

"Writing the truth
as I see it;
trying not to
offend
those who will
disagree."

The truth as I see it™

Idaho Common Sense™



Craig L. Bosley, MD

How objective is media reporting on gun control?

August 27, 2007

The Idaho State Journal in two recent editorials supported some sort of gun control. They seem to be taking the path of most media assuming guns are a problem and gun control will solve that problem. They applaud the University of Idaho for banning guns on campus, calling it wise.

Where is the evidence that any type of gun control is beneficial? Australia legislated gun control in 1996, confiscating and destroying over 640,000 guns at a cost of \$100,000,000. The fruits of this massive endeavor were seeing their murder rate remaining essentially level with only statistical variations or perhaps a very slight decrease. Several other crime rates actually increased rather substantially. Why doesn't the media report this with the same zeal they report the assumed need for gun control?

This tunnel vision logic believes we can solve crime by simply removing the weapon the murderer uses in the crime. If this is accurate, then we must also have our government confiscate all automobiles because drunk drivers use them as weapons to murder innocent people. Of course, we must also confiscate all overlooked one very critical fact that explains why Hamilton is actually proof legislated gun control fails. The Journal did not report the fact that Hamilton had been ordered by the court to not possess any firearms. So much for legislating safety.

Is the media reporting on gun control objective or do they report what they want us to believe? Let us look at two recent multiple murders. On Feb. 12, five people were murdered at the Trolley Square mall in Salt Lake City. On April 16, 33

people were murdered at Virginia Tech in Roanoke, Va.

How much media attention did each of these murders receive? Was the reporting objective or biased? Was the reporting genuine journalism or was it tabloid journalism because terrorists have used them as weapons of mass destruction. This is simply failed, stale logic. Why attack the weapon the murderer chooses rather than deal with the murderer? I was discussing this with my pastor's father. He told me he had owned a deer rifle for nearly 60 years and in that entire time the rifle had never murdered anyone.

The Idaho State Journal cited the Jason Hamilton murders as reason to compliment the University of Idaho for not allowing guns on campus. They seeking market share rather than disseminating appropriate information? What do we know about Kenneth Hammonds, the off-duty police officer who saved lives at Trolley Square and what do we know about Virginia Tech's Cho Seung-Hui? I asked one of my partners about these two rampages. He immediately knew about Virginia Tech but had not heard of the shooting at Trolley Square.

I was so tired of the unending media coverage of the Virginia Tech shootings I stopped watching any news about it. I could not tolerate any more information about the life of Cho Seung-Hui. As I became media numbed to the Virginia Tech murders, I began wondering about the Trolley Square murders and why I had not seen the same magnitude of media coverage. Why do I know more about Cho Seung-Hui than I know about Kenneth Hammonds, who heroically saved so many lives? Why are 33

murdered people more newsworthy than one hero saving lives? I believe it is because it would be difficult for the media to advance the agenda of more gun control if they aggressively reported about someone who saved numerous lives with a gun. You certainly cannot use Kenneth Hammonds as a poster child for gun control.

Did you read or hear what Kenneth Hammonds said about Trolley Square? He said, "I had to do something." There are a lot more Kenneth Hammonds in this country than there are Cho Seung-Hui. In addition, the Kenneth Hammonds deserve the media spotlight, not the Cho Seung-Huis. We have heard precious little about the man who used a gun to save lives. Is this accurate, fair, objective reporting or is this manipulating the news to advance an agenda?

The majority of the reports on Virginia Tech did not mention what occurred at the university during the year prior to the 33 murders. Less than a year before the murders, the Virginia legislators had a bill before them that would allow Virginia Tech students and faculty members with concealed handgun permits to carry firearms on campus. After the bill died in committee, The Roanoke Times reported that Virginia Tech spokesperson Larry Hincker welcomed the bill's defeat, saying, "I'm sure the university community is appreciative of the General Assembly's actions because this will help parents, students, faculty and visitors feel safe on our campus." Virginia Tech banned the possibility of their own Kenneth Hammonds saving lives. Think about it.