
homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Scot - 2010/01/08 10:28

In article <382D1175.45D9A...@postoffice.pacbell.net, Scot <scotgd@post From _The Logic of Causal Order_ by James A. Davis. Variable X is a cause of Variable Y when

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by David Brundle - 2010/01/08 10:28

The US: a) appears to have a greater propensity to kill (7.3 : 1.4) b) greater freedom to acquire and own legally. (see volumes above) c) uses guns as the preferred means of murder (68% : 8%) Thus there would appear to be, prima facie, a connection between the propensity to kill, the availability of guns and the use of gun as a preferred murder tool. You have far from proved a prima facie case, all you have done is to present a simple pair wise comparison of the UK. Your use of latin does not add weight to your as I shall soon demonstrate in a reductio ad absurdum. [-] The figures for homicide you quote are correct for the two sources quoted. However, differences in the two statistics mean that are not directly comparable. The US figure from the FBI UCR is little more than an estimate. The FBI is responsible for compiling the UCR and decides what is and is not homicide. No matter what the decision of the legal process the figures are not adjusted and as a result accidents and suicides are often included in the UCR. The figure for England and Wales represent only those cases where a conviction was obtained for murder, manslaughter and infanticide. Britain also has a number of offences, for example causing death by reckless or dangerous driving, that would be classified as involuntary manslaughter and included in the US figure. I note that you quote the figures for England and Wales. Due to it's separate judicial system Scotland compiles its own statistics. As a result a cursory examination would appear to show that the Scottish rate of homicide is approximately twice that of the UK. The Scots are no more violent than the English or Welsh the difference is simply due to the different ways in which the statistics are compiled. Similarly comparison of Swiss and French homicide statistics would be misleading since both countries lump murder and attempted murder into the same statistic of homicide. At best one can conclude the US figure represents a gross estimate of the American homicide rate and the British figure a conservative one. Recognising the fact that comparison of international homicide statistics is fraught with difficulties Shikita Minoru et al attempted to provide a coherent set of statistics by combining sets of statistics to approximate the Japanese standard. This resulted in homicide rates per capita of: France 4.1 Germany 4.3 UK 5.5 US 8.3 The above figures were produced in 1988 and over the last few years US homicide rates have declined dramatically. Referring to the FBI UCR we find over the last two decades the rate per capita is: 1980 10.2 1981 9.8 1982 9.1 1983 8.3 1984 7.9 1985 7.9 1986 8.6 1987 8.3 1988 8.4 1989 8.7 1990 9.4 1991 9.8 1992 9.3 1994 9.0 1995 8.2 1996 7.4 1997 6.8 Whereas the rate per capita for England and Wales has remained essentially constant: 1980 1.2 1981 1.1 1982 1.2 1983 1.1 1984 1.3 1985 1.3 1986 1.3 1988 1.3 1989 1.2 1990 1.3 1991 1.4 1992 1.3 1993 1.3 1994 1.4 1995 1.5 1997 1.4 Given that the US homicide rate has dropped to nearly 3/4 it's former value and the British rate is approximately the same we can estimate the US homicide rate (according to the Japanese standard) at 6.4 and the British rate as 5.5. The difference is not as marked as you imply. You have also limited yourself to a comparison of homicide statistics. What would happen if we were to compare other offences. The US rate of burglary of occupied premises is 1/3 that of the UK. Due to the continued decline in crime rates in the US street crime is now lower in the UK; you are more likely not less to be mugged in the UK. And returning to homicide it is interesting to look at the distribution of homicide in the US. Clayton Cramer examined the incidence of homicide in California and found that violent crime is contained to a few relatively small areas of certain major cities such as LA. Excluding those areas the rest of California had a homicide rate comparable to that of rural England. The crime rate in the inner city areas was so massive, however, that it dominated the statistics of the state as a whole. The real tragedy of violent crime in the US is that whilst it is confined to inner city ghettos and it predominantly affects the poor and deprived sections of society (who do not tend to vote) there is little incentive to do something about it. Gun control is window dressing and gesture politics that does not tackle fundamental and underlying problems. You have also restricted yourself to a simple comparison between the UK and the US. Why just the UK and the US? To prove the hypothesis you present one might expect that if we were to examine other countries we would find the same thing. Well Switzerland has a rate of firearms ownership that surpasses even that of the US. Similarly New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and Finland combine high rates of firearm ownership and an enviable low crime rate. One might also expect that where the incidence of firearms ownership has fallen crime would reduce and vice versa. Since 1968 firearms act gun ownership in the UK has halved in real terms yet violent crime has increased dramatically. Similarly in the US although gun ownership has doubled their crime rate has fallen. The argument you present is simplistic, naive and demonstrably false. No matter how it is examined the difference in UK and US gun laws has little impact on the criminal use of firearms. Focussing simply on firearms is dangerous since it can distract attention from the main causes of crime. The US homicide rate rose during the '80s because of the crack epidemic; it was a drugs problem that fuelled the homicide rate and not gun ownership. We in Britain are beginning to witness the growth of a similar problem; the number of drug murders in London resulting from the crack trade has increased alarmingly. Smug complacency about our gun laws is not going to solve these problems. David Brundle Quemadmoeum gladius neminem occidit, occidentis telum est. (A sword is never a killer,

it's a tool in the killer's hands.) - Lucius Annaeus Seneca the Younger (ca. 4 BC-65 AD).

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Scout - 2010/01/08 10:28

there are Lies, damn lies and statistics and that there is no irrefutable proof for any of the arguments, just subjective opinions?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Scout - 2010/01/08 10:28

The statistics did *not* attempt to address gun control . By your subjectively inserting the gun control aspect you are providing a good example of my absence of truth argument above :-). I'm sorry, I though gun control was what led to the differences in availability of guns between our nations. Are you refuting that at this time?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

In article <382D1175.45D9A...@postoffice.pacbell.net, Scot <scotgd@post From _The Logic of Causal Order_ by James A. Davis. Variable X is a cause of Variable Y when

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Scout - 2010/01/08 10:28

about conducting and/or bias. Do we know what that error is? No. Heaven forbid that you are doubting statistics , Scout. Surely they indicate truth to you, or do only the ones opposing gun control has that attribute? Nope, I don't doubt the statistics, I doubt the manner in which they were collected reflects reality. I doubt this because based on my research results such as these are normally the result of biased sampling and/or erroneous methodology.

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Scot - 2010/01/08 10:28

To satisfy your demand, and against my better judgement, I published statistics (both US and UK) that should be reasonably independent. Naturally you do not like them as they do not support your agenda. I missed them. And as one of those who have complained about your lack belief in truth, I would like to see your data. Can you repost it to me (I know, you get Scot and Scout confused) Scot, Scott, Scout (scratches head in confusion). Sorry about that- all you cyberyanks look the same to me :-). Be consistent. Do you want statistics, or do you, like me, believe that there are Lies, damn lies and statistics and that there is no irrefutable proof for any of the arguments, just subjective opinions?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Scot - 2010/01/08 10:28

In article <382D1175.45D9A...@postoffice.pacbell.net, Scot <scotgd@post From _The Logic of Causal Order_ by James A. Davis. Variable X is a cause of Variable Y when

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Noel B. Brinkley - 2010/01/08 10:28

To satisfy your demand, and against my better judgement, I published statistics (both US and UK) that should be reasonably independent. Naturally you do not like them as they do not support your agenda. I missed them. And as one of those who have complained about your lack belief in truth, I would like to see your data. Can you repost it to me (I know, you get Scot and Scout confused) Scot, Scott, Scout (scratches head in confusion). Sorry about that- all you cyberyanks look the same to me :-). Be consistent. Do you want statistics, or do you, like me, believe that there are Lies, damn lies and statistics and that there is no irrefutable proof for any of the arguments, just subjective opinions?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Erich - 2010/01/08 10:28

John <j...@lorca.demon.co.uk wrote in message In article <GfEX3.37445\$oa2.165...@iad-read.news.verio.net, Scout <sc...@monumental.com writes in response to Erich's statistics: Because when I research the few that have the details available the questions asked do NOT support the conclusion that was drawn from it. Note the example above. As such given the history I would tend to doubt them until shown otherwise. 761, That certainly is a massive number. In what area was this done? Local calls to DC area? Or was it nationwide? How many did not respond when called. Were the people called evenly distributed among races, sex, and urban/suburban/rural? What is the extent of the other errors admitted? 10% 20% 50% 95%? Please note that how you conduct the poll can greatly alter the accuracy, yet as you see they don't have to admit to any specific level of error. IOW you know that the statistical error is 4%, however the other errors could be...well anything. What exactly is an assault weapon? Is this based on the definition by HCI, The press, The Congress, or what the people think it means? Please note the disclaimer above about the error, specifically that portion about conducting and/or bias. Do we know what that error is? No. Heaven forbid that you are doubting statistics, Scout. Surely they indicate truth to you, or do only the ones opposing gun control has that attribute? Nope, I don't doubt the statistics, I doubt the manner in which they were collected reflects reality. I doubt this because based on my research results such as these are normally the result of biased sampling and/or erroneous methodology. I posted the results of two different surveys from well respected organizations. The included URL's had details on how the polls were done and confirmed that standard polling techniques were indeed followed. The Washington Post/ ABC poll even included the exact questions asked. Both surveys showed there is overwhelming popular support for background checks at gun shows. That two different surveys returned almost the same numbers further confirms the data. For Scout to refute the results he needs to present his own data here where we can all evaluate it. Simply alluding to his research proves nothing. For those that missed it, the Washington Post poll showing 89% support for background checks at gun shows is here: <<http://elections98.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/vault/sto...> The Gallup poll showing 87% support is here: <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr990713.asp> ... Erich

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by W. E. Woods - 2010/01/08 10:28

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by W. E. Woods - 2010/01/08 10:28

: On Sat, 13 Nov 1999 00:55:22 -0800, W. E. Woods : <wewo...@ix.netcom.com carefully left the following thoughtprints : where they could be seen: :Incorrect. They trust each other with power. : That's True Believer rhetorical spin-doctoring.

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by W. E. Woods - 2010/01/08 10:28

K-Mac Remember, a ship in harbor is safe, but that is not what ships are built for. Give me ambiguity or give me something else!

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by W. E. Woods - 2010/01/08 10:28

Is a Mexican Standoff better than a handshake? Careful, now, you're falling into a logic trap. There is a third alternative available. Remember, a ship in harbor is safe, but that is not what ships are built for. Give me ambiguity or give me something else!

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by W. E. Woods - 2010/01/08 10:28

wewo...@ix.netcom.com (W. E. Woods) wrote in <382934F9.D040F...@ix.netcom.com: ... The violent conflict arises as the home owner carrying his firearm confronts the criminal, and the later wets himself and leaps out the window. True. I once had occasion to confront a fellow who was breaking into a house I owned. A shuck-shuck of the 12 guage froze him where he stood, and the piss running down his leg was rather obvious. He didn't jump, though. I think the puke was frozen to the ground. The cops laughed their asses off when they picked his sorry ass up. At least they should have made him mop it up before hauling him off. Good thought. He was outside. It was *really* cold, too. Oh well, at least outside waters the plants. Hey, we gotta be in favor of anything that helps out our green friends, right? Remember, a ship in harbor is safe, but that is not what ships are built for. Give me ambiguity or give me something else!

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by W. E. Woods - 2010/01/08 10:28

It's his property after all, why should there be any rules? Stupid remark. Remember, a ship in harbor is safe, but that is not what ships are built for. Give me ambiguity or give me something else!

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

In article <382D1175.45D9A...@postoffice.pacbell.net, Scot <scotgd@post From _The Logic of Causal Order_ by James A. Davis. Variable X is a cause of Variable Y when

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

To satisfy your demand, and against my better judgement, I published statistics (both US and UK) that should be reasonably independent. Naturally you do not like them as they do not support your agenda. I missed them. And as one of those who have complained about your lack belief in truth, I would like to see your data. Can you repost it to me (I know, you get Scot and Scout confused) Scot, Scott, Scout (scratches head in confusion). Sorry about that- all you cyberyanks look the same to me :-). Be consistent. Do you want statistics, or do you, like me, believe that there are Lies, damn lies and statistics and that there is no irrefutable proof for any of the arguments, just subjective

opinions?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

The US: a) appears to have a greater propensity to kill (7.3 : 1.4) b) greater freedom to acquire and own legally. (see volumes above) c) uses guns as the preferred means of murder (68% : 8%) Thus there would appear to be, prima facie, a connection between the propensity to kill, the availability of guns and the use of gun as a preferred murder tool. Sorry, but the data shown does not support your conclusion because there is nothing here that shows the reason for the difference is guns, so without support for this conclusion it is but your unsupported opinion of why this difference exists. Putting words in my mouth again, Scout. I have made no comment about the differences in US and UK gun control laws, nor given any opinion why the difference exists. However you would agree that a difference of some kind does exist? If so, the questions that now need answering are: a) does the availability of guns increase/decrease/ or have no effect on the propensity to kill ? b) does the availability of guns impact the choice of homicide weapon? What do you think?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

The statistics did *not* attempt to address gun control . By your subjectively inserting the gun control aspect you are providing a good example of my absence of truth argument above :-). I'm sorry, I thought gun control was what led to the differences in availability of guns between our nations. Are you refuting that at this time? How do you explain there are more guns per head of population in the US (mixture of control/no control) and per head of population in England and Wales (reasonably strict gun control) ?

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Melissa - 2010/01/08 10:28

In article <382E84F9.2...@ix.netcom.com, Richard Popkin <pop...@ix.netcom.com writes one more tidbit, folks. john lott's work is not speculation, it's statistics. the armed populace idea works. If you believe statistics..... Don't believe anyone or anything Chicken Little, after all you can't trust anyone and everyone's out to get you, except the govt of course. Now back under the bed.

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by Avarice - 2010/01/08 10:28

the validity of the example. I may have a PDF file around here somewhere of the ... read more »

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

j...@lorca.demon.co.uk (John) wrote in <0rdv\$GAICsL4E...@lorca.demon.co.uk: In article <382E84F9.2...@ix.netcom.com, Richard Popkin <pop...@ix.netcom.com writes one more tidbit, folks. john lott's work is not speculation, it's statistics. the armed populace idea works. If you believe statistics..... Don't believe anyone or anything Chicken Little, after all you can't trust anyone and everyone's out to get you, except the govt of course. Now back under the bed. Errrr no, Melissa, inappropriate suggestion that you might make to your compatriots!. You recall I suggested that perhaps one of the reasons you feel you need guns as defence is that *you* do not trust *either* the US government *or* your fellow Americans.

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

=====

homicide statistics "More guns, less crime? Are you positive?"

Posted by John - 2010/01/08 10:28

be high? I do not have the figures for those countries, As you obviously do, please post them. Very tight restrictions on firearms. BTW Rwanda has been a civil war zone for some years, with little or no actual restriction on firearms. However, most of the slaughter early on was committed using machetes. Does either Jamaica or Mexico have tight restrictions on firearms ?. Both have extremely tight restrictions on firearms. And extremely high murder rates. More examples of the relevance of 'propensity' to kill, and irrelevance of firearms availability. Thanks..... I'll see if I can find any info.

=====