


If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net !
Follow me on Twitter at <http://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!
Visit my website at <http://www.myslantonthings.com> !

 **TODAY'S "QUICK HIT":**
JOHN R. LOTT, JR. –
GUNS AND CRIME
RESEARCHER, HAS
SOME GOOD ADVICE!



By Stephen L. Bakke  October 4, 2016

Here's what provoked me:

This is merely my rebuttal to a writer who took unfair and misleading exception to a capable "guns and crime" researcher whose work I have studied over the last few years. While no research should be free of criticism, in this case I tried to provide some balance.

Here's my response:

John R. Lott, Jr. – Guns and Crime Researcher, Has Some Good Advice!

On October 1 a writer wrote "If the Second District race is influenced, blame the messenger." He tells us John Lott (firearms researcher and author of "More Guns Less Crime") is incompetent and spreading harmful information. Lott is described as "(a) discredited pro-gun advocate," "spouting NRA memes," "debunked by academics," and spreading "repudiated statistics."

Lott's September 30 article was specifically about fighting terrorism – "Here's a real difference in how to battle terror." While supporting one of the candidates in a Congressional race, he's trying to bring some common sense to the gun control arguments being raised. Among other things, here are some of Lott's observations:

- Terrorists and mass murderers virtually always target gun free zones.
- He doesn't comprehensively oppose gun controls, but criticizes pushing for more controls rather than "fixing the current background-check system mess."
- He points out that 99 percent of the "denials" in the current system are "mistakes," and those mistakes discriminate against blacks and Hispanics.

Regarding the October 1 writer's accusations regarding Lott's competence, I'd like to provide some balance. Over several years, I've read a lot of Lott's research as well that of dozens of others. Here's what I believe readers would find if they duplicated my research. Lott has been criticized, sometimes appropriately. He has been debated, usually unsuccessfully. He has been seriously challenged, yet most of his research still merits trust and attention.

This writer's criticism of Lott by stating he has been "discredited, debunked and repudiated" is misleading and unhelpful in advancing the right kind of improvements to gun control.