

SR-75

Submitted on: 3/21/2018 1:25:23 PM

Testimony for PSM on 3/22/2018 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Melodie Aduja	Testifying for Oahu County Committee on Legislative Priorities of the Democratic Party of Hawai'i	Support	No

Comments:

SR-75

Submitted on: 3/19/2018 1:57:36 PM

Testimony for PSM on 3/22/2018 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Brian Isaacson	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments:

The reason that Congress quit supporting research by the CDC into firearms related issues is that the CDC failed, repeatedly, to be impartial while claiming to be scientific. The current wording of the resolution with the emphasis on gun violence already betrays your lack of impartiality, since there is no mention of the possibility that firearms prevent crime and/or violence when used lawfully. We don't need another cycle of prejudiced research in order to have Congress not support such bias again. Call for impartial research into firearms related issues, including the positive effects of concealed carry policies enacted in states with a resulting drop in crime (already proven by uncontested studies) and your resolution might be worth supporting.



Institute for Rational and Evidence-based Legislation

P. O. Box 41

Mountain View, Hawaii 96771

March 20, 2018

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, INTERGOVERNMENTAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

OPPOSE SR75

Chairs, Vice-chairs, and committee members,

Good grief!

How many lies, lies of omission, and propaganda terms can one relatively short “resolution” contain?

Is this an attempt at a record of some kind?

I'm just going to address one of them.

“WHEREAS, former United States President Barack Obama issued a memorandum in 2013 directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other federal agencies to conduct or sponsor research into the causes of gun violence and ways to prevent it .“

Why don't the authors of this resolution mention the actual findings of the research that Obama asked them to do? Hmmm. I wonder why? An inadvertent omission?

We know exactly what the CDC produced under Obama's directive:

Here are some key findings from the CDC report, “Priorities for Research to Reduce the Threat of Firearm-Related Violence,” (http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=18319&page=R1) released in June, 2013:

1. Armed citizens are less likely to be injured by an attacker:

“Studies that directly assessed the effect of actual defensive uses of guns (i.e., incidents in which a gun was ‘used’ by the crime victim in the sense of attacking or threatening an offender) have found consistently lower injury rates among gun-using crime victims compared with victims who used other self-protective strategies.”

2. Defensive uses of guns are common:

“Almost all national survey estimates indicate that defensive gun uses by victims are at least as common as offensive uses by criminals, with estimates of annual uses ranging from about 500,000 to more than 3 million per year...in the context of about 300,000 violent crimes involving firearms in 2008.”

3. Mass shootings and accidental firearm deaths account for a small fraction of gun-related deaths, and both are declining:

“The number of public mass shootings of the type that occurred at Sandy Hook Elementary School accounted for a very small fraction of all firearm-related deaths. Since 1983 there have been 78 events in which 4 or more individuals were killed by a single perpetrator in 1 day in the United States, resulting in 547 victims and 476 injured persons.” The report also notes, “Unintentional firearm-related deaths have steadily declined during the past century. The number of unintentional deaths due to firearm-related incidents accounted for less than 1 percent of all unintentional fatalities in 2010.”

4. “Interventions” (i.e, gun control) such as background checks, so-called assault rifle bans and gun-free zones produce “mixed” results:

“Whether gun restrictions reduce firearm-related violence is an unresolved issue.” The report could not conclude whether “passage of right-to-carry laws decrease or increase violence crime.”

5. Gun buyback/turn-in programs are “ineffective” in reducing crime:

“There is empirical evidence that gun turn in programs are ineffective, as noted in the 2005 NRC study Firearms and Violence: A Critical Review. For example, in 2009, an estimated 310 million guns were available to civilians in the United States (Krouse, 2012), but gun buy-back programs typically recover less than 1,000 guns (NRC, 2005). On the local level, buy-backs may increase awareness of firearm violence. However, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, for example, guns recovered in the buy-back were not the same guns as those most often used in homicides and suicides (Kuhn et al., 2002).”

6. Stolen guns and retail/gun show purchases account for very little crime:

“More recent prisoner surveys suggest that stolen guns account for only a small percentage of guns used by convicted criminals. ... According to a 1997 survey of inmates, approximately 70 percent of the guns used or possess by criminals at the time of their arrest came from family or friends, drug dealers, street purchases, or the underground market.”

7. The vast majority of gun-related deaths are not homicides, but suicides:

“Between the years 2000-2010 firearm-related suicides significantly outnumbered homicides for all age groups, annually accounting for 61 percent of the more than 335,600 people who died from firearms related violence in the United States.”

In other words, everything Obama was “fishing” for turned out to be untrue. That's why most people

never heard of the results of Obama's directive: it was buried by the media because it didn't support the “progressive” narrative about the evil nature of all firearms and thus the necessity to take as many of them as possible away from as many law-abiding citizens as quickly as possible.

Well, there it is. What else do you need to know?

There's absolutely no need for the “Centers for **DISEASE** Control” to research violence of any kind, including so-called “gun violence”, or “knife violence” or “hammer violence” or “feet and fist violence” etc. “Violence” is NOT a disease. There may be mental disorders that contribute to violence, but they certainly aren't restricted to causing the propaganda-termed “gun violence”. Why would anyone restrict research into mentally defective induced violence to “gun violence”? That doesn't seem, uh, “objective”.

Unless, that is, one is seeking advocacy research, which is what the CDC was doing shortly before they were de-funded by Congress for doing such advocacy research as was made clear by the head of the CDC at the time:

“We need to revolutionize the way we look at guns, like what we did with cigarettes,” Dr. Mark Rosenberg, who oversaw CDC gun research, told *The Washington Post* in 1994. “Now [smoking] is dirty, deadly and banned.”

Now, I'm sure no one in the Hawaii legislature would want that kind of obviously biased advocacy research masquerading as facts, would they?

Thank you,
George Pace