

*The Myth
of
Police Protection*

It is a “fundamental principle of American law that a government and its agents are under no general duty to provide public services, such as police protection, to any individual citizen.”

Warren v. District of Columbia,
444 A.2d 1 (D.C. Ct. of Ap., 1981)

When seconds count - the police are only minutes away

Those who beat their swords into plowshares
Will do the plowing for those who don't.

This booklet is dedicated to
Those who Won't.

The Myth of Police Protection

Today in America, there are some who believe that Private Citizens should not own firearms. This is dangerous thinking. If the American Citizen, the true sovereign of America, is not allowed by his government to have and bear arms, then the servant government has become the master and the sovereign American people have become the servants.

An Armed Citizenry Will Not Be Oppressed

This booklet deals primarily with the right of American Citizens to protect themselves from the criminal predators that roam our streets, but I will touch briefly on the true purpose of the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America reads, "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." Could any rational thinking person really believe that the Second Amendment has to do with duck hunting or guaranteeing that our military has the right to have weapons? There are those who would like for us to believe that the purpose of the Second Amendment was to guarantee American Citizens the right to have hunting weapons or to allow the National Guard or the Military to have firearms. This would be an absurd understanding of this guaranteed right of the people.

The lessons of history are numerous, clear and bloody. A disarmed population inevitably becomes an enslaved population. A disarmed population is without power, reduced to childlike obedience to and dependent upon the organs of a parental state. A disarmed population will lose either piecemeal or in one sweeping act those basic rights for which the Citizens of America risked their lives and fortunes over 200 years ago.

Will we bow our heads to cowards and fools who will not learn and do not understand the lessons of human history or will we stand straight and assume the daily tasks and risks that liberty entails? Will we ignore even the lessons of this present era which has seen the cruel oppression of millions on the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa and South America and believe that the continent of North America is immune to such political disease or will we wisely accept the realities of this world and listen to and make use of the precautions provided by our ancestors?

Will we be deceived by shameless liars who say that disarmament equals safety, helplessness equals strength, patriotism equals criminality or will we heed the words of our forefathers, who wrote in plain and unmistakable language: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed"?

Firearms of military utility, which serve well and nobly in times of social disturbance as tools of defense for the law-abiding, serve also in the quite role of prevention, against both the criminal and the tyrannical. An armed Citizenry - the well-regulated militia of the Second Amendment, properly armed with military firearms - is a powerful deterrent, on both conscious and subconscious levels, to those inclined toward governmental usurpations. An armed citizenry stands as a constant reminder to those in power that, though they may violate our rights temporarily, they will not do so endlessly and without consequence.

The rationale for Citizen gun ownership lies in the right to overthrow one's government. Armed Citizens can never be oppressed. In the American revolution, the defeat of the British was directly attributable to the Americans' ownership of and ability to access and use firearms. The framers of our Constitution feared oppressive governments and believed that government oppression was inevitable. The right to keep and bear arms is another American freedom, unique in the world and undervalued by the majority of Americans, guaranteed as our birthright, and even more important to true liberty than freedom of religion, the press, and expression.

To the blind, the ignorant, the apathetic, the safe and sheltered, these may seem to be concerns of another age. They are not. They are as vital as they have ever been through history. For times may change, but human nature does not. And it is to protect forever against the evil in human nature that the Founding Fathers set aside certain rights as inviolable. For these reasons we must now make known: We will not passively take the path that leads to tyranny.

To be an American Citizen is to treasure freedom, self-determination and liberty above all else.

American Citizens Have the Right to Protect Themselves

Americans not only have the right, but the responsibility to protect themselves and their communities from crime. To rely solely on the police for protection shows not only laziness, but cowardice. Too often many Citizens find out too late what a terrible mistake they have made when they rely on someone else for their own protection. Many people believe that the police officer is a highly trained firearms expert who will show up in the nick of time and save them from the criminals in our society. This type of thinking has gotten too many people killed.

Did you know that many of the police officers that patrol our streets are barely able to pass their annual firearms qualification test? Here are some statistics that are not widely publicized so you are probably not aware of them. Did you know that in New York City in the year 2005, NYPD had a 51% hit rate at 0 to 2 yards, a 44% hit rate at 3 to 7 yards, and only a 7% hit rate at 8 to 15 yards? Do you really want to trust your life or the lives of your loved ones to someone who can only hit their target 7% of the time at 10 yards away?

Perhaps Mark Twight said it best in his article titled "Eat or Be Eaten" which appeared in S.W.A.T. magazine, March 2000.

"[S]tatistics reveal that police suffer from a stunning lack of training and competence with firearms. According to the national average, police hit their targets 18% of the time during violent confrontations. Individual locales vary: The LAPD's percentage is the highest in the nation (30%) while New York's is the lowest (11%).

In comparison, graduates of schools such as Gunsite, Ragemaster, Yavapai Firearms, Thunder Ranch, etc. who were involved in shootings subsequent to their classes hit with **85 - 100%** of their shots fired in defense of life."

I know that beliefs, not facts, determine behavior, but let me try to convince you with some facts that you should start taking responsibility for your own safety. Did you know that you do **not** have a right to police protection? That's right! The courts have consistently ruled that the police are not obligated to respond to your calls for help, even in life threatening situations! Yes, the courts have stated that it is a "**fundamental principle of American law that a government and its agents are under no general duty to provide public services, such as police protection, to any individual citizen.**" Don't take my word for this, I will provide you with court cites so that you can go to any law library and look these court rulings up for yourself.

So, if the police are not responsible for your safety, then who is? I think you know the answer. YOU ARE! How well prepared are you if a mentally deranged person walks into this facility right now and starts shooting everyone in sight? If you are like most people, you will die if you cannot get out of their way fast enough. *Do you wish to go through life relying on chance that you will live to see another day?* If that is how you wish to live your life, read no further, this booklet is not for you and the information contained within its pages will only disturb you.

There are those among us who believe that carrying a firearm is not only a right, but a social responsibility. This is as it should be. A Citizen who shirks his duty to contribute to the security of his community is little better than the criminal who threatens it, and is better off living in a society that places lesser demands on his capacity to accept responsibility.

Currently there are over 30 states which require the prompt issuance to their Citizens of legal permits to carry concealed weapons. Notwithstanding the fact that most people do not carry guns, the mere possibility that an intended victim could be armed with a firearm eliminates thousands of crimes every year. According to the FBI, states with "shall-issue" right-to-carry laws have a 26% lower total violent crime rate, a 20% lower homicide rate, a 39% lower robbery rate and a 22% lower aggravated assault rate than those states that do not allow their Citizens to legally carry firearms.

Convicted felons reveal in surveys that they are more afraid of armed Citizens than they are of the police and well they should be. Armed Citizens kill 2,000 to 3,000 criminals each year, three times the number killed by the police.

Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida State University, Gary Kleck, has shown through research that private Citizens use firearms to protect themselves and thwart crime about 2.5 million times a year. Citizens use firearms to prevent mass killings, bank robberies, gang attacks, carjackings, rapes, kidnappings and hostage-takings. They use them to help capture prison escapees and murderers, to come to the aid of outnumbered or ambushed police officers. Yet only a handful of these 2.5 million life-saving uses of firearms are ever reported in the mainstream press.

There are those who believe that "Private Citizens don't need firearms because the police will protect them from crime." That belief is both false and dangerous for two reasons.

First, the police cannot and do not protect everyone from crime. If you believe that the police can protect you, how do you explain that in 1997 for example, there were 18,209 murders, 497,950 robberies and 96,122 rapes? Not a very impressive protection record, is it? Second, as consistently stated by the courts, the government and the police have no legal duty to protect individuals from criminal attack. When it comes to deterring crime and defending against criminals, individuals are ultimately responsible for themselves and their loved ones. Depending solely on police emergency response means relying on the telephone as the only defensive tool. Too often, Citizens in trouble dial 911 . . . and die.

The police are nobody's personal bodyguard. Their jobs are to find and arrest people who have committed crimes, not to prevent such potential crimes from happening in the first place. Clearly, the responsibility for victim prevention lies with the victim-to-be.

DUTY TO PROTECT - THE MYTH

All our lives, especially during our younger years, we hear that the police are there to protect us. From the very first kindergarten class visit of "Officer Friendly" to the very last time we saw a police car - most of which have "To Protect and Serve" emblazoned on their doors - we're encouraged to give ourselves over to police protection. But it hasn't always been that way.

Before the mid-1800's, American and British Citizens - even in large cities - were expected to protect themselves and each other. Indeed, they were legally required to pursue and attempt to apprehend criminals. The notion of a police force in those days was abhorrent in England and America, where many viewed it as a form of the dreaded "standing army."

England's first police force, in London, was not instituted until 1827. The first such forces in America followed in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia during the period between 1835 and 1845. They were established only to augment Citizen self-protection. It was never intended that they act affirmatively, prior to or during criminal activity or violence against individual Citizens. Their duty was to protect society as a whole by deterrence; i.e., by systematically patrolling, detecting and apprehending criminals after the occurrence of crimes. There was no thought of police displacing the Citizens' right of self-protection. Nor could they, even if it were intended.

In 1991 Professor Don B. Kates, Jr., eminent civil rights lawyer and criminologist, stated:

"Even if all 500,000 American police officers were assigned to patrol, they could not protect 240 million citizens from upwards of 10 million criminals who enjoy the luxury of deciding when and where to strike. But we have nothing like 500,000 patrol officers; to determine how many police are actually available for any one shift, we must divide the 500,000 by four (three shifts per day, plus officers who have days off, are on sick leave, etc.). The resulting number must be cut in half to account for officers assigned to investigations, juvenile, records, laboratory, traffic, etc., rather than patrol."

It is, therefore, a fact of law and of practical necessity that individuals are responsible for their own personal safety, and that of their loved ones. Police protection must be recognized for what it is: only an auxiliary general deterrent.

Because the police have no general duty to protect individuals, judicial remedies are not available for their failure to protect. In other words, if someone is injured because they expected but did not receive police protection, they cannot recover damages by suing (except in very special cases, explained later). Despite a long history of such failed attempts, however, many people persist in believing the police are obligated to protect them, attempt to recover when no protection was forthcoming, and are emotionally demoralized when the recovery fails. Legal annals abound with such cases.

Warren v. District of Columbia, 444 A.2d 1 (D.C. Ct. of Ap., 1981), is one of the leading cases of this type. Two women were upstairs in a townhouse when they heard their roommate, a third woman, being attacked downstairs by intruders. They phoned the police several times and were assured that officers were on the way. After about 30 minutes, when their roommate's screams had stopped, they assumed the police had finally arrived. When the two women went downstairs they saw that in fact the police never came, but the intruders were still there. As the Warren court graphically states in the opinion: "For the next **fourteen** hours the women were held captive, raped, robbed, beaten, forced to commit sexual acts upon each other, and made to submit to the sexual demands of their attackers."

The three women sued the District of Columbia for failing to protect them, but D.C.'s highest court exonerated the District and its police, saying that it is a "*fundamental principle of American law that a government and its agents are under no general duty to provide public services, such as police protection, to any individual citizen.*" There are many similar cases with results to the same effect. See, for example, Riss v. City of New York, 22 N.Y.2d 579, 293 NYS2d 897, 240 N.E.2d 860 (N.Y. Ct. of Ap. 1958); Keane v. City of Chicago, 98 Ill. App.2d 460, 240 N.E.2d 321 (1968); Morgan v. District of Columbia, 468 A.2d 1306 (D.C. Ct. of Ap. 1983); Calogrides v. City of Mobile, 475 So.2d 560 (S.Ct. A;a. 1985); Morris v. Musser, 478 A.2d 937 (1984); Davidson v. City of Westminster, 32 C.3d 197, 185 Cal.Rptr. 252, 649 P.2d 894 (S.Ct. Cal. 1982); Chapman v. City of Philadelphia, 434 A.2d 753 (Sup.Ct. Penn. 1981); Weutrich v. Delia, 155 N.J. Super 324, 326, 382 A.2d 929, 930 (1978); Sapp v. City of Tallahassee, 348 So.2d 363 (Fla.Ct. of Ap. 1977); Simpson's Food Fair v. Evansville, 272 N.E. 2d 871 (Ind.Ct. of Ap.); Silver v. City of Minneapolis, 170 N.W.2d 206 (S.Ct. Minn. 1969) and Bowers v. DeVito, 686 F.2d 61 (7th Cir. 1982).

In the Warren case, the injured parties sued the District of Columbia under its own laws for failing to protect them. Most often such cases are brought in state (or, in the case of Warren, D.C.) courts for violation of state statutes, because federal law pertaining to these matters is even more onerous. But when someone does sue under federal law, it is nearly always for violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 (often inaccurately referred to as "the civil rights act"). Section 1983 claims are brought against government officials for allegedly violating the injured parties' federal statutory or Constitutional rights.

The seminal case establishing the general rule that police have no duty under federal law to protect Citizens is DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services, 109 S.Ct. 998 (1989). Frequently these cases are based on an alleged "special relationship" between the injured party and the police. In DeShaney the injured party was a boy who was beaten and permanently injured by his father. He claimed a special relationship existed because local officials knew he was being abused, indeed they had "specifically proclaimed by word and deed [their] intention to protect him against that danger," but failed to remove him from his father's custody.

The Court in DeShaney held that no duty arose because of a "special relationship," concluding that Constitutional duties of care and protection only exist as to certain individuals, such as incarcerated prisoners, involuntarily committed mental patients and others restrained against their will and therefore unable to protect themselves. "The affirmative duty to protect arises not from the State's knowledge of the individual's predicament or from its expressions of intent to help him, but from the limitation which it has imposed on his freedom to act on his own behalf."

About a year later, the United States Court of Appeals interpreted DeShaney in the California case of Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department, 901 F.2d 696 (9th Cir. 1990). Ms. Balistreri,

beaten and harassed by her estranged husband, alleged a “special relationship” existed between her and the Pacifica Police Department, to wit, they were duty-bound to protect her because there was a restraining order against her husband. The Court of Appeals, however, concluded that DeShaney limited the circumstances that would give rise to a “special relationship” to instances of custody. Because no such custody existed in *Balistreri*, the Pacifica Police had no duty to protect her, so when they failed to do so and she was injured they were not liable. A Citizen injured because the police failed to protect her can only sue the State or local government in federal court if one of their officials violated a federal statutory or Constitutional right, and can only win such a suit if a “special relationship” can be shown to have existed, which DeShaney and its progeny make it very difficult to do. Moreover, *Zinermon v. Burch*, 110 S.Ct. 975, 984 (1990), very likely precludes Section 1983 liability for police agencies in these types of cases if there is a potential remedy via a State tort action.

Many states, however, have specifically precluded such claims, barring lawsuits against State or local officials for failure to protect, by enacting statutes such as California’s Government Code, Sections 821, 845, and 846 which state, in part: “Neither a public entity or a public employee [may be sued] for failure to provide adequate police protection or service, failure to prevent the commission of crimes and failure to apprehend criminals.”

It is painfully clear that the police cannot be relied upon to protect us. Thus far we’ve seen that they have no duty to do so. And we’ve also seen that even if they did have a duty to protect us, practically speaking they could not fulfill it with sufficient certainty that we would want to bet our lives on it.

Even the Supreme Court has ruled on this issue. In 1999, Jessica Gonzales obtained a restraining order against her estranged husband Simon, which limited his access to their children. On June 22, 1999, Simon abducted their three daughters. After her daughters’ abduction, Jessica repeatedly phoned the police for assistance. Officers visited the home, but believing Simon to be non-violent and in compliance with the limited access granted by the restraining order, the police did nothing.

The next morning, Simon committed “suicide by cop.” He shot a gun repeatedly through a police station window and was killed by returned fire. The murdered bodies of Leslie, 7, Kathryn, 9 and Rebecca, 10 were found in Simon’s pickup truck.

In her lawsuit, Jessica claimed the police violated her 14th Amendment right to due process and sued them for \$30 million. She won at the Appeals level. Castle Rock appealed to the Supreme Court and in the case of *Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, 545 U.S. 748, the Supreme Court found that Jessica did not have a constitutional right to police protection, even in the presence of a restraining order. By a vote of 7 to 2, the Supreme Court ruled that Jessica has no right to sue her local police department for failing to protect her and her children from her estranged husband.

Now it’s time to take off the gloves, so to speak, and get down to reality. So the police aren’t duty-bound to protect us, and they can’t be expected to protect us even if they want to. Does that mean that they won’t protect us if they have the opportunity?

One of the leading cases on this point dates way back into the 1950’s, *Riss v. City of New York*, 22 N.Y.2d 579, 293 NYS2d 897, 240 N.E.2d 860 (N.Y. Ct. of Ap. 1958). Ms. Riss was being harassed by a former boyfriend, in a familiar pattern of increasingly violent threats. She went to the police for help many times, but was always rebuffed. Desperate because she could not get police protection, she applied for a gun permit, but was refused that as well. On the eve of her engagement party she and her mother went to the police one last time pleading for protection against what they were certain was a serious and dangerous threat. And one last time the police refused. As she was leaving the party, her former boyfriend threw acid in her face, blinding and permanently disfiguring her.

Her case against the City of New York for failing to protect her was, not surprisingly, unsuccessful. The lone dissenting justice of New York’s high court wrote in his opinion:

“What makes the City’s position [denying any obligation to protect the woman] particularly difficult to understand is that, in conformity to the dictates of the law [she] did not carry any weapon for self-defense. Thus, by a rather bitter irony she was required to rely for protection on the City of New York which now denies all responsibility to her.” Riss, *Ibid*.

Instances of police refusing to protect someone in grave danger, who is urgently requesting help, are becoming disturbingly more common. In 1988, Lisa Bianco’s violently abusive husband was finally in jail for beating and kidnapping her, after having victimized her for years. Ms. Bianco was somewhat comforted by the facts that he was supposedly serving a seven-year sentence, and she had been promised by the authorities that she’d be notified well in advance of his release. Nevertheless, after being in only a short time, he was temporarily released on an eight-hour pass, and she wasn’t notified. He went directly to her house and, in front of their 6 and 10 year old daughters, beat Lisa Bianco to death.

In 1989, in a suburb of Los Angeles, Maria Navarro called the L. A. County Sheriff’s 911 emergency line asking for help. It was her birthday and there was a party at her house, but her estranged husband, against whom she had a restraining order, said he was coming over to kill her. She believed him, but got no sympathy from the 911 dispatcher, who said: “What do you want us to do lady, send a car to sit outside your house?” Less than half an hour after Maria hung up in frustration, one of her guests called the same 911 line and informed the dispatcher that the husband was there and had already killed Maria and one other guest. Before the cops arrived, he had killed another.

But certainly no cop would stand by and do nothing while someone was being violently victimized. Or would they? In *Freeman v. Ferguson*, 911 F.2d52 (8th Cir. 1990), a police chief directed his officers not to enforce a restraining order against a woman’s estranged husband because the man was a friend of the chief’s. The man subsequently killed the woman and her daughter. Perhaps such a specific case is an anomaly, but more instances of general abuses aren’t at all rare.

In one such typical case *Thurman v. City of Torrington*, 595 F.Supp.1521 (D. Conn. 1984), a woman and her son were harassed, threatened and assaulted by her estranged husband, all in violation of his probation and a restraining order. Despite numerous requests for police protection, the police did nothing because “the police department used an administrative classification that resulted in police protection being fully provided to persons abused by someone with whom the victim has no domestic relationship, but less protection when the victim is either: 1) a woman abused or assaulted by a spouse or boyfriend, or 2) a child abused by a father or stepfather.”

In a much more recent case, *McKee v. City of Rockwall, Texas*, 877 F.2d409 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 110 S.Ct.727 (1990), a woman claimed she was injured because the police refused to make an arrest following a domestic violence call. She claimed their refusal to arrest was due to a city policy of gender-based discrimination. In that case the U. S. District Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit held that “no constitutional violation [occurred] when the most that can be said of the police is that they stood by and did nothing...” *McKee v. City of Rockwall, Texas*, *Id.* at 413.

It is true that in the real world, law enforcement authorities very often do perpetuate the victimization. It is also true that each of us is the only person upon whom we can absolutely rely to avoid victimization.

Remember, even if the police were obligated to protect us (which they aren’t), or even if they tried to protect us (which they often don’t, a fact brought home to millions nationwide as they watched in horror the Rodney King riots in Los Angeles in April 1992 in which 53 people died), most often there wouldn’t be time enough for them to do it. It’s about time that we came to grips with that, and resolved never to abdicate responsibility for our personal safety, and that of our loved ones, to anyone else.

MASSACRES AND ACTIVE SHOOTERS

An “Active Shooter” is defined as an armed person who has used deadly physical force on other persons and continues to do so while having unrestricted access to additional victims. The following characteristics usually pertain to active shooters:

- * They are usually armed with several weapons and a large amount of ammunition.
- * They seek out places where there are a large number of potential victims that have been disarmed either by laws or policies.
- * Their goal is to kill as many victims as possible before they are stopped.
- * They do not expect to survive.
- * They are either stopped by the police or when they are cornered, they usually commit suicide.

EXAMPLES OF MASSACRES AND ACTIVE SHOOTERS:

San Ysidro McDonalds’s Massacre - On July 18, 1984, James Oliver Huberty, a 41 year old former welder from Canton, Ohio killed 21 people and injured another 19 people at a McDonald’s restaurant in the San Ysidro section of San Diego. Huberty was armed with 9mm Uzi semi-automatic, a Winchester pump-action twelve-gauge shotgun, and a 9mm Browning HP. Huberty’s victims were predominantly Mexican and Mexican-American and ranged in age from 8 months to 74 years. The massacre began at 4 P.M. and lasted for 77 minutes. Huberty spent 257 rounds of ammunition before he was fatally shot by Chuck Foster, a SWAT team sniper perched on the roof of a nearby post office. *California’s strict gun laws contributed to this massacre by providing an opportunity for James Huberty to have access to a large number of unarmed victims.*

Luby’s Massacre - On October 16, 1991, George Jo Hennard killed 23 people and injured another 20 people at a Luby’s Cafeteria in Killeen, Texas. Hennard drove his 1987 Ford Ranger pickup truck through the front window of a Luby’s Cafeteria, yelled “This is what Bell County has done to me!” then opened fire on the restaurant’s patrons and staff with a Glock 17 pistol and a Ruger P89. He stalked, shot, and killed 23 people and wounded another 20 before committing suicide. Hennard’s victims ranged in age from 30 to 75 years. One patron, Suzanna Gratia Hupp, had her firearm, but left it in her vehicle because of a law in force at the time, forbidding Citizens from carrying firearms. *Texas’s strict gun laws contributed to this massacre by providing an opportunity for George Hennard to have access to a large number of unarmed victims.* In 1995 the Texas Legislature passed a shall-issue gun law allowing Texas Citizens with the required permit to carry concealed weapons. The law was sponsored by State Rep. Suzanna Gratia Hupp, who was present at the Luby’s massacre when both of her parents were killed.

Columbine High School Massacre - On April 20, 1999, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold killed 13 people and wounded 23 others at the Columbine High School near Littleton Colorado. They were armed with a TEC-DC9, Hi-Point 995 Carbine, Savage 67H pump action shotgun, and a Stevens 311D sawed-off shotgun. At 11:10 Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold arrived at Columbine in separate cars. After arriving, they armed two 20 pound propane bombs before entering the cafeteria. The bombs were set to explode at approximately 11:17 A.M. and had enough explosive power to destroy the entire cafeteria and bring the library above crashing down. Harris and Klebold armed themselves and waited for the bombs to explode. After the bombs failed to explode, they walked towards the cafeteria and began shooting students. At 11:24, a Jefferson County deputy sheriff arrived and began shooting at Harris and Klebold. They returned fire and ran into the school where they began shooting at unarmed students and faculty. At 12:08 P.M. they committed suicide. Over 3 hours later, at 3:22 P.M. the police entered the school and began removing the injured. *The law not allowing those qualified to carry a gun in schools, even security guards, contributed to this massacre by providing an opportunity for Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold to have access to a large number of unarmed victims.*

Red Lake High School Massacre - On March 21, 2005, Jeffrey Weise a student at Red Lake High School killed his grandfather and his grandfather’s girlfriend, then drove his grandfather’s squad car to Red Lake High School where he killed 7 additional people and wounded 5 people before

killing himself. Weise was armed with a .22 handgun, a 9mm Glock and a 12 gauge shotgun. One of the persons killed was 28 year old unarmed security guard, Derrick Brunn, who was manning the school's metal detector. When police cornered Weise inside the school, he shot and killed himself. *The law not allowing those qualified to carry a gun in schools, even security guards, contributed to this massacre by providing an opportunity for Jeffrey Weise to have access to a large number of unarmed victims.*

Virginia Tech Massacre - On April 16, 2007, 23 year old Seung-Hui Cho killed 32 people and wounded 17 other people in two separate attacks about 2 hours apart. At approximately 7:15 armed with a .22 caliber Walther P22 and 9mm semi-automatic Glock 19, Cho killed 2 students at the West Ambler Johnston Hall and then returned back to his room. While in his room, Cho changed his clothes, deleted his E-Mail and campus account and removed his hard drive. Cho then went to the post office and mailed a package of writings and video recordings to NBC News. He then went to the Norris Hall with a backpack containing several chains, locks, a hammer, a knife, a .22 caliber Walther P22 and 9mm Glock 19, and 19 magazines with approximately 400 rounds of ammunition. He entered Norris Hall and chained the 3 main entrance doors shut and then went to the second floor and began shooting students and faculty. During the next 9 minutes, Cho fired at least 174 rounds killing 30 people and wounding 17 more. As the police entered the second floor, they heard Cho's final shot, a self-inflicted wound to the temple. *Virginia's gun laws contributed to this massacre by providing an opportunity for Seung-Hui Cho to have access to a large number of unarmed victims.*

Westroads Mall Massacre - On December 5, 2007, 19 year old Robert A. Hawkins killed 8 people and wounded 4 others. An hour before the massacre Hawkins' mother gave the Sarpy County Sheriff's Department his suicide note which stated, "I just want to take a few pieces of shit with me. . . I'm going to be fuckin famous." Shortly before 2 P.M. Hawkins entered the mall with an AK 47 semi-automatic rifle stolen from his stepfather's house along with two 30-round magazines concealed in a sweatshirt. He took the elevator to the top floor. He stepped out of the elevator and opened fire killing 8 people and wounding 4 others over the course of 6 minutes before finally killing himself. He fired 30 rounds striking 12 people. The mall was posted with signs prohibiting weapons on its premises. *The mall's "No Weapons Allowed" policy contributed to this massacre by providing an opportunity for Robert Hawkins to have access to a large number of unarmed victims.*

Now we have seen what happens when an "active shooter" has been aided by the misguided laws or policies which have disarmed their potential victims. Contrast the above massacres with what happens when an "active shooter" goes into an area where the potential victims have not been disarmed by misguided laws or policies.

Colorado YWAM and New Life Shootings - On December 9, 2007, Matthew J. Murray killed 4 people and wounded 5 people at the Youth With A Mission training center in Arvada, Colorado and the New Life Church in Colorado Springs, Colorado. At about 12:30 A.M., Matthew Murray armed with a semi-automatic pistol killed 2 people and wounded 2 others at the Youth With A Mission training center. Approximately 12 hours later at 1 P.M., Murray went to the New Life Church in Colorado Springs armed with a Bushmaster XM15 .223 rifle, a Berretta .40 handgun, and a Springfield Armory 9mm pistol and killed 2 people and wounded 2 others in the parking lot. He then entered the church and wounded 1 other person. Church member, Jeanne Assam, volunteering as a church security guard opened fire on Murray with her personally owned concealed weapon stopping his attack. The pastor of the church stated that Assam shot Murray before he entered 50 feet inside the building, after she encountered him in the hallway, and that Assam probably saved "over 100 lives."

Conclusion

It should now be clear to you that the only defense against an active shooter is to have armed Citizens on the scene when the active shooter begins shooting. There is much truth to the saying, "When seconds counts, the police are only minutes away." In the 5 to 10 minutes that it would take for the police to arrive and begin setting up their containment perimeter, dozens of innocent victims could be killed. Since law enforcement has shown a reluctance to quickly enter into an area where an active shooter is operating, the unarmed victims are on their own and many will die.

It should also be very clear to you that "Gun Free Zones" are in reality "Free to Kill Zones" since criminals by nature do not obey laws. A "No Weapons Allowed" sign will no more deter a criminal than the laws which makes it illegal to kill, rob and rape. As stated earlier, there were 18,209 murders, 497,950 robberies, and 96,122 rapes in 1997. Even an adolescent school kid can figure out that an advertised killing field where no one is allowed to shoot back is the safest location in the world to carry out a mass shooting. Armed and properly trained private Citizens are the greatest deterrent to crime. It has been consistently shown that police protection is not adequate in preventing crime or mass shootings.

Isn't it ironic that States or municipalities that pass laws, or mall or store owners who institute policies banning law-abiding Citizens from carrying firearms are quick to deny all responsibilities for the innocent victims slain or injured as a direct result of their misguided laws or policies. In the Luby's massacre, Suzanna Gratia Hupp left her firearm in her vehicle because of a Texas law prohibiting private Citizens from carrying firearms and as a direct result of that law, Ms. Hupp's parents were slain that day. In *Riss v. City of New York*, Ms. Riss was permanently injured for life. Even though she had applied for a gun for protection and was denied, the city later denied all responsibilities for her injuries.

If you just open your eyes and watch people for a little time, you will realize how vulnerable we all are to becoming another tidbit-of-opportunity for a criminal intent upon victimizing us. Criminals do not respect you, your property, or your right to life. You can ignore it out of faint-heartedness, deny it out of lunacy, submit to it out of a fatalistic contempt for your own life and the lives of others, or you can face it with courage and intelligence and prepare yourself to deal with the fact that someday you may have to defend yourself or your loved ones against a criminal assault.

Hopefully by now you realize that you are ultimately responsible for your own safety. There are volumes of data in which private Citizens have defended their lives and the lives of their loved ones with firearms. Many experts believe that the number of times a private Citizen uses a firearm to defend himself in which no police report is filed far exceeds the number of times in which a police report is filed. The courts have consistently ruled that the police are not responsible to protect you. Misguided laws and policies have contributed to numerous deaths and injuries by disarming Citizens who were later murdered or seriously injured.

There are three kinds of people in this world:

Predators - those who cannibalize their own species.

Prey - those who allow themselves to be eaten.

Warriors - those who refuse to be either predator or prey.

The choice is yours - if you do not have the courage to take responsibility to protect yourself and your loved ones, then you have no right to criticize those who do.