respect and admire the Constitution and the Second Amendment and an Americans right to defend themselves at home, has also gotten in on the act. This is from his January 10, 2013, show: PIERS MORGAN: Youve got to make a stand somewhere. You have to start somewhere. The logical place to start, given that automatic weapons are banned, is you go to the next level down, semiautomatic weapons. You know, in an ideal world, Id have all guns gone, as we have in Britain. But this is not my country. And I respect the fact that most Americans wouldnt wear that kind of argument. Heres a pro tip, Piers, free of charge: when attempting to convince Americans how much you respect the Second Amendment, try not to reveal how you would really like to ban all guns. And if youre going to make fun of the slippery slope argument, as youve done so often on your show, maybe try not to use expressions like You have to start somewhere. Its important for people to understand where most of these controllists are really coming from. Piers Morgan believes that all guns should be banned. Not just assault weapons or large capacity magazines, but all guns gone. You must listen to everything else he says with that basic framework in mind. Two days earlier, Morgan had this exchange on his show with Pulitzer Prizewinning New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof: KRISTOF: So if the only thing that legislators do is reinstitute the assault weapons ban and the high magazine, that will be great. That will be a step forward. MORGAN: But it wont be enough. KRISTOF: But it wont be nearly enough.... We have to make a move on handguns as well. Hey, Tour, do you still think that no serious person proposes to take guns away? Still think we should #StopFearmongering? In case you have not heard, Piers Morgan is British. He has seen firsthand how theyve successfully been able to change public perception, using one incident at a time to push further and further down the slippery slope that allegedly does not exist. Heres a brief summary of how their gun ban came to be; see if you recognize any similarities to the American debate: 1689: King William of Orange guarantees his subjects (except Catholics) the right to bear arms for self-defense in a new Bill of Rights. 1819: In response to civil unrest, a temporary Seizure of Arms Act is passed; it allows constables to search for, and confiscate, arms from people who are dangerous to the public peace. This expired after two years. 1870: A license is needed only if you want to carry a firearm outside of your home. 1903: The Pistols Act is introduced and seems to be full of common sense. No guns for drunks or the mentally insane, and licenses are required for handgun purchases. 1920: The Firearms Act ushers in the first registration system and gives police the power to deny a license to anyone unfitted to be trusted with a firearm. According to historian Clayton Cramer, this is the first true pivot point for the United Kingdom, as the ownership of firearms ceased to be a right of Englishmen, and instead became a privilege. 1937: An update to the Firearm Act is passed that raises the minimum age to buy a gun, gives police more power to regulate licenses, and bans most fully automatic weapons. The home secretary also rules that self-defense is no longer a valid reason to be granted a gun certificate. 1967: The Criminal Justice Act expands licensing to shotguns. 1968: Existing gun laws are placed into a single statute. Applicants have to show good reason for carrying ammunition and guns. The Home Office is also given the power to set fees for shotgun licenses. 1988: After the Hungerford Massacre, in which a crazy person uses two semi-automatic rifles to kill fifteen people, an amendment to the Firearms Act is passed. According to the BBC, this amendment banned semi-automatic and pump-action rifles; weapons which fire explosive ammunition; short shotguns with magazines; and elevated pump-action and self-loading rifles. Registration was also made mandatory for shotguns, which were required to be kept in secure storage. 1997: After the Dunblane massacre results in the deaths of sixteen children and a teacher (the killer uses two pistols and two revolvers), another Firearms Act amendment is passed, this one essentially banning all handguns. 2006: After a series of gun-related homicides get national attention, the Violent Crime Reduction Act is passed, making it a crime to make or sell imitation guns and further restricting the use of air weapons. If that does not prove how the slippery slope from Bill of Rights to total ban actually worksthen I dont know what does. So, youll have to excuse us, Piers, when we get a little dodgy about your assault weapon ban proposal or when CNN anchors and major newspaper columnists advocate for zero tolerance on private gun ownership. Weve seen this movie before and we know how it ends. WELL, CANT WE AT LEAST CLARIFY THE SECOND AMENDMENT? Is there an argument for the Second Amendment to be repealed and to be clarified and be redrafted? PIERS MORGAN, December 18, 2012 I know that Piers isnt an American citizen, so Ill give him the benefit of the doubt and assume he doesnt quite understand how this works in the United States. Yes, Piers, the Second Amendment could be repealed, clarified, or redrafted. And you could lead all of cable news in ratings. Both of those things are technically possiblebut neither will ever happen. The Constitution is, of course, not immutable. When the American people wish to change the Constitution, they can do so through the amendment process detailed in Article V. In fact,

the people themselves (acting through their state legislatures) can use Article V to call a convention to propose a particular amendment, or they can call a convention to propose an entirely new constitution. Yet, for well over two centuries, through wars and peace, mob violence, gang violence, and unthinkable public massacres, no serious attempt has ever been made to repeal or redraft the Second Amendment. If one had been, its doubtful that even a single state wouldve ratified the proposal. Even today, with what the media alleges is a completely changed national attitude toward guns, it is very likely that a proposal to repeal the Second Amendment would be ratified by a grand total of zero states. However, plenty of states have gone the other way, amending their state constitutions toward a clearer understanding of the right to keep and bear arms being an individual right. The most recent example is Louisiana, where nearly 73 percent of voters in 2012 approved an amendment to the state constitution making it much more difficult for gun control legislation to pass. The old Louisiana constitution read: The right of each citizen to keep and bear arms shall not be abridged, but this provision shall not prevent the passage of laws to prohibit the carrying of weapons concealed on the person. But this was replaced with far stronger wording: The right of each citizen to acquire, keep, possess, transport, carry, transfer, and use arms for defense of life and liberty, and for all other legitimate purposes is fundamental and shall not be denied or infringed, and any restriction on this right shall be subject to strict scrutiny. So, yes, Pierswe could definitely clarify all of this for youbut probably not in the direction you think. **THAT MAY BE, BUT EVEN THOMAS JEFFERSON WANTED THE SECOND AMENDMENT TO EXPIRE.** Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Second Amendment, said that it should be revisited every 20 years to see if it is still appropriate. **CHRISTOPHER KENNEDY LAWFORD**, January 7, 2013 A small point of clarification for Mr. Lawford: Thomas Jefferson didnt write the Second Amendment. In fact, he was not even in the country at the time it was created; he was the United States minister plenipotentiary to France. It was James Madison who took the numerous suggestions for the language of the Second Amendment and synthesized them into a proposal that Congress subsequently debated, amended, and sent to the states for ratification. But lets excuse for a second the fact that JFKs nephewa man who is a self-described author, activist and actor and who routinely puts himself on television to discuss gun controldoes not even know who actually wrote the Second Amendment. Hes still wrong. Jefferson never said that the Second Amendment in particular ought to be reexamined every twenty years. What he did say one time in a letter to Madisonand what I assume Lawford was referring towas that all laws, including the U.S. Constitution, ought to automatically expire after twenty years: On similar ground it may be proved that no society can make a perpetual constitution, or even a perpetual law. The earth belongs to the living generation. They may manage it then, and what proceeds from it, as they please, during their usufruct. They are masters too of their own persons, and consequently may govern them as they please. But persons and property make the sum of the objects of government. The constitution and the laws of their predecessors extinguished them, in their natural course, with those whose will gave them being. This could preserve that being till it ceased to be itself, and no longer. Every constitution, then, and every law, naturally expires at the end of 19 years. If it be enforced longer, it is an act of force and not of right. **LETTER FROM THOMAS JEFFERSON**, in Paris, to James Madison, September 6, 1789 While this letter makes Jefferson sound as though he could be a member of the Center for American Progress, theres actually an important lesson here: Jefferson lost. His views were in the extreme minority. Most Americans, including James Madison, hoped that the new Constitution of 1787 would provide long-term stability to the United States. And thats exactly what has happened. Since the Constitution is not a living document, it has guaranteed generations of Americans that the bedrock principles of freedom will endure. But Lawford is wrong for another reason as well. By focusing on this one letter, hes missing a much larger point: even if laws were reviewed, Jefferson would have always insisted that any new constitution respect the natural rights of mankind. As he affirmed in his writings, including the Declaration of Independence, the essential purpose of government is to protect our God-given rights. Whether a law was to expire in ten years, twenty years, or one hundred years is irrelevantJefferson would always be against any effort to suppress our inalienable rights. Like the other Founders, Jefferson believed there were many different ways in which a government could be structured, but that every legitimate government must protectand never violatethe natural rights of mankind. Finally, if Lawford is really so supportive of Jeffersons idea, then he also must be willing to throw out every major current gun control law that is more than twenty years old. That would wipe out the vast majority of federal gun control lawsincluding the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Gun Control Act of 1968. Most state gun control laws would disappear as well. The result? The United States of 2013 would look a lot like the United States of 1788a nation with no constitutional guarantee about the right to bear arms, but also a nation with a lot of guns and almost no laws restricting them. **THE UNITED STATES HAS THE HIGHEST GUN MURDER RATE IN THE DEVELOPED WORLD.** You have by far the worst rate of gun murder and gun crime of any of the civilized countries of this world.... **PIERS MORGAN**, December 18, 2012 This all sounds pretty plausiblewhich is probably why this line is repeated so often. Yet things are a lot more complicated than they seem. Its not clear exactly what countries Morgan has picked when he says other civilized countries, but it is possible to generate almost any kind of result by picking the right set of countries. First, lets just be clear that lots of nations, including civilized ones, suffer from higher overall murder and gun murder rates than America. In 2011, the U.S. murder rate was 4.7 per 100,000 people and the gun murder rate was 3.2. Much of Eastern Europe, most of Southeast Asia, the Caribbean, Africa, all but one South American nation, and all of Central

America and Mexico suffer from higher murder rates than we do. For example, despite very strict gun control, homicide rates in Russia and Brazil have averaged about four to five times higher than ours over the last decade. As the Washington Post reported: The dubious distinction of having the most gun violence goes to Honduras, at 68.43 homicides by firearm per 100,000 people, even though it only has 6.2 firearms per 100 people. Other parts of South America and South Africa also rank highly, while the United States is somewhere near the mid-range. In fact, if you look across all nations and not just a select few, what you find is that those with the strictest gun control laws also tend to have the highest murder rates. Gun control advocates prefer to use the very questionable data from the pro-gun control Small Arms Survey to make their case but even that data proves that higher rates of gun ownership correlate with fewer deaths. (See charts.)