

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 P. PATTY LI
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 ANNA FERRARI
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 261579
JOHN D. ECHEVERRIA
5 Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 268843
6 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
7 Telephone: (415) 510-3479
Fax: (415) 703-1234
8 E-mail: John.Echeverria@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Defendant Rob Bonta,
9 *in his official capacity*¹

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 WESTERN DIVISION
13

14
15 **STEVEN RUPP; STEVEN**
DEMBER; CHERYL JOHNSON;
16 **MICHAEL JONES;**
CHRISTOPHER SEIFERT;
17 **ALFONSO VALENCIA; TROY**
WILLIS; and CALIFORNIA RIFLE
18 **& PISTOL ASSOCIATION,**
INCORPORATED,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21
22 **ROB BONTA, in his official capacity**
as Attorney General of the State of
23 **California; and DOES 1-10,**

24 Defendants.
25

8:17-cv-00746-JLS-JDE

**SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERT
REPORT AND DECLARATION
OF RANDOLPH ROTH**

Courtroom: 8A
Judge: The Honorable Josephine
L. Staton

Action Filed: April 24, 2017

26 ¹ Rob Bonta has succeeded former Attorney General Xavier Becerra as the
27 Attorney General of the State of California. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
28 Procedure 25(d), Attorney General Bonta, in his official capacity, is substituted as
the defendant in this case.

1 **SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERT REPORT AND DECLARATION OF**
2 **RANDOLPH ROTH**

3 I, Randolph Roth, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true
4 and correct:

5 1. I have been asked by the Office of the Attorney General of the
6 California Department of Justice to prepare an expert report providing opinions on
7 the history of homicides and mass murders in the United States. This supplemental
8 expert report and declaration (“Report”) is based on my own personal knowledge
9 and experience, and, if I am called as a witness, I could and would testify
10 competently to the truth of the matters discussed in this Report.

11 **BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS**

12 2. I am an Arts and Sciences Distinguished Professor of History and
13 Sociology at The Ohio State University. I received a B.A. in History with Honors
14 and Distinction in 1973 from Stanford University, where I received the James
15 Birdsall Weter Prize for the outstanding honors thesis in History. I received a
16 Ph.D. in History in 1981 from Yale University, where I received the Theron
17 Rockwell Field Prize for the outstanding dissertation in the humanities and the
18 George Washington Eggleston Prize for the outstanding dissertation in American
19 history. I have taught courses in history, the social sciences, and statistics since
20 1978, with a focus on criminology and the history of crime. A true and correct
21 copy of my curriculum vitae is attached as **Exhibit A** to this Report.

22 3. I am the author of *American Homicide* (The Belknap Press of the
23 Harvard University Press, 2009), which received the 2011 Michael J. Hindelang
24 Award from the American Society of Criminology awarded annually for the book
25 published over the three previous years that “makes the most outstanding
26 contribution to research in criminology over the previous three years,”² and the

27 _____
28 ² See American Society of Criminology, Michel J. Hindelang outstanding

1 2010 Allan Sharlin Memorial Book Award from the Social Science History
2 Association for outstanding books in social science history.³ *American Homicide*
3 was also named one of the Outstanding Academic Books of 2010 by *Choice*, and
4 the outstanding book of 2009 by *reason.com*. The book is an interregional,
5 internationally comparative study of homicide in the United States from colonial
6 times to the present. I am a Fellow of the American Association for the
7 Advancement of Science, and I have served as a member of the National Academy
8 of Sciences Roundtable on Crime Trends, 2013-2016, and as a member of the
9 Editorial Board of the *American Historical Review*, the most influential journal in
10 the discipline. And in 2022 I received the inaugural Distinguished Scholar Award
11 from the Historical Criminology Division of the American Society of Criminology.

12 4. I am the principal investigator on the National Homicide Data
13 Improvement Project, a project funded by the National Science Foundation (SES-
14 1228406, https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=1228406) and
15 the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation to improve the quality of homicide data
16 in the United States from 1959 to the present. The pilot project on Ohio has drawn
17 on a wide range of sources in its effort to create a comprehensive database on
18 homicides (including narratives of each incident) based on the mortality statistics of
19 the Ohio Department of Health, the confidential compressed mortality files of the
20 National Center for Health Statistics, the F.B.I.'s Supplementary Homicide Reports,
21 death certificates, coroner's reports, the homicide case files of Cincinnati,
22 Cleveland, and Columbus, obituaries, and newspaper accounts.

23 5. I have published numerous essays on the history of violence and the
24 use of firearms in the United States, including a) "Guns, Gun Culture, and

25 _____
26 Book Award Recipients, <https://asc41.com/about-asc/awards/michael-j-hindelang-outstanding-book-award-recipients/>.

27 ³ See Social Science History Association, Allan Sharlin Memorial Book
28 Award, https://ssha.org/awards/sharlin_award/.

1 Homicide: The Relationship between Firearms, the Uses of Firearms, and
2 Interpersonal Violence in Early America,” *William and Mary Quarterly* (2002) 59:
3 223-240 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/3491655#metadata_info_tab_contents); b)
4 “Counting Guns: What Social Science Historians Know and Could Learn about
5 Gun Ownership, Gun Culture, and Gun Violence in the United States,” *Social*
6 *Science History* (2002) 26: 699-708
7 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/40267796#metadata_info_tab_contents); c) “Why
8 Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem: The Relationship between Guns and Homicide
9 in American History,” in Jennifer Tucker, Barton C. Hacker, and Margaret Vining,
10 eds., *A Right to Bear Arms? The Contested Role of History in Contemporary*
11 *Debates on the Second Amendment* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution
12 Scholarly Press, 2019); and d) “The Opioid Epidemic and Homicide in the United
13 States,” co-authored with Richard Rosenfeld and Joel Wallman, in the *Journal of*
14 *Research in Crime and Delinquency* (2021)
15 ([https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348513393_The_Opioid_Epidemic_and](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348513393_The_Opioid_Epidemic_and_Homicide_in_the_United_States)
16 [Homicide_in_the_United_States](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348513393_The_Opioid_Epidemic_and_Homicide_in_the_United_States)).

17 6. I am also co-founder and co-director of the Historical Violence
18 Database. The web address for the Historical Violence Database is:
19 <http://cjrc.osu.edu/research/interdisciplinary/hvd>. The historical data on which this
20 Report draws are available through the Historical Violence Database. The
21 Historical Violence Database is a collaborative project by scholars in the United
22 States, Canada, and Europe to gather data on the history of violent crime and
23 violent death (homicides, suicides, accidents, and casualties of war) from medieval
24 times to the present. The project is described in Randolph Roth et al., “The
25 Historical Violence Database: A Collaborative Research Project on the History of
26 Violent Crime and Violent Death.” *Historical Methods* (2008) 41: 81-98
27 ([https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3200/HMTS.41.2.81-](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3200/HMTS.41.2.81-98?casa_token=PfjkmSciOwAAAAA:1HrNKToUGfQT4T-)
28 [98?casa_token=PfjkmSciOwAAAAA:1HrNKToUGfQT4T-](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3200/HMTS.41.2.81-98?casa_token=PfjkmSciOwAAAAA:1HrNKToUGfQT4T-)

1 [L4wqloRc2DFsM4eRmKEc346vchboaSh-X29CkEdqIe8bMoZjBNdk7yNh_aAU](https://www.cjrc.osu.edu/sites/cjrc.osu.edu/files/AHSV-Homicide-Estimates.pdf)).

2 The only way to obtain reliable historical homicide estimates is to review every
3 scrap of paper on criminal matters in every courthouse (indictments, docket books,
4 case files, and judicial proceedings), every jail roll and coroner's report, every diary
5 and memoir, every article in every issue of a number of local newspapers, every
6 entry in the vital records, and every local history based on lost sources, local
7 tradition, or oral testimony. That is why it takes months to study a single rural
8 county, and years to study a single city.⁴

9 7. My work on data collection and my research for *American Homicide*,
10 together with the research I have conducted for related essays, has helped me gain
11 expertise on the causes of homicide and mass violence, and on the role technology
12 has played in changing the nature and incidence of homicide and mass violence. I
13 hasten to add that the insights that my colleagues and I have gained as social
14 science historians into the causes of violence and the history of violence in the

15 ⁴ It is also essential, in the opinion of historians and historical social scientists
16 involved in the Historical Violence Database, to use capture-recapture mathematics,
17 when multiple sources are available, to estimate the number of homicides where
18 gaps or omissions exist in the historical record. The method estimates the
19 percentage of the likely number of homicides that appear in the surviving records
20 by looking at the degree to which homicides reported in the surviving legal sources
21 overlap with homicides reported in the surviving non-legal sources (newspapers,
22 vital records, diaries, etc.). A greater degree of overlap means a higher percentage
23 in the surviving records and a tighter confidence interval. A lesser degree of
24 overlap, which typically occurs on contested frontiers and during civil wars and
25 revolutions, means a lower percentage and a wider confidence interval. See
26 Randolph Roth, "American Homicide Supplemental Volume: Homicide Estimates"
27 (2009) ([https://cjrc.osu.edu/sites/cjrc.osu.edu/files/AHSV-Homicide-
Estimates.pdf](https://cjrc.osu.edu/sites/cjrc.osu.edu/files/AHSV-Homicide-Estimates.pdf)); Roth, "Child Murder in New England," *Social Science History*
28 (2001) 25: 101-147
(https://www.jstor.org/stable/1171584#metadata_info_tab_contents); Roth and
James M. Denham, "Homicide in Florida, 1821-1861: A Quantitative Analysis,"
Florida Historical Quarterly 86 (2007): 216-239; and Douglas L. Eckberg, "Stalking
the Elusive Homicide: A Capture-Recapture Approach to the Estimation of Post-
Reconstruction South Carolina Killings." *Social Science History* 25 (2001): 67-91
(https://www.jstor.org/stable/1171582#metadata_info_tab_contents).

1 United States stem from our tireless commitment to empiricism. Our goal is to
2 gather accurate data on the character and incidence of violent crimes and to follow
3 the evidence wherever it leads, even when it forces us to accept the fact that a
4 hypothesis we thought might be true proved false. As my colleagues and I are fond
5 of saying in the Criminal Justice Network of the Social Science History
6 Association, the goal is not to be right, but to get it right. That is the only way to
7 design effective, pragmatic, nonideological laws and public policies that can help us
8 address our nation's problem of violence.

9 8. I have been retained by the California Department of Justice to render
10 expert opinions in this case. I am being compensated at a rate of \$250 per hour.

11 9. I have previously served as an expert witness in cases concerning the
12 constitutionality of state and municipal gun laws, including *Miller v. Bonta*, No.
13 3:19-cv-1537 (S.D. Cal.); *Duncan v. Bonta*, No. 3:17-cv-1017 (S.D. Cal.); *Ocean*
14 *State Tactical v. Rhode Island*, No. 22-cv-246 (D.R.I.); *Hanson v. District of*
15 *Columbia*, No. 1:22-cv-02256-RC (D.D.C.); *Capen v. Healey*, No. 22-cv-11431-
16 FDS (D. Mass.); and *Goldman v. City of Highland Park, Illinois*, No. 1:22-cv-
17 04774 (N.D. Ill.).

18 OPINIONS

19 I. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

20 10. I have been asked by the California Department of Justice to provide
21 opinions on the history of homicides and mass murders in the United States, with
22 special attention to the role that technologies have played in shaping the character
23 and incidence of homicides and mass murders over time, and the historical
24 restrictions that local and federal authorities have imposed in response to new
25 technologies that they deemed particularly lethal, prone to misuse, and a danger to
26 the public because of the ways in which they reshaped the character and incidence
27 of homicides and mass murders.

28

1 11. For the past thirty-five years, I have dedicated my career to
2 understanding why homicide rates rise and fall over time, in hopes of understanding
3 why the United States—which, apart from the slave South, was perhaps the least
4 homicidal society in the Western world in the early nineteenth century—became by
5 far the most homicidal, as it remains today. I discovered that the key to low
6 homicide rates over the past 450 years has been successful nation-building. High
7 homicide rates among unrelated adults—friends, acquaintances, strangers—
8 coincide with political instability, a loss of trust in government and political leaders,
9 a loss of fellow feeling among citizens, and a lack of faith in the justice of the social
10 hierarchy.⁵ As a nation, we are still feeling the aftershocks of our catastrophic
11 failure at nation-building in the mid- and late-nineteenth century, from the political
12 crisis of the late 1840s and 1850s through the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the
13 rise of Jim Crow.

14 12. Our nation’s homicide rate would thus be high today even in the
15 absence of modern technologies that have made firearms far more capable of
16 injuring multiple people over a short span of time than they were in colonial and
17 Revolutionary era. But the evidence also shows that the availability of guns and
18 changes in firearms technology, especially the emergence of modern breech-
19 loading firearms in the mid-nineteenth century, and of rapid-fire semiautomatic
20

21 ⁵ See Randolph Roth, “Measuring Feelings and Beliefs that May Facilitate
22 (or Deter) Homicide,” *Homicide Studies* (2012) 16: 196-217
23 (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1088767912442501?casa_token=dkP_nZZxCaYAAAAA:vL522E2inh9U2gr4X2qAhPnqRminWEjLv8nbwrNEhqNpRliTesFI_1SDY6tepvZbjwiRWPEom7M), for an introduction to the ways that social
24 science historians can measure the feelings and beliefs that lead to successful
25 nation-building. My research has shown that those measures have gone up and
26 down with homicide rates among unrelated adults in the United States from
27 colonial times to the present. In social science history, as in the non-experimental
28 historical sciences (geology, paleontology, evolutionary biology), correlations that
persist across wide stretches of time and space are not random. They reveal deep
patterns that are causal.

1 weapons and extended magazines in the late twentieth century, have pushed the
2 homicide rate in United States well beyond what it would otherwise have been.

3 13. My opinion will address in turn: 1) firearms restrictions on colonists
4 from the end of the seventeenth century to the eve of the Revolution, when
5 homicide rates were low among colonists and firearms were seldom used in
6 homicides among colonists when they did occur; 2) the development during the
7 Founding and Early National periods of laws restricting the use or ownership of
8 concealable weapons in slave and frontier states, where homicide rates among
9 persons of European ancestry soared after the Revolution in large part because of
10 the increased manufacture and ownership of concealable percussion cap pistols and
11 fighting knives; 3) the spread of restrictions on carrying concealed weapons in
12 every state by World War I, as homicide rates rose across the nation, beginning
13 around the time of the Mexican War of 1846-1848 and lasting until World War I—
14 a rise caused in part by the invention of modern revolvers, which were used in a
15 majority of homicides by the late nineteenth century; 4) the difficulty that local and
16 federal officials faced from the colonial era into the early twentieth century in
17 addressing the threat of mass murders, which, because of the limitations of existing
18 technologies, were carried out by large groups of individuals acting in concert,
19 rather than by individuals or small groups; and 5) the spread of restrictions in the
20 twentieth and early twenty-first centuries on new technologies, including rapid-fire
21 firearms and large capacity magazines, that changed the character of mass murder,
22 by enabling individuals or small groups to commit mass murder.

23
24
25
26
27
28

1 II. GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF FIREARMS IN RESPONSE TO HOMICIDE 2 TRENDS

3 A. Homicide and Firearms in the Colonial Era (1688-1763)

4 14. In the eighteenth century, the use and ownership of firearms by Native
5 Americans and African Americans, enslaved and free, were heavily regulated.⁶ But
6 laws restricting the use or ownership of firearms by colonists of European ancestry
7 were rare, for two reasons. First, homicide rates were low among colonists from
8 the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689 through the French and Indian War of 1754-
9 1763, thanks to political stability, a surge in patriotic fellow feeling within the
10 British empire, and greater trust in government.⁷ By the late 1750s and early
11 1760s, the rates at which adult colonists were killed were roughly 5 per 100,000
12 adults per year in Tidewater Virginia, 3 per 100,000 in Pennsylvania, and 1 per
13 100,000 in New England.⁸ Violence among colonists was not a pressing problem
14 on the eve of the Revolution.

15 15. Second, the impact of firearms on the homicide rate was modest, even
16 though household ownership of firearms was widespread. Approximately 50 to 60
17 percent of households in the colonial and Founding eras owned a working firearm,

18 ⁶ Clayton E. Cramer, “Colonial Firearms Regulation” (April 6, 2016).
19 Available at SSRN: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2759961.

20 ⁷ Randolph Roth, *American Homicide* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of
21 Harvard University Press, 2009), 63, noting that “Fear of Indians and slaves, hatred
22 of the French, enthusiasm for the new colonial and imperial governments
23 established by the Glorious Revolution, and patriotic devotion to England drew
24 colonists together. The late seventeenth century thus marks the discernible
beginning of the centuries-long pattern linking homicide rates in America with
political stability, racial, religious, and national solidarity, and faith in government
and political leaders.”

25 ⁸ Roth, *American Homicide*, 61-63, and especially the graphs on 38, 39, and
26 91. By way of comparison, the average homicide rate for adults in the United
27 States from 1999 through 2016—an era in which the quality of emergency services
28 and wound care was vastly superior to that in the colonial era—was 7 per 100,000
per year. See CDC Wonder Compressed Mortality Files, ICD-10
(<https://wonder.cdc.gov/cmfi-icd10.html>, accessed Jan. 6, 2023).

1 usually a musket or a fowling piece.⁹ Fowling pieces, like muskets, were muzzle-
2 loading. But unlike muskets, were manufactured specifically to hunt birds and
3 control vermin, so they were designed to fire shot, primarily, rather than ball, and
4 were of lighter construction than muskets. Family, household, and intimate partner
5 homicides were rare, and only 10 to 15 percent of those homicides were committed
6 with guns.¹⁰ In New England, the rate of family and intimate partner homicides
7 stood at only 2 per million persons per year for European Americans and 3 per
8 million for African Americans for the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth
9 century, and fell to 1 per million for both European and African Americans after the
10 Revolution. The rates in the Chesapeake were likewise low, at 8 per million per
11 year for European Americans and 4 to 5 per million for African Americans.¹¹ And
12 because the homicide rate among unrelated adults was low, the proportion of
13 nondomestic homicides committed with guns was similarly low—never more than
14 10 to 15 percent.¹²

15 16. Firearm use in homicides was generally rare because muzzle-loading
16 firearms, such as muskets and fowling pieces, had significant limitations as murder
17 weapons in the colonial era.¹³ They were lethal and accurate enough at short range,
18 but they were liable to misfire, given the limits of flintlock technology; and with the
19 exception of a few double-barreled pistols, they could not fire multiple shots
20 without reloading.¹⁴ They could be used effectively to threaten and intimidate, but

21 ⁹ Randolph Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem: The Relationship
22 between Guns and Homicide in American History,” in Jennifer Tucker, Barton C.
23 Hacker, and Margaret Vining, eds., *Firearms and the Common Law: History and
Memory* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, 2019), 116.

24 ¹⁰ Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 116.

25 ¹¹ Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 116.

26 ¹² *Ibid.*, 116-119.

27 ¹³ *Ibid.*, 117.

28 ¹⁴ *Ibid.*

1 once they were fired (or misfired), they lost their advantage: they could only be
2 used as clubs in hand-to-hand combat. They had to be reloaded manually to enable
3 the firing of another shot, which was a time-consuming process that required skill
4 and experience.¹⁵ And more important, muzzle-loading firearms could not be used
5 impulsively unless they were already loaded for some other purpose.¹⁶ It took at
6 least half a minute (and plenty of elbow room) to load a muzzle-loader if the
7 weapon was clean and if powder, wadding, and shot or ball were at hand.¹⁷ The
8 user had to pour powder down the barrel, hold it in place with wadding, and drop or
9 ram the shot or ball onto the charge.¹⁸ The firing mechanism also had to be readied,
10 often with a fresh flint.¹⁹ And muzzle-loading guns were difficult to keep loaded
11 for any length of time, because black powder absorbed moisture and could corrode
12 the barrel or firing mechanism or make the charge liable to misfire.²⁰ The life of a
13 charge could be extended by storing a gun in a warm, dry place, typically over a
14 fireplace, but even there, moisture from boiling pots, drying clothes, or humid
15 weather could do damage.²¹ That is why most owners stored their guns empty,
16 cleaned them regularly, and loaded them anew before every use.²²

18 ¹⁵ Harold L. Peterson, *Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783*
19 (New York: Bramhall House, 1956), 155-225; Priya Satia, *Empire of Guns: The*
20 *Violent Making of the Industrial Revolution* (New York: Penguin Press, 2018), 9-
21 10; and Satia, “Who Had Guns in Eighteenth Century Britain?” in Tucker, Hacker,
and Vining, *Firearms and the Common Law*, 41-44.

22 ¹⁶ Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 117.

23 ¹⁷ Ibid.

24 ¹⁸ Ibid.

25 ¹⁹ Ibid.

26 ²⁰ Ibid.

27 ²¹ Ibid.

28 ²² Ibid.; and Herschel C. Logan, *Cartridges: A Pictorial Digest of Small Arms*
Ammunition (New York: Bonanza Books, 1959), 11-40, 180-183.

1 17. The infrequent use of guns in homicides in colonial America reflected
2 these limitations. Family and household homicides—most of which were caused
3 by abuse or fights between family members that got out of control—were
4 committed almost exclusively with hands and feet or weapons that were close to
5 hand: whips, sticks, hoes, shovels, axes, or knives.²³ It did not matter whether the
6 type of homicide was rare—like family and intimate homicides—or common, like
7 murders of servants, slaves, or owners committed during the heyday of indentured
8 servitude or the early years of racial slavery.²⁴ Guns were not the weapons of
9 choice in homicides that grew out of the tensions of daily life.²⁵

10 18. When colonists anticipated violence or during times of political
11 instability gun use was more common. When homicide rates were high among
12 unrelated adults in the early and mid-seventeenth century, colonists went armed to
13 political or interpersonal disputes,²⁶ so the proportion of homicides committed with
14 firearms was at that time 40 percent and rose even higher in contested areas on the
15 frontier.²⁷ Colonists also armed themselves when they anticipated hostile
16 encounters with Native Americans, so 60 percent of homicides of Native
17 Americans by European Americans in New England were committed with
18 firearms.²⁸ And slave catchers and posses kept their firearms at the ready, so 90
19 percent of runaway slaves who were killed in Virginia were shot.²⁹ Otherwise,

20 ²³ Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 117.

21 ²⁴ Ibid.

22 ²⁵ Ibid. Contrary to popular belief, dueling was also rare in colonial America.
23 Roth, *American Homicide*, 45, 158.

24 ²⁶ Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 118-119.

25 ²⁷ Ibid., 116-117.

26 ²⁸ Ibid., 118-119 (reporting that “In New England, 57 percent of such
27 homicides were committed with guns between the end of King Phillip’s War in
28 1676 and the end of the eighteenth century”).

29 Ibid., 118 (reporting that “Petitions to the Virginia House of Burgesses for
compensation for outlawed slaves who were killed during attempts to capture them

1 however, colonists seldom went about with loaded guns, except to hunt, control
2 vermin, or muster for militia training.³⁰ That is why firearms had a modest impact
3 on homicide rates among colonists.

4 **B. The Rise in Violence in the South and on Contested Frontiers**
5 **during the Early National Period, the Role of New Technologies**
6 **and Practices, and Regulations on Concealable Weapons (1790s-**
7 **1840s)**

7 19. The Founding Generation was zealous in its defense of the people's
8 rights, and so enshrined them in the Constitution. At the same time, they
9 recognized that some citizens could be irresponsible or motivated by evil intent and
10 could thus threaten the security of the government and the safety of citizens.³¹ The
11 threats that such citizens posed to public safety could be checked in most instances
12 by ordinary criminal statutes, drawn largely from British common law. But at
13 times those threats could be checked only by statutes that placed limits on basic
14 rights.³²

15 _____
16 indicate that 90 percent were shot”).

16 ³⁰ Ibid., 118-119.

17 ³¹ On the fears of the Founders that their republic might collapse because
18 selfish or unscrupulous citizens might misuse their liberties, see Gordon S. Wood,
19 *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (Chapel Hill: University of
20 North Carolina Press, 1969), 65-70, 282-291, 319-328, 413-425, 463-467; Drew R.
21 McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy* (New
22 York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 42-45; and Andrew S. Trees, *The*
23 *Founding Fathers and the Politics of Character* (Princeton: Princeton University
24 Press, 2003), 6-9, 60-65, 86-104, 113-114.

25 ³² On the Founders' belief that rights might have to be restricted in certain
26 instances, see Terri Diane Halperin, *The Alien and Sedition Acts: Testing the*
27 *Constitution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016), 1-8, on restraints
28 on freedom of speech and the press during the administration of John Adams;
Leonard Levy, *Jefferson and Civil Liberties: The Darker Side* (Cambridge: The
Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963), 93-141, on loosening restrictions
on searches and seizures during the administration of Thomas Jefferson; and Patrick
J. Charles, *Armed in America: A History of Gun Rights from Colonial Militias to*
Concealed Carry (New York: Prometheus Books, 2018), 70-121, especially 108-
109, as well as Saul Cornell, *A Well-Regulated Militia: The Founding Fathers and*
the Origins of Gun Control in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006),

1 20. The Founders were aware that the rate at which civilians killed each
2 other or were killed by roving bands of Tories or Patriots rose during the
3 Revolution.³³ And they recognized that more civilians, expecting trouble with
4 neighbors, public officials, and partisans, were likely to go about armed during the
5 Revolution, which is why the proportion of homicides of European Americans by
6 unrelated adults rose to 33 percent in Virginia and 46 percent in New England.³⁴
7 But the surge in violence ended in New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, and the
8 settled Midwest once the Revolutionary crisis was over. In those areas homicide

9 _____
10 39-70, and Jack N. Rakove, “The Second Amendment: The Highest State of
11 Originalism,” in Carl T. Bogus, ed., *The Second Amendment in Law and History: Historians and Constitutional Scholars on the Right to Bear Arms* (New York: The
12 New Press, 2000), 74-116, on the limited scope of the Second Amendment. Jack N.
13 Rakove, *Original Meanings: Politics and Ideas in the Making of the Constitution*
14 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 291, notes that “Nearly all the activities that
15 constituted the realms of life, liberty, property, and religion were subject to
16 regulation by the state; no obvious landmarks marked the boundaries beyond which
17 its authority could not intrude, *if* its actions met the requirements of law.” See also
18 Rakove, “The Second Amendment: The Highest State of Originalism,” *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 76 (2000), 157
<https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=3289&context=cklawreview>: “[At] the time when the Second Amendment was
adopted, it was still possible to conceive of statements of rights in quite different
terms, as assertions or confirmations of vital principles, rather than the codification
of legally enforceable restrictions or commands.”

19 ³³ Roth, *American Homicide*, 145-149; Holger Hoock, *Scars of Independence: America’s Violent Birth* (New York: Broadway Books / Penguin
20 Random House, 2017), 308-322; Alan Taylor, *Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution* (New York: Knopf,
21 2006), 91-102; George C. Daughan, *Revolution on the Hudson: New York City and the Hudson River Valley in the American War for Independence* (New York: W. W.
22 Norton, 2016), 137-138; John B. Frantz and William Pencak, eds., *Beyond Philadelphia: The American Revolution in the Pennsylvania Hinterland* (University
23 Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 42-43, 141-145, 149-152; Francis S. Fox, *Sweet Land of Liberty: the Ordeal of the American Revolution in Northampton County, Pennsylvania* (University Park: Pennsylvania State
24 University Press, 2000), 25-27, 32, 64-65, 91-92, 114; and Fox Butterfield, *All God’s Children: The Bosket Family and the American Tradition of Violence* (New
25 York: Vintage, 1996), 3-18.

26 ³⁴ Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 119-120.
27
28

1 rates fell to levels in some instances even lower than those which had prevailed in
2 the early and mid-eighteenth century. By the 1820s, rates had fallen to 3 per
3 100,000 adults per year in Cleveland and Philadelphia, to 2 per 100,000 in rural
4 Ohio, and to 0.5 per 100,000 in northern New England. Only New York City stood
5 out, at 6 per 100,000 adults per year.³⁵ And the proportion of domestic and
6 nondomestic homicides committed with firearms was correspondingly low—
7 between 0 and 10 percent—because people once again generally refrained, as they
8 had from the Glorious Revolution through the French and Indian War, from going
9 about armed, except to hunt, control vermin, or serve in the militia.³⁶

10 21. The keys to these low homicide rates and low rates of gun violence in
11 New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, and the settled Midwest were successful
12 nation-building and the degree to which the promise of the democratic revolution
13 was realized. Political stability returned, as did faith in government and a strong
14 sense of patriotic fellow feeling, as the franchise was extended and political
15 participation increased.³⁷ And self-employment—the bedrock of citizenship, self-
16 respect, and respect from others—was widespread. By 1815, roughly 80 percent of
17 women and men owned their own homes and shops or farms by their mid-thirties;
18 and those who did not were often white-collar professionals who also received
19 respect from their peers.³⁸ African Americans still faced discrimination and limits
20 on their basic rights in most Northern states. But despite these barriers, most

21 ³⁵ Roth, *American Homicide*, 180, 183-186; and Eric H. Monkkonen, *Murder*
22 *in New York City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 15-16.

23 ³⁶ For detailed figures and tables on weapons use in homicides by state, city,
24 or county, see Roth, “American Homicide Supplemental Volume: Weapons,”
25 available through the Historical Violence Database, sponsored by the Criminal
26 Justice Research Center at the Ohio State University
(<https://cjrc.osu.edu/sites/cjrc.osu.edu/files/AHSV-Weapons-10-2009.pdf>). On
27 weapons use in homicides in the North, see Figures 25 through 46.

28 ³⁷ Roth, *American Homicide*, 180, 183-186.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 180, 183-186.

1 African Americans in the North were optimistic, after slavery was abolished in the
2 North, about earning their own living and forming their own churches and
3 voluntary organizations.³⁹

4 22. That is why there was little interest among public officials in the North
5 in restricting the use of firearms during the Early National period, except in duels.
6 They took a strong stand against dueling in the wake of Alexander Hamilton's
7 death, because of the threat the practice posed for the nation's democratic polity
8 and the lives of public men: editors, attorneys, military officers, and politicians.⁴⁰

9 23. Laws restricting the everyday use of firearms did appear, however, in
10 the early national period in a number of slave states,⁴¹ where violence among
11 citizens increased after the Revolution to extremely high levels. Revolutionary
12 ideas and aspirations wreaked havoc on the status hierarchy of the slave South,
13 where homicide rates ranged from 8 to 28 per 100,000 adults per year.⁴² Poor and
14 middle-class whites were increasingly frustrated by their inability to rise in a
15

16
17 ³⁹ Ibid., 181-182, 195-196; Leon F. Litwack, *North of Slavery: The Negro in*
18 *the Free States, 1790-1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961); Joanne
19 Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New*
20 *England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998); Sean White,
21 *Somewhat More Independent: The End of Slavery in New York City, 1780-1810*
(Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991); and Graham R. Hodges, *Root and*
Branch: African Americans in New York and East Jersey, 1613-1863 (Chapel Hill:
University of North Carolina Press, 1999).

22 ⁴⁰ Joanne B. Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New*
23 *Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); and C. A. Harwell, "The End
24 of the Affair? Anti-Dueling Laws and Social Norms in Antebellum America,"
25 *Vanderbilt Law Review* 54 (2001): 1805-1847
[26 \(<https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1884&context=vlr>\).](https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1884&context=vlr)

27 ⁴¹ Clayton E. Cramer, *Concealed Weapons Laws of the Early Republic:*
28 *Dueling, Southern Violence, and Moral Reform* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger,
1999); and Cornell, *Well-Regulated Militia*, 141-144.

⁴² Roth, *American Homicide*, 180, 199-203.

1 society that remained class-bound and hierarchical.⁴³ Prominent whites were
2 subjected to the rough and tumble of partisan politics and their position in society
3 was threatened by people from lower social positions.⁴⁴ African Americans
4 despaired over the failure of the abolition movement in the South, and whites were
5 more fearful than ever of African American rebellion.⁴⁵ As a result, impatience
6 with restraint and sensitivity to insult were more intense in the slave South, and
7 during this period the region saw a dramatic increase in the number of deadly
8 quarrels, property disputes, duels, and interracial killings.⁴⁶ The violence spread to
9 frontier Florida and Texas, as well as to southern Illinois and Indiana—wherever
10 Southerners settled in the early national period.⁴⁷ During the Early National period,
11 the proportion of homicides committed with firearms went up accordingly, to a
12 third or two-fifths, as Southerners armed themselves in anticipation of trouble, or
13 set out to cause trouble.⁴⁸

14 24. Citizens and public officials in these states recognized that concealable
15 weapons—pistols, folding knives, dirk knives, and Bowie knives—were used in an
16 alarming proportion of the era’s murders and serious assaults.⁴⁹ They were used to
17 ambush both ordinary citizens and political rivals, to bully or intimidate law-
18 abiding citizens, and to seize the advantage in fist fights. As the Grand Jurors of

19 ⁴³ Ibid., 182.

20 ⁴⁴ Ibid.

21 ⁴⁵ Ibid.

22 ⁴⁶ Ibid., 182, 199-203.

23 ⁴⁷ Ibid., 162, 180-183, 199-203; Roth and James M. Denham, “Homicide in
24 Florida, 1821-1861,” *Florida Historical Quarterly* 86 (2007): 216-239; John Hope
25 Franklin, *The Militant South, 1800-1861* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard
University Press, 1961); and Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and
Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

26 ⁴⁸ Roth, “American Homicide Supplemental Volume: Weapons,” Figures 51
27 through 57.

28 ⁴⁹ Roth, *American Homicide*, 218.

1 Jasper County, Georgia, stated in a plea to the state legislature in 1834 for
2 restrictions on concealable weapons,

3 The practice which is common amongst us with the young the middle
4 aged and the aged to arm themselves with Pistols, dirks knives sticks &
5 spears under the specious pretence of protecting themselves against
6 insult, when in fact being so armed they frequently insult others with
7 impunity, or if resistance is made the pistol dirk or club is immediately
8 resorted to, hence we so often hear of the stabbing shooting & murdering
9 so many of our citizens.⁵⁰

8 The justices of the Louisiana Supreme Court echoed these sentiments—“unmanly”
9 men carried concealed weapons to gain “secret advantages” over their
10 adversaries.⁵¹ These concealed weapons laws were notably difficult to enforce,
11 however, and did not address underlying factors that contributed to rising homicide
12 rates. Nevertheless, these laws represent governmental efforts at that time to
13 address the use of new weapons in certain types of crime.

14 25. The pistols of the early national period represented a technological
15 advance. Percussion-lock mechanisms enabled users to extend the life of a charge,
16 because unlike flint-lock mechanisms, they did not use hydroscopic black powder
17 in their priming pans; they used a sealed mercury-fulminate cap as a primer and
18 seated it tightly on a small nipple (with an inner diameter the size of a medium
19 sewing needle) at the rear of the firing chamber, which restricted the flow of air and
20 moisture to the chamber. Percussion cap pistols, which replaced flint-lock pistols
21 in domestic markets by the mid-1820s, could thus be kept loaded and carried
22 around for longer periods without risk of corrosion.⁵² The new types of knives
23 available in this era also represented technological advances over ordinary knives

25 ⁵⁰ Ibid., 218-219. See also the concerns of the Grand Jurors of Wilkes
26 County, Georgia, Superior Court Minutes, July 1839 term.

27 ⁵¹ Roth, *American Homicide*, 219.

28 ⁵² Roth, “Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” 117.

1 because they were designed expressly for fighting. Dirks and Bowie knives had
2 longer blades than ordinary knives, crossguards to protect the combatants' hands,
3 and clip points to make it easier to cut or stab opponents.⁵³

4 26. The violence in the slave South and its borderlands, and the
5 technological advances that exacerbated it, led to the first prohibitions against
6 carrying certain concealable weapons, which appeared in Kentucky, Louisiana,
7 Indiana, Arkansas, Georgia, and Virginia between 1813 and 1838. These laws
8 differed from earlier laws that restricted access to arms by Native Americans or by
9 free or enslaved African Americans, because they applied broadly to *everyone* but
10 also applied more *narrowly* to certain types of weapons and to certain types of
11 conduct. Georgia's 1837 law "against the unwarrantable and too prevalent use of
12 deadly weapons" was the most restrictive. It made it unlawful for merchants

13 and any other person or persons whatsoever, to sell, or offer to sell, or to
14 keep, or have about their person or elsewhere . . . Bowie, or any other
15 kind of knives, manufactured or sold for the purpose of wearing, or
16 carrying the same as arms of offence or defence, pistols, dirks, sword
canes, spears, &c.

17 The sole exceptions were horseman's pistols—large weapons that were difficult to
18 conceal and were favored by travelers. But the laws in the other five states were
19 also strict: they forbid the carrying of concealable weapons in all circumstances.
20 Indiana made an exemption for travelers.⁵⁴

21 ⁵³ Harold L. Peterson, *American Knives: The First History and Collector's*
22 *Guide* (New York: Scribner, 1958), 25-70; and Peterson, *Daggers and Fighting*
23 *Knives in the Western World, from the Stone Age till 1900* (New York: Walker,
1968), 67-80.

24 ⁵⁴ Cramer, *Concealed Weapons Laws*, especially 143-152, for the texts of
25 those laws. Alabama and Tennessee prohibited the concealed carrying of fighting
26 knives, but not pistols. See also the Duke Center for Firearms Law, Repository of
27 Historical Gun Laws ([https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/search-
results/?sft_subjects=dangerous-or-unusual-weapons](https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/search-results/?sft_subjects=dangerous-or-unusual-weapons), accessed Jan. 6, 2023).
28 Note that the Georgia Supreme Court, in *Nunn v. State*, 1 Ga. 243 (1846), held that
prohibiting the concealed carry of certain weapons was valid, but that the state

1 27. Thus, during the lifetimes of Jefferson, Adams, Marshall, and
2 Madison, the Founding Generation passed laws in a number of states that restricted
3 the use or ownership of certain types of weapons after it became obvious that those
4 weapons, including certain fighting knives and percussion-cap pistols, were being
5 used in crime by people who carried them concealed on their persons and were thus
6 contributing to rising crime rates.⁵⁵

7 **C. Homicide, Concealable Weapons, and Concealable Weapons**
8 **Regulations from the Mexican War through the Early**
9 **Twentieth Century (1846-1920s)**

10 28. By the early twentieth century, every state either banned concealed
11 firearms or placed severe restrictions on their possession.⁵⁶ They did so in response
12 could not also prohibit open carry, which would destroy the right to bear arms.
13 That decision put Georgia in line with the five other states that had prohibited the
14 carrying of concealable firearms.

15 ⁵⁵ Cramer, *Concealed Weapons Laws*, 69-96; Cramer, *For the Defense of*
16 *Themselves and the State: The Original Intent and Judicial Interpretation of the*
17 *Right to Keep and Bear Arms* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1994);
18 Don B. Kates, Jr., “Toward a History of Handgun Prohibition in the United States,”
19 in Cates, ed., *Restricting Handguns: The Liberal Skeptics Speak Out* (Croton-on-
20 Hudson, New York: North River Press, 1979), 7-30; and Philip D. Jordan, *Frontier*
21 *Law and Order—10 Essays* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970), 1-22.
22 Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died on July 4, 1826, John Marshall on July 6,
23 1835, and James Madison on July 28, 1836. On the history of firearms regulations
24 that pertained to African Americans, see Robert J. Cottrol and Raymond T.
25 Diamond, “The Second Amendment: Toward an Afro-Americanist
26 Reconsideration,” *Georgetown Law Journal* 80 (1991): 309-361
27 ([https://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&art](https://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1283&context=faculty_scholarship)
28 [icle=1283&context=faculty_scholarship](https://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1283&context=faculty_scholarship)); Cottrol and Diamond, “Public Safety and
the Right to Bear Arms” in David J. Bodenhamer and James W. Ely, Jr., eds., *The*
Bill of Rights in Modern America, revised and expanded (Bloomington: Indiana
University Press, 2008), 88-107; and Cramer, *For the Defense of Themselves and*
the State, 74, 83-85, 97-140.

29 ⁵⁶ Kates, “Toward a History of Handgun Prohibition,” 7-30; and Jordan,
30 *Frontier Law and Order*, 17-22. These sources identify laws that either banned
31 concealed firearms or placed severe restrictions on their possession in every state
32 except Vermont. However, Vermont also had such a law by the early twentieth
33 century. See An Act Against Carrying Concealed Weapons, No. 85, § 1 (12th
34 Biennial Session, General Assembly of the State of Vermont, Nov. 19, 1892) (“A
35 person who shall carry a dangerous or deadly weapon, openly or concealed, with
36

1 to two developments: the nationwide surge in homicide rates, from the North and
2 South to the Trans-Mississippi West; and the invention of new firearms, especially
3 the revolver, which enabled the firing of multiple rounds in succession without
4 reloading and made the homicide problem worse. Between the mid-nineteenth and
5 the early twentieth century homicide rates fell in nearly every Western nation.⁵⁷
6 But in the late 1840s and 1850s those rates exploded across the United States and
7 spiked even higher during the Civil War and Reconstruction, not only in the South
8 and the Southwest, where rates had already risen in the early national period, but in
9 the North. Rates that had ranged in the North in the 1830s and early 1840s from a
10 low of 1 per 100,000 adults per year in northern New England to 6 per 100,000 in
11 New York City, rose to between 2 and 33 per 100,000 in the northern countryside
12 and to between 10 and 20 per 100,000 in northern cities. In the South, rates in the
13 plantation counties of Georgia rose from 10 per 100,000 adults to 25 per 100,000,
14 and rates soared even higher in rural Louisiana to 90 per 100,000 and in mountain
15 communities in Georgia and Missouri from less than 5 per 100,000 adults per year
16 to 60 per 100,000. And in the West, the rates reached 65 per 100,000 adults per
17 year in California, 76 per 100,000 in Texas, 119 per 100,000 in mining towns in
18 South Dakota, Nevada, and Montana, and 155 per 100,000 in cattle towns in
19 Kansas. Americans, especially men, were more willing to kill friends,
20 acquaintances, and strangers. And so, the United States became—and remains
21 today—by far the most murderous affluent society in the world.⁵⁸

22 the intent or avowed purpose of injuring a fellow man, shall, upon conviction
23 thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars, or by
24 imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court.”).

24 ⁵⁷ Roth, *American Homicide*, 297-300.

25 ⁵⁸ Ibid., 199, 297-300, 302, 337, 347; and Roth, Michael D. Maltz, and
26 Douglas L. Eckberg, “Homicide Rates in the Old West,” *Western Historical*
27 *Quarterly* 42 (2011): 173-195
28 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/westhistquar.42.2.0173#metadata_info_tab_contents).

1 29. The increase occurred because America's heretofore largely successful
2 effort at nation-building failed catastrophically at mid-century.⁵⁹ As the country
3 struggled through the wrenching and divisive changes of the mid-nineteenth
4 century—the crises over slavery and immigration, the decline in self-employment,
5 and rise of industrialized cities—the patriotic faith in government that most
6 Americans felt so strongly after the Revolution was undermined by anger and
7 distrust.⁶⁰ Disillusioned by the course the nation was taking, people felt
8 increasingly alienated from both their government and their neighbors.⁶¹ They
9 were losing the sense that they were participating in a great adventure with their
10 fellow Americans.⁶² Instead, they were competing in a cutthroat economy and a
11 combative political system against millions of strangers whose interests and values
12 were antithetical to their own.⁶³ And most ominously, law and order broke down in
13 the wake of the hostile military occupation of the Southwest, the political crisis of
14 the 1850s, the Civil War, and Reconstruction.⁶⁴

15 30. The proportion of homicides committed with firearms increased as
16 well from the Mexican War through Reconstruction, as it had during previous
17 increases in nondomestic homicides during the Revolution, in the postrevolutionary
18 South, and on contested frontiers.⁶⁵ Because the pistols, muskets, and rifles in use
19 in the early years of the crisis of the mid-nineteenth century were still
20 predominantly single-shot, muzzle-loading, black powder weapons, the proportion

21 ⁵⁹ Ibid., 299-302, 384-385; and Roth, "American Homicide: Theory,
22 Methods, Body Counts," *Historical Methods* 43 (2010): 185-192.

23 ⁶⁰ Roth, *American Homicide*, 299-302, 384-385. See also Roth, "Measuring
24 Feelings and Beliefs that May Facilitate (or Deter) Homicide."

25 ⁶¹ Roth, *American Homicide*, 300.

26 ⁶² Ibid.

27 ⁶³ Ibid.

28 ⁶⁴ Ibid., 299-302, 332, 337, 354.

⁶⁵ Roth, "Why Guns Are and Aren't the Problem," 116-117.

1 of homicides committed with guns stayed in the range of a third to two-fifths,
2 except on the frontier.⁶⁶ Concealable fighting knives, together with concealable
3 percussion-cap pistols, remained the primary murder weapons. But in time, new
4 technologies added to the toll in lives, because of their lethality and the new ways
5 in which they could be used.

6 31. Samuel Colt's cap-and-ball revolvers, invented in 1836, played a
7 limited role in the early years of the homicide crisis, but they gained popularity
8 quickly because of their association with frontiersmen, Indian fighters, Texas
9 Rangers, and cavalrymen in the Mexican War.⁶⁷ They retained some of the
10 limitations of earlier firearms, because their rotating cylinders—two of which came
11 with each revolver—had to be loaded one chamber at a time. Users had to seat a
12 percussion cap on a nipple at the rear of each chamber, pour powder into each
13 chamber, secure the powder with wadding, and ram the bullet down the chamber
14 with a rod or an attached loading lever. Thus cap-and-ball revolvers, like muzzle-
15 loaders, could not be loaded quickly, nor could they be kept loaded indefinitely
16 without risk of damaging the charge or the gun. But they were deadlier than their
17 predecessors, because they made it possible for a person to fire five or six shots in
18 rapid succession and to reload quickly with the second cylinder.⁶⁸

21 ⁶⁶ Roth, "American Homicide Supplemental Volume: Weapons," Figures 25
22 through 46, and 51 through 57.

23 ⁶⁷ Patricia Haag, *The Gunning of America: Business and the Making of*
American Gun Culture (New York: Basic Books, 2016).

24 ⁶⁸ Edward C. Ezell, *Handguns of the World: Military Revolvers and Self-*
25 *Loaders from 1870 to 1945* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1981), 24-
26 28; Julian S. Hatcher, *Pistols and Revolvers and Their Use* (Marshallton, Delaware:
27 Small-Arms Technical Publishing Company, 1927), 8-11; and Charles T. Haven
28 and Frank A. Belden, *A History of the Colt Revolver and the Other Arms Made by*
Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Company from 1836 to 1940 (New York:
Bonanza Books, 1940), 17-43.

1 32. Smith and Wesson's seven-shot, .22 caliber, breech-loading, Model 1
2 rimfire revolver, invented in 1857, appeared on the market when the homicide crisis
3 was already well underway. But it had none of the limitations of percussion-cap
4 pistols or cap-and-ball revolvers. It could be loaded quickly and easily because it
5 did not require powder, wadding, and shot for each round; and it could be kept
6 loaded indefinitely because its corrosive powder was encapsulated in the bullet.⁶⁹
7 And it did not require a new percussion cap for each chamber, because the primer
8 was located in a rim around the base of the bullet, set to ignite as soon as it was hit
9 by the hammer.⁷⁰ As Smith and Wesson noted in its advertisements,

10 Some of the advantages of an arm constructed on this plan are:
11 The convenience and safety with which both the arm and ammunition
12 may be carried;
13 The facility with which it may be charged, (it requiring no ramrod,
14 powder-flask, or percussion caps);
15 Certainty of fire in damp weather;
16 That no injury is caused to the arm or ammunition by allowing it to
17 remain charged any length of time.⁷¹

18 33. Smith and Wesson had created a near-perfect murder weapon. It was
19 lethal, reliable, easy to carry and conceal, capable of multiple shots, and ready to
20 use at any time.⁷² Its only drawbacks were its small caliber and low muzzle
21 velocity, which limited its ability to stop an armed or aggressive adversary on the
22 first shot, and the difficulty and danger of reloading. The reloading problem was
23 remedied by Colt's development in 1889 of the first double-action commercial

24 ⁶⁹ Roy G. Jinks, *History of Smith and Wesson* (North Hollywood: Beinfeld,
25 1977), 38-57.

26 ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 38-57.

27 ⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 39.

28 ⁷² *Ibid.*, 38-57.

1 revolver with a swing-out cylinder and Smith and Wesson's addition in 1896 of an
2 ejector to push out spent cartridges.⁷³

3 34. These new weapons were not the primary cause of the surge in
4 violence that occurred in the United States from the Mexican War through
5 Reconstruction. But they did contribute to the later stages of the crisis, as they
6 superseded knives and black powder handguns as the primary weapons used in
7 interpersonal assaults, not only because of their greater lethality, but because they
8 were used in novel ways.⁷⁴ Easily concealed, they became the weapons of choice
9 for men who stalked and ambushed estranged spouses or romantic partners, for
10 suspects who killed sheriffs, constables, or police officers, and for self-styled
11 toughs who engaged in shootouts in bars, streets, and even churchyards.⁷⁵ And as
12 modern, breech-loading firearms replaced the muzzle-loading and cap-and-ball
13 gunstock from the late 1850s through World War I, the proportion of homicides
14 committed with firearms continued to climb even when homicide rates fell for a
15 short time, as they did at the end of Reconstruction. By the eve of World War I,
16 rates had fallen in the New England states to 1 to 4 per 100,000 adults per year, to 2
17 to 5 per 100,000 in the Prairie states, and 3 to 8 per 100,000 in the industrial states.
18 In the West, rates had fallen to 12 per 100,000 adults per year in California, 15 per
19 100,000 in Colorado, and approximately 20 to 30 per 100,000 in Arizona, Nevada,
20 and New Mexico. Homicide rates whipsawed, however, in the South. They fell in

21 _____
22 ⁷³ Rick Sapp, *Standard Catalog of Colt Firearms* (Cincinnati: F+W Media,
23 2011), 96; Jeff Kinard, *Pistols: An Illustrated History of Their Impact* (Santa
24 Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003), [163](#); and [Jinks](#), *History of Smith and Wesson*, 104-170.

24 ⁷⁴ Roth, "Why Guns Are and Aren't the Problem," 124-126 (recognizing that
25 "Americans used the new firearms in ways they could never use muzzle-loading
26 guns [. . .] The ownership of modern breech-loading [firearms] made the homicide
27 rate worse in the United States than it would have been otherwise because it
28 facilitated the use of *lethal* violence in a *wide variety of circumstances*."') (emphasis
added).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 124-125.

1 the late 1870s and 1880s, only to rise in the 1890s and early twentieth century, to
2 just under 20 per 100,000 adults in Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, and
3 Tennessee, and 35 per 100,000 in Virginia and North Carolina.⁷⁶ Ominously, too,
4 firearms invaded families and intimate relationships, so relatives, spouses, and
5 lovers were as likely to be killed with guns as unrelated adults—something that had
6 never happened before in America’s history.⁷⁷ That is why the proportion of
7 homicides committed with firearms—overwhelmingly, concealed revolvers—
8 reached today’s levels by the 1920s, ranging from a median of 56 percent in New
9 England and over 70 percent in the South and West.⁷⁸ And that is why every state
10 in the Union restricted the right to carrying certain concealable weapons.

11 35. It is important to note that state legislators experimented with various
12 degrees of firearm regulation, as the nation became more and more violent. In
13 Texas, where the homicide rate soared to at least 76 per 100,000 adults per year
14 from June, 1865, to June, 1868,⁷⁹ the legislature passed a time-place-manner
15 restriction bill in 1870 to prohibit the open or concealed carry of a wide range of
16 weapons, including firearms, on social occasions;⁸⁰ and it followed in 1871 with a

17 ⁷⁶ Ibid., 125-127, 388, 403-404; and Roth, “American Homicide
18 Supplemental Volume: American Homicides in the Twentieth Century,” Figures 4a
and 5a.

19 ⁷⁷ Ibid., 125.

20 ⁷⁸ Roth, “American Homicide Supplemental Volume: Weapons,” Figures 2
21 through 7.

22 ⁷⁹ Roth, Michael D. Maltz, and Douglas L. Eckberg, “Homicide Rates in the
23 Old West,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 42 (2011): 192
(https://www.jstor.org/stable/westhistquar.42.2.0173#metadata_info_tab_contents).

24 ⁸⁰ Brennan Gardner Rivas, “Enforcement of Public Carry Restrictions: Texas
25 as a Case Study,” *UC Davis Law Review* 55 (2021): 2609-2610
(https://lawreview.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/55/5/articles/files/55-5_Rivas.pdf). “Be it
26 enacted by the Legislature of the State of Texas, That if any person shall go into
27 any church or religious assembly, any school room or other place where persons are
28 assembled for educational, literary or scientific purposes, or into a ball room, social
party or other social gathering composed of ladies and gentlemen, or to any election
precinct on the day or days of any election, where any portion of the people of this

1 bill banning in most circumstances the carrying, open or concealed, of small deadly
2 weapons, including pistols, that were not designed for hunting or militia service.⁸¹

3 _____
4 State are collected to vote at any election, or to any other place where people may
5 be assembled to muster or perform any other public duty, or any other public
6 assembly, and shall have about his person a bowie-knife, dirk or butcher-knife, or
7 fire-arms, whether known as a six-shooter, gun or pistol of any kind, such person so
8 offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall
9 be fined in a sum not less than fifty or more than five hundred dollars, at the
10 discretion of the court or jury trying the same; provided, that nothing contained in
11 this section shall apply to locations subject to Indian depredations; and provided
12 further, that this act shall not apply to any person or persons whose duty it is to bear
13 arms on such occasions in discharge of duties imposed by law.” An Act Regulating
14 the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, 12th Leg., 1st Called Sess., ch. XLVI, § 1, 1870
15 Tex. Gen. Laws 63. See also Brennan Gardner Rivas, “The Deadly Weapon Laws
16 of Texas: Regulating Guns, Knives, and Knuckles in the Lone Star State, 1836-
17 1930” (Ph.D. dissertation: Texas Christian University, 2019)
18 (<https://repository.tcu.edu/handle/116099117/26778>).

19 ⁸¹ Rivas, “Enforcement of Public Carry Restrictions,” 2610-2611. Rivas,
20 quoting the law, says that “The first section stated, ‘That any person carrying on or
21 about his person, saddle, or in his saddle bags, any pistol, dirk, dagger, slung-shot,
22 sword-cane, spear, brass-knuckles, bowie knife, or any other kind of knife
23 manufactured or sold for the purposes of offense or defense, unless he has
24 reasonable grounds for fearing an unlawful attack on his person, and that such
25 ground of attack shall be immediate and pressing; or unless having or carrying the
26 same on or about his person for the lawful defense of the State, as a militiaman in
27 actual service, or as a peace officer or policeman, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor,
28 and, on conviction thereof shall, for the first offense, be punished by fine of not less
than twenty-five nor more than one hundred dollars, and shall forfeit to the county
the weapon or weapons so found on or about his person; and for every subsequent
offense may, in addition to such fine and forfeiture, be imprisoned in the county jail
for a term not exceeding sixty days; and in every case of fine under this section the
fines imposed and collected shall go into the treasury of the county in which they
may have been imposed; provided that this section shall not be so construed as to
prohibit any person from keeping or bearing arms on his or her own premises, or at
his or her own place of business, nor to prohibit sheriffs or other revenue officers,
and other civil officers, from keeping or bearing arms while engaged in the
discharge of their official duties, nor to prohibit persons traveling in the State from
keeping or carrying arms with their baggage; provided, further, that members of the
Legislature shall not be included under the term “civil officers” as used in this act.’
An Act to Regulate the Keeping and Bearing of Deadly Weapons, 12th Leg. Reg.
Sess., ch. XXXIV, § 1, 1871 Tex. Gen. Laws 25. The third section of the act reads,
‘If any person shall go into any church or religious assembly, any school room, or
other place where persons are assembled for amusement or for educational or
scientific purposes, or into any circus, show, or public exhibition of any kind, or

1 These laws were enforced with little or no racial bias until the 1890s, when white
2 supremacists disfranchised African Americans, legalized segregation, and took firm
3 control of the courts and law enforcement.⁸²

4 36. Tennessee and Arkansas went farther than Texas to stem the tide of
5 post-Civil War interpersonal violence. In 1871, Tennessee flatly prohibited the
6 carrying of pocket pistols and revolvers, openly or concealed, except for the large
7 army and navy pistols commonly carried by members of the military, which could
8
9

10 _____
11 into a ball room, social party, or social gathering, or to any election precinct on the
12 day or days of any election, where any portion of the people of this State are
13 collected to vote at any election, or to any other place where people may be
14 assembled to muster, or to perform any other public duty, (except as may be
15 required or permitted by law,) or to any other public assembly, and shall have or
16 carry about his person a pistol or other firearm, dirk, dagger, slung shot, sword
17 cane, spear, brass-knuckles, bowie-knife, or any other kind of knife manufactured
18 and sold for the purposes of offense and defense, unless an officer of the peace, he
19 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall, for the first
20 offense, be punished by fine of not less than fifty, nor more than five hundred
21 dollars, and shall forfeit to the county the weapon or weapons so found on his
22 person; and for every subsequent offense may, in addition to such fine and
23 forfeiture, be imprisoned in the county jail for a term not more than ninety days.’
24 Id. § 3.” The law did not apply, however, ‘to a person’s home or business, and
25 there were exemptions for “peace officers” as well as travelers; lawmakers and
26 jurists spent considerable time fleshing out who qualified under these exemptions,
27 and how to allow those fearing an imminent attack to carry these weapons in public
28 spaces. Also, the deadly weapon law did not apply to all guns or firearms but just
pistols. The time-place-manner restrictions, however, applied to any “fire-arms . . .
gun or pistol of any kind” and later “pistol or other firearm,” as well as “any gun,
pistol”

23 See also Brennan Gardner Rivas, “The Deadly Weapon Laws of Texas:
24 Regulating Guns, Knives, and Knuckles in the Lone Star State, 1836-1930 (Ph. D.
25 dissertation: Texas Christian University, 2019), 72-83, 124-163
(<https://repository.tcu.edu/handle/116099117/26778>).

26 ⁸² Rivas, “Enforcement of Public Carry Restrictions,” 2609-2620. The study
27 draws on enforcement data from four Texas counties, 1870-1930: 3,256 total cases,
28 of which 1,885 left a record of final adjudication. See also Rivas, “Deadly Weapon
Laws of Texas,” 164-195.

1 be carried openly, but not concealed.⁸³ Arkansas followed suit in 1881.⁸⁴
2 Tennessee’s law withstood a court challenge, and Arkansas’s was never
3 challenged.⁸⁵ And both states moved to prevent the sale or transfer of pocket
4 pistols or ordinary revolvers. In 1879, Tennessee prohibited “any person to sell, or
5 offer to sell, or bring into the State for the purpose of selling, giving away, or
6 otherwise disposing of, belt or pocket pistols, or revolvers, or any other kind of
7 pistol, except army or navy pistols.”⁸⁶ Arkansas passed a similar prohibition in
8 1881, but went even further by prohibiting the sale of pistol cartridges as well:
9 “Any person who shall sell, barter, or exchange, or otherwise dispose of, or in any
10 manner furnish to any person any dirk or bowie knife, or a sword or a spear in a
11 cane, brass or metal knucks, or any pistol, of any kind of whatever, except as are
12 used in the army or navy of the United States, and known as the navy pistol, or any

13
14 ⁸³ 1871 Tenn. Pub. Acts 81, An Act to Preserve the Peace and to Prevent Homicide,
15 ch. 90, § 1; *State v. Wilburn*, 66 Tenn. 57, 61 (1872) (“It shall not be lawful for any
16 person to publicly carry a dirk, sword cane, Spanish stiletto, belt or pocket pistol, or
17 revolver, other than an army pistol, or such as are commonly carried and used in the
18 United States army, and in no case shall it be lawful for any person to carry such
19 army pistol publicly or privately about his person in any other manner than openly
20 in his hands.”).

21 ⁸⁴ 1881 Ark. Acts 191, An Act to Preserve the Public Peace and Prevent
22 Crime, chap. XCVI, § 1-2 (“That any person who shall wear or carry, in any
23 manner whatever, as a weapon, any dirk or bowie knife, or a sword, or a spear in a
24 cane, brass or metal knucks, razor, or any pistol of any kind whatever, except such
25 pistols as are used in the army or navy of the United States, shall be guilty of a
26 misdemeanor. . . . Any person, excepting such officers or persons on a journey, and
27 on his premises, as are mentioned in section one of this act, who shall wear or carry
28 any such pistol as i[s] used in the army or navy of the United States, in any manner
except uncovered, and in his hand, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.”).

24 ⁸⁵ See Brennan Gardner Rivas, “The Problem with Assumptions: Reassessing
25 the Historical Gun Policies of Arkansas and Tennessee,” *Second Thoughts*, Duke
26 Center for Firearms Law (Jan. 20, 2022), <https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/2022/01/the-problem-with-assumptions-reassessing-the-historical-gun-policies-of-arkansas-and-tennessee/>.

27 ⁸⁶ 1879 Tenn. Pub. Act 135-36, An Act to Prevent the Sale of Pistols, chap.
28 96, § 1; *State v. Burgoyne*, 75 Tenn. 173, 173-74 (1881).

1 kind of cartridge for any pistol, or any person who shall keep such arms or
2 cartridges for sale, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.”⁸⁷

3 37. California’s legislature, recognizing that the homicide rate had reached
4 catastrophic levels (over 65 per 100,000 adults per year),⁸⁸ banned concealed
5 weapons in 1863, because, as the editor of the *Daily Alta Californian* declared,

6 During the thirteen years that California has been a State, there have been
7 more deaths occasioned by sudden assaults with weapons previously
8 concealed about the person of the assailant or assailed, than by all other
9 acts of violence which figure on the criminal calendar.... For many
10 sessions prior to the last, ineffectual efforts were made to enact some
11 statute which would effectually prohibit this practice of carrying
12 concealed weapons. A radical change of public sentiment demanded it,
13 but the desired law was not passed until the last Legislature, by a
14 handsome majority.⁸⁹

15 38. But the legislature repealed the law in 1870, as public sentiment
16 veered back toward the belief that the effort to make California less violent was
17 hopeless, and that the only protection law-abiding citizens could hope for was to
18 arm themselves. And the legislature once again had the enthusiastic support of the
19 editor of the *Daily Alta Californian*, which then opined, “As the sovereignty resides
20 in the people in America, they are to be permitted to keep firearms and other

21 ⁸⁷ Acts of the General Assembly of Arkansas, No. 96 § 3 (1881).

22 ⁸⁸ Roth, Maltz, and Eckberg, “Homicide Rates in the Old West,” 183. On
23 violence in California and across the Far West, see Roth, Maltz, and Eckberg,
24 “Homicide Rates in the Old West,” 173-195; Clare V. McKanna, Jr., *Homicide,
25 Race, and Justice in the American West, 1880-1920* (Tucson: University of Arizona
26 Press, 1997); McKanna, *Race and Homicide in Nineteenth-Century California*
27 (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2002); and John Mack Faragher, *Eternity
28 Street: Violence and Justice in Frontier Los Angeles* (New York: W. W. Norton,
2016); and Roth, *American Homicide*, 354.

⁸⁹ Clayton E. Cramer and Joseph Olson, “The Racist Origins of California’s
Concealed Weapon Permit Law,” Social Science Research Network, posted August
12, 2016, 6-7 (https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2599851).

1 weapons and to carry them at their pleasure.”⁹⁰ A number of counties dissented,
2 however, and made it a misdemeanor to carry a concealed weapon without a
3 permit—ordinances that they enforced.⁹¹ In 1917, the state made it a misdemeanor
4 to carry a concealed weapon in incorporated cities and required that gun dealers
5 register handgun sales and send the Dealer’s Record of Sale to local law
6 enforcement.⁹² And in 1923, the state extended the licensing requirement to
7 unincorporated areas and prohibited non-citizens from carrying concealed
8 weapons.⁹³

9 39. Other states, like Ohio, tried to have it both ways. The Ohio
10 legislature banned the carrying of concealable weapons in 1859, citing public
11 safety. But it directed jurors, in the same law, to acquit persons who carried such
12 weapons,

13 If it shall be proved to the jury, from the testimony on the trial of any
14 case presented under the first section of this act, that the accused was, at
15 the time of carrying any of the weapon or weapons aforesaid, engaged in
16 the pursuit of any lawful business, calling, or employment, and that the
17 circumstances in which he was placed at the time aforesaid were such as
to justify a prudent man in carrying the weapon or weapons aforesaid for
the defense of his person, property or family.⁹⁴

18 The burden of proof remained with the person who carried the concealed weapon.

19 40. It is important to remember, however, that even when states enacted
20 different types of firearms restrictions, the fact remains that many jurisdictions

21 ⁹⁰ Cramer and Olson, “Racist Origins of California’s Concealed Weapon
22 Permit Law,” 7-10.

23 ⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

24 ⁹² *Ibid.*, 11-13.

25 ⁹³ *Ibid.*, 13-15. Note that the title of the Cramer and Olson essay is
26 misleading. It does not refer to the origins of the laws discussed here or to the ways
in which they were enforced. It refers instead to an unsuccessful effort in 1878 and
a successful effort in 1923 to deny resident aliens the right to bear arms.

27 ⁹⁴ Joseph R. Swan, *The Revised Statutes of the State of Ohio, of a General*
28 *Nature, in Force August 1, 1860* (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1860), 452.

1 enacted statutory restrictions at that time to ensure the safety of the public and law
2 enforcement.

3 **III. ADDRESSING THREATS TO THE REPUBLIC AND ITS CITIZENS FROM**
4 **MASS MURDERERS FROM THE REVOLUTION INTO THE EARLY**
5 **TWENTIETH CENTURY**

6 41. The Republic faced threats not only from individual murderers, but
7 from groups of murderers. Mass murder has been a fact of life in the United States
8 since the mid-nineteenth century, when lethal and nonlethal violence of all kinds
9 became more common. But mass murder was a group activity through the
10 nineteenth century because of the limits of existing technologies.⁹⁵ The only way to
11 kill a large number of people was to rally like-minded neighbors and go on a
12 rampage with clubs, knives, nooses, pistols, shotguns, or rifles—weapons that were
13 certainly lethal but did not provide individuals or small groups of people the means
14 to inflict mass casualties on their own. Mass killings of this type were rare in the
15 colonial, Revolutionary, and Early National eras, outside of massacres of Native
16 Americans or irregular warfare among citizens seeking political power.⁹⁶ But from
17 the 1830s into the early twentieth century, mass killings were common.

18 ⁹⁵ On the history of mob violence, including riots and popular protests that
19 led to mass casualties, see Paul A. Gilje, *Rioting in America* (Bloomington: Indiana
20 University Press, 1996); and David Grimsted, *American Mobbing: Toward Civil
21 War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

22 ⁹⁶ For examples of massacres of unarmed Native Americans, see the murder
23 in 1623 of six Massachusetts men by a party from Plymouth Colony, led by Captain
24 Miles Standish [Roth, *American Homicide*, 42]; and the massacre in 1782 of 96
25 pacifist Moravian Delaware Indians at Gnadenhutzen in present-day Ohio [Rob
26 Harper, “Looking the Other Way: The Gnadenhutzen Massacre and the Contextual
27 Interpretation of Violence,” *William and Mary Quarterly* (2007) 64: 621-644
28 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/25096733#metadata_info_tab_contents)]. For
examples of political conflict among colonists that led to mass killings, see the
confrontation in 1655 at Severn River in Maryland between opposed factions in the
English Civil War [Aubrey C. Land, *Colonial Maryland: A History* (Millwood,
New York: Kato Press, 1981), 49-54] and the slaughter in 1782 of rebel prisoners at
Cloud’s Creek, South Carolina, by Tory partisans under the leadership of William
Cunningham [J. A. Chapman, *History of Edgefield County* (Newberry, South
Carolina: Elbert H. Aull, 1897), 31-34]; see also Fox Butterfield, *All God’s*

1 42. Examples include Nat Turner’s rebellion in Southampton County,
2 Virginia, in 1831, which claimed sixty-nine lives; the murder of seventeen
3 Mormons, perpetrated by militia men and vigilantes at Haun’s Mill, Missouri in
4 1838; Bloody Monday in Louisville, Kentucky, where an assault by nativist
5 Protestants on Irish and German Catholics in 1855 left twenty-two people dead; and
6 the murder of nineteen Chinese Americans by a racist mob in Los Angeles in 1871.
7 Because these mass killings were almost always spontaneous and loosely
8 organized, they were difficult for government to prevent. Worse, in some incidents,
9 such as the Haun’s Mill Massacre, state and local governments were complicit; and
10 in others, state and local governments turned a blind eye to the slaughter, as was the
11 case in the murder of Chinese farm workers in Chico, California, in 1877.⁹⁷

12 43. The Federal government did act during Reconstruction, however, to
13 prevent mass murder when formally organized white supremacist organizations
14 engaged in systematic efforts to deprive African Americans of their civil rights,
15 which had been guaranteed by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth
16 Amendments. The Ku Klux Klan Acts of 1870 and 1871, meant to prevent
17 assassinations and mass shootings and lynchings by white supremacist terrorists,

18 *Children: The Bosket Family and the American Tradition of Violence* (New York:
19 Vintage, 2008), 5-6.

20 ⁹⁷ David F. Almendinger, Jr., *Nat Turner and the Rising in Southampton*
21 *County* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2014); Patrick H. Breen, *The Land Shall*
22 *Be Deluged in Blood: A New History of the Nat Turner Revolt* (New York: Oxford

23 *University Press, 2015); Stephen B. Oates, The Fires of Jubilee: Nat Turner’s*
24 *Fierce Rebellion* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975); Stephen C. LeSueur, *The*
25 *1838 Mormon War in Missouri* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1987),
26 162-168; Brandon G. Kinney, *The Mormon War: Zion and the Missouri*
27 *Extermination Order of 1838* (Yardley, Pennsylvania: Westholme, 2011); Mary
28 Alice Mairose, “Nativism on the Ohio: the Know Nothings in Cincinnati and
Louisville, 1853-1855” (M.A. thesis, Ohio State University, 1993); W. Eugene
Hollon, *Frontier Violence: Another Look* (New York: Oxford University Press,
1974), 93-95; Faragher, *Eternity Street*, 463-480; and Sucheng Chan, *The Bitter-*
Sweet Soil: The Chinese in California Agriculture, 1860-1910 (Berkeley:
University of California Press, 1986), 372.

1 were effective when enforced by the federal government and the U.S. Army.⁹⁸ But
2 when federal troops were withdrawn, white supremacist mass killings resumed. In
3 New Orleans, for example, an ultimately successful effort by white-supremacist
4 Democrats to seize control of the city's government by violent means left dozens of
5 Republican officials and police officers shot dead and scores wounded.⁹⁹ And the
6 Klan Acts did nothing to prevent mass murders by spontaneous mobs and loosely
7 organized vigilantes. Rioters and vigilantes remained a threat well into the
8 twentieth century. In 1921 more than three hundred African American citizens
9 were murdered in the Tulsa Race Massacre in Oklahoma.¹⁰⁰

10 **IV. ADDRESSING THREATS TO THE REPUBLIC AND ITS CITIZENS FROM** 11 **MASS MURDERERS FROM THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY TO THE** 12 **PRESENT**

13 44. The character of mass murder began to change in the late nineteenth
14 and early twentieth century with the invention and commercial availability of new
15 technologies that gave individuals or small groups of people the power to kill large
16 numbers of people in a short amount of time. These technologies proved useful to
17 criminal gangs, anarchists, and factions of the labor movement intent on killing
18 adversaries, public officials, and law enforcement officers. The technologies that
19 were most widely used by criminals and terrorists were dynamite, invented by

20 ⁹⁸ Alan Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975).

21 ⁹⁹ Dennis C. Rousey, *Policing the Southern City: New Orleans, 1805-1889*
22 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 151-158. See also
23 LeeAnna Keith, *The Colfax Massacre: The Untold Story of Black Power, White*
24 *Terror, and the Death of Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press,
2008); and Gilles Vandal, *Rethinking Southern Violence: Homicides in Post-Civil*
War Louisiana, 1866-1884 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000), 67-109.

25 ¹⁰⁰ On the deadly race riots of 1919-1921, see William M. Tuttle, Jr., *Race*
26 *Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919* (New York: Atheneum, 1970); Scott
27 Ellsworth, *Death in a Promised Land: The Tulsa Race Riot of 1921* (Baton Rouge:
28 Louisiana State University Press, 1982); and Tim Madigan, *The Burning:*
Massacre, Destruction, and the Tulsa Race Riot of 1921 (New York: Thomas
Dunne Books / St. Martin's Press, 2001).

1 Alfred Nobel in 1866, and the Thompson submachine gun, invented in 1918 by
2 General John T. Thompson, who improved upon a pioneering German design.

3 45. The advantage of dynamite over nitroglycerin and other explosives
4 used in mining and construction was its power and its stability, which made
5 accidental explosions rare. The advantages of submachine guns over existing
6 machine guns as weapons of war were that they were light enough to be carried and
7 operated by a single individual, and they were capable of firing .45 caliber bullets
8 from 20-round clips or 50- or 100-round drum magazines at a rate of 600 to 725
9 rounds per minute.¹⁰¹

10 46. Criminals and terrorists quickly discovered how accessible and useful
11 these new technologies were. They could be purchased legally by private citizens.
12 In the 1920s, Thompson submachine guns were expensive. They sold for \$175 to
13 \$225 each, at a time when a new Ford cost \$440 (the rough equivalent of \$2996 to
14 \$3852 today, while now a base model of the AR-15 semiautomatic rifle can be
15 purchased for less than \$400 and a 30-round magazine for as little as \$10).¹⁰² That
16 is why Thompsons were favored by those with resources: law enforcement, the
17 Irish Republican Army, Sandinista rebels in Nicaragua, and bank robbers.
18 Dynamite, however, cost only 18 cents a pound (the rough equivalent of \$3.08
19 today), so it was favored by labor activists and anarchists.¹⁰³ Federal, state, and

20 ¹⁰¹ Herta E. Pauli, *Alfred Nobel: Dynamite King, Architect of Peace* (New
21 York: L. B. Fisher, 1942); and Bill Yenne, *Tommy Gun: How General Thompson's
22 Submachine Gun Wrote History* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2009).

23 ¹⁰² Yenne, *Tommy Gun*, 86. Estimates vary on the purchasing power of 1919
24 dollars in today's dollars, but \$1.00 in 1919 was worth roughly \$17.12 today. See
25 the CPI Inflation Calculator (<https://bit.ly/3CS5UNI>), accessed Jan. 6, 2023. The
26 prices of AR-15 style rifles today are from guns.com
27 (<https://www.guns.com/firearms/ar-15-rifles?priceRange=%24250%20-%20%24499>),
28 accessed Jan. 6, 2023. The prices of 30-round magazines of .233
caliber ammunition are from gunmagwarehouse.com
(<https://gunmagwarehouse.com/all-magazines/rifles/magazines/ar-15-magazines>),
accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

¹⁰³ Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fourteenth Census of*

1 local officials and law enforcement officers suddenly confronted novel threats to
2 their personal safety. Submachine guns were used most notoriously in gangland
3 slayings in Chicago during the Prohibition Era, such as the St. Valentine's Day
4 Massacre and the Kansas City Massacre.¹⁰⁴ Dynamite was used in a string of
5 anarchist bombings in 1919-1920. Those included the murder of 38 people and the
6 wounding of 143 in an attack on Wall Street, 36 dynamite bombs mailed to justice
7 officials, newspaper editors, and businessmen (including John D. Rockefeller), and
8 a failed attempt to kill Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer and his family.¹⁰⁵
9 Dynamite was also used effectively for malicious, private ends. For example,
10 Osage Indians were murdered by an individual in Oklahoma in an attempt to gain
11 their headrights and profit from insurance policies on them.¹⁰⁶

12
13
14

the United States Manufactures: Explosives (Washington, D.C.: Government
15 Printing Office, 1922), 6. Note that a pound of dynamite would be far more
16 expensive today—potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars—because it would
17 require the purchase of a blasting license, a storage bunker, and an isolated plot of
18 land for the storage bunker. See U.S Department of Justice, Bureau of Alcohol,
19 Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Enforcement Programs and Services, *ATF*
20 *Federal Explosives Law and Regulations, 2012*
21 ([https://www.atf.gov/explosives/docs/report/publication-federal-explosives-laws-
22 and-regulations-atf-p-54007/download](https://www.atf.gov/explosives/docs/report/publication-federal-explosives-laws-and-regulations-atf-p-54007/download)), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

23 ¹⁰⁴ William Helmer and Arthur J. Bilek, *The St. Valentine's Day Massacre: The Untold Story of the Bloodbath That Brought Down Al Capone* (Nashville: Cumberland House, 2004); and Yenne, *Tommy Gun*, 74-78, 91-93.

24 ¹⁰⁵ Paul Avrich, *Sacco and Vanzetti: The Anarchist Background* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 140-156, 181-195; Beverly Gage, *The Day Wall Street Exploded: A Story of America in Its First Age of Terror* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); David Rapoport, *Waves of Global Terrorism: From 1879 to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2022), 65-110. Consider also the bombing of the office of the *Los Angeles Times* in 1910 by two union activists, which killed 21 persons and injured 100 more, in Louis Adamic, *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America* (New York: Viking, 1931).

25 ¹⁰⁶ For this and other murders of Osage people see David Grann, *Killers of the Flower Moon: The Osage Murders and the Birth of the FBI* (New York, Doubleday, 2017).

1 47. Because of the threats these new technologies posed for public safety,
2 public officials widened their regulatory focus beyond concealed and concealable
3 weapons. Thirteen states restricted the capacity of ammunition magazines for
4 semiautomatic and automatic firearms between 1927 and 1934,¹⁰⁷ and Congress
5 passed the National Firearms Acts of 1934 and 1938, which restricted ownership of
6 machine guns and submachine guns (known today as automatic weapons) because
7 of their ability to fire rapidly from large-capacity magazines.¹⁰⁸ And the Organized
8 Crime Control Act of 1970 restricted ownership of a wide range of explosives,
9 building upon regulations that began in 1917 with the passage of the Federal
10 Explosives Act, which restricted the distribution, storage, possession, and use of
11 explosive materials during the time of war.¹⁰⁹

12 48. Since 1970, public officials have continued to reserve the right to
13 regulate the sale, ownership, and control of new technologies that can be used by
14 individuals or small groups to commit mass murder. The Homeland Security Act
15 of 2002 improved security at airports and in cockpits to ensure that airplanes could
16 not be used by terrorists to commit mass murder. The Secure Handling of
17 Ammonium Nitrate Act of 2007 restricted access to large quantities of fertilizer to
18 prevent terrorist attacks like the one that killed 165 people in Oklahoma City in
19

20
21 ¹⁰⁷ Robert J. Spitzer, “Gun Accessories and the Second Amendment: Assault
22 Weapons, Magazines, and Silencers.” *Law and Contemporary Problems* 83 (2020):
23 238 (<https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/lcp/vol83/iss3/13>). In the same period,
24 five additional states restricted magazine capacity for fully automatic weapons, but
25 not semiautomatic weapons.

26 ¹⁰⁸ The National Firearms Act of 1934, 48 Statute 1236
27 (https://homicide.northwestern.edu/docs_fk/homicide/laws/national_firearms_act_of_1934.pdf); and the National Firearms Act of 1938, 52 Statute 1250
28 (https://homicide.northwestern.edu/docs_fk/homicide/laws/national_firearms_act_of_1938.pdf).

¹⁰⁹ The Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, 84 Statute 922; and the
Federal Explosives Act of 1917, 40 Statute 385.

1 1995.¹¹⁰ And in the wake of the massacre of 58 people and wounding of hundreds
2 of others at a concert in Las Vegas in 2017, the Trump administration issued a
3 regulation that banned the sale or possession of bump stocks. It gave owners 90
4 days to destroy their bump stocks or turn them in to the Bureau of Alcohol,
5 Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.¹¹¹

6 49. In recent decades, criminal organizations, terrorists, and lone gunmen
7 with an intent to commit mass murder have also discovered the effectiveness of
8 rapid-fire semiautomatic weapons with large capacity magazines. These weapons,
9 which were designed for offensive military applications rather than individual self-
10 defense, emerged from technologies developed for military use during the Cold
11 War, beginning with the Soviet AK-47 assault rifle, which was invented in 1947,
12 adopted by the Soviet Army in 1949, and used in the 1950s by the Soviets or their
13 allies during the Hungarian Revolution, the Vietnam War, and the Laotian Civil
14 War.¹¹² The signature military firearm of that era—the M-16 rifle with a 30-round
15 magazine and a muzzle velocity of over 3,000 feet per second¹¹³—was capable of
16 firing 750 to 900 rounds per minute when set on fully automatic.¹¹⁴ But the M-16

17 ¹¹⁰ Public Law 107-296, November 25, 2002, “To Establish the Department
18 of Homeland Security” (https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/hr_5005_enr.pdf); and
19 6 U.S. Code § 488a - Regulation of the sale and transfer of ammonium nitrate
20 (<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/6/chapter-1/subchapter-VIII/part-J>). The
21 ammonium nitrate regulations were to be enforced no later than 90 days after
22 December 26, 2007. Accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

21 ¹¹¹ *New York Times*, December 18, 2018
22 (<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/18/us/politics/trump-bump-stocks-ban.html>),
23 accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

23 ¹¹² Edward and Ezell, *The AK-47 Story: Evolution of the Kalashnikov*
24 *Weapons* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1986).

25 ¹¹³ Muzzle velocity is the speed at which a round exits the barrel of a firearm.

26 ¹¹⁴ Edward Ezell, *The Great Rifle Controversy: Search for the Ultimate*
27 *Infantry Weapon from World War II through Vietnam and Beyond* (Harrisburg,
28 Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1984)

1 was used more often in combat—and more accurately, effectively, and sustainably
2 as a weapon for inflicting mass casualties—when set on semiautomatic, which was
3 standard military procedure. That is why the U.S. Army defines “rapid fire” as 45
4 rounds per minute (the rate of fire of an M-16 when set on semiautomatic), not 750
5 to 900.¹¹⁵ And that is why in 1998 the U.S. Marine Corps adopted the M-16A4,
6 which replaced the “fully automatic” switch with a three-round burst (but otherwise
7 the same weapon as the M-16)—an alteration that slows the potential rate of fire,
8 conserves ammunition, and improves accuracy.¹¹⁶ The civilian version of the M-
9 16—the ArmaLite AR-15—has approximately the same muzzle velocity as the M-
10 16 (3,300 feet per second) and the same rate of fire as the M-16 on semiautomatic:
11 45 rounds per minute.¹¹⁷

12 50. The muzzle velocity of semiautomatic handguns, like the Glock 17, is
13 far lower than that of an M-16 or its civilian counterparts: around 1,350 feet per
14 second. But technological advances have increased the speed at which
15 semiautomatic handguns can be fired. An expert can fire an entire 30-round clip
16 from a Glock 17 handgun in five seconds.¹¹⁸ And they are affordable. A new
17
18

19
20 ¹¹⁵ Sections 8-17 through 8-22 (Rates of Fire), Sections 8-23 and 8-24
21 (Follow Through), and Sections B-16 through B22 (Soft Tissue Penetration), in *TC*
22 *3-22.9 Rifle and Carbine Manual*, Headquarters, Department of the Army (May
23 2016). Available at the Army Publishing Directorate Site
24 ([https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN19927_TC_3-
25 22x9_C3_FINAL_WEB.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN19927_TC_3-22x9_C3_FINAL_WEB.pdf)), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

26 ¹¹⁶ See military-today.com ([http://www.military-
27 today.com/firearms/m16.htm](http://www.military-today.com/firearms/m16.htm)), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

28 ¹¹⁷ See military-today.com ([http://www.military-
today.com/firearms/m16.htm](http://www.military-today.com/firearms/m16.htm)), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

¹¹⁸ See Jerry Miculek, “Dual Glock 17 Rapid Fire 60 Rounds in 5 Seconds!
660 RPM.” YouTube (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1H5KsnoUBzs>),
accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

1 semiautomatic handgun can be purchased for less than \$200 and equipped with a
2 33-round magazine for less than \$15.¹¹⁹

3 51. It did not take criminals, terrorists, and lone gunmen long to adopt the
4 rapid-fire semiautomatic handguns and rifles with large capacity magazines that
5 arrived on the domestic market in the 1970s and 1980s. These firearms can inflict
6 mass casualties in a matter of seconds and maintain parity with law enforcement in
7 a standoff, which is why many police and sheriff departments across the United
8 States have purchased semiautomatic rifles and armored vehicles to defend
9 themselves and decrease the likelihood that officers are killed or wounded.¹²⁰

10 52. Manufacturers soon discovered ways to increase the rate of fire of
11 these new semiautomatic weapons even further. Some innovations, such as bump
12 stocks and modification kits, allowed owners to transform semiautomatic rifles into
13 fully automatic rifles. And in response to the Trump administration’s regulatory
14 ban on the production and sale of bump stocks and modification kits, the firearms
15 industry has developed “binary” triggers that fire when pulled *and when released*—
16 a modification that doubles the rate at which semiautomatic weapons can be
17 fired.¹²¹

18 ¹¹⁹ See guns.com for the price of semiautomatic handguns
19 ([https://www.guns.com/firearms/handguns/semi-
20 auto?priceRange=Less%20than%20%24250](https://www.guns.com/firearms/handguns/semi-auto?priceRange=Less%20than%20%24250)) and bymymags.com for the price of
21 large capacity magazines (<https://www.buymymags.com/>), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

22 ¹²⁰ Sam Bieler, “Police Militarization in the USA: The State of the Field,”
23 Policing: An International Journal 39 (2016): 586-600, available at
24 [https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/PIJPSM-03-2016-
25 0042/full/pdf?casa_token=TYUuIouUCc8AAAAA:IWXQRQOtW90KZ2AKwzH
26 NMX2tfRix0zAxRRkjQSy3rA-
27 uUpnylZrnp0Xolhj7UFIf05WGZkr_92L_QGk_OAxnSH-
28 3h26oxKC4e7vM79VCBpF19_cHg](https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/PIJPSM-03-2016-0042/full/pdf?casa_token=TYUuIouUCc8AAAAA:IWXQRQOtW90KZ2AKwzHNMX2tfRix0zAxRRkjQSy3rA-uUpnylZrnp0Xolhj7UFIf05WGZkr_92L_QGk_OAxnSH-3h26oxKC4e7vM79VCBpF19_cHg), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

¹²¹ Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Office of
Enforcement Programs and Services, Office of Field Operations, “Open Letter to
All Federal Firearms Licensees,” March 22, 2022
([https://www.atf.gov/firearms/docs/open-letter/all-ffls-mar-2022-open-letter-forced-
reset-triggers-frts/download](https://www.atf.gov/firearms/docs/open-letter/all-ffls-mar-2022-open-letter-forced-reset-triggers-frts/download)), accessed Jan. 6, 2023. The ATF has not banned the

	Mass shootings with non-semiautomatic/non-automatic firearm	Mass shootings with semiautomatic handgun	Mass shootings with semiautomatic rifle	Mass shootings with automatic firearms
Average Killed	5.4	6.5	9.2	8.1
Average Wounded	3.9	5.8	11.0	8.1
Average Victims	9.3	12.3	20.2	16.2
Number of Mass Shootings	52	82	40	8

Note that mass shootings with semiautomatic rifles have been as deadly as mass shootings with fully automatic weapons.¹²³

¹²³ The data are from the Violence Project (<https://www.theviolenceproject.org/mass-shooter-database/>), accessed Jan. 6, 2023. The Violence Project, which has compiled data on mass shootings from 1966 through 2021, defines a mass shooting as “a multiple homicide incident in which four or more victims are murdered with firearms—not including the offender(s)—within one event, and at least some of the murders occurred in a public location or locations in close geographical proximity (e.g., a workplace, school, restaurant, or other public settings), and the murders are not attributable to any other underlying criminal activity or commonplace circumstance (armed robbery, criminal competition, insurance fraud, argument, or romantic triangle).” The Violence Project database provides information on the weapons used in the shootings. It notes, for instance, that two shooters who possessed semiautomatic rifles at the times of their crimes did not use them, and that 8 shooters had illegal, fully automatic weapons. Those automatic weapons included 2 Uzi submachine guns, 3 machine pistols, 1 M-16, and 2 AK-47 rifles converted to automatic. I have not participated in Violence Project or in the collection of their data. In Figure 1, however, I have added the data from the six mass shootings that occurred from January through August, 2022, that fit the Violence Project’s definition of a mass shooting. Three were committed with semiautomatic rifles and three with semiautomatic handguns. The table does not include the Las Vegas shooting of 2017 (58 killed, 887 wounded).

1 on mass shootings from 1966 through 2021, defines a mass shooting as “a multiple
2 homicide incident in which four or more victims are murdered with firearms—not
3 including the offender(s)—within one event, and at least some of the murders
4 occurred in a public location or locations in close geographical proximity (e.g., a
5 workplace, school, restaurant, or other public settings), and the murders are not
6 attributable to any other underlying criminal activity or commonplace circumstance
7 (armed robbery, criminal competition, insurance fraud, argument, or romantic
8 triangle).” Other authorities have adopted similar definitions of “mass shootings”
9 and “mass murder.” For example, the FBI has defined mass murder as “a number
10 of murders (four or more) occurring during the same incident, with no distinctive
11 time period between the murderers.”¹²⁶ Federal legislation enacted in 2013
12 authorized the Attorney General to assist in the investigation of mass killings,
13 defined to mean “3 or more killings in a single incident.”¹²⁷

14 58. What is remarkable about the mass shootings that have plagued the
15 United States since 1965 is that all but four involved a lone shooter, and those that
16 have involved more than one assailant have involved only two: in 1998 in
17 Jonesboro, Kentucky; in 1999 in Littleton, Colorado; in 2015 in San Bernardino,
18 California; and in 2019 in Jersey City, New Jersey. In the nineteenth and early

19 _____
20 shooting: the Buffalo, New York, supermarket shooting on May 14; the Robb
21 Elementary School shooting in Uvalde, Texas, on May 24; the Tulsa, Oklahoma
22 medical center shooting on June 1; the concrete company shooting in Smithsburg,
23 Maryland, on June 9; the Highland Park, Illinois, Fourth of July Parade shooting;
24 and the Greenwood, Indiana, Park Mall shooting on July 17. Three were
25 committed with semiautomatic rifles and three with semiautomatic handguns. The
26 table in this declaration, unlike the tables in the Violence Project, does not include
27 the Las Vegas shooting of 2017 (58 killed, 887 wounded). The Las Vegas shooting
28 is an outlier in the number killed and wounded which would skew the results of the
analysis.

¹²⁶ FBI, *Serial Murder: Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives for Investigators* at 8
(2005) (<https://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/serial-murder#two>),
accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

¹²⁷ 28 U.S.C. § 530C(b)(1)(M).

1 twentieth centuries, it required scores of individuals to gather together as mobs,
2 rioters, vigilantes, or terrorists to kill or wound dozens of people in a short space of
3 time—generally because of their race, ethnicity, or faith.

4 59. Today, thanks especially to extended magazines and certain classes of
5 semiautomatic firearms, it requires only one or two individuals to kill or wound that
6 many people. And because of these modern technologies, which were developed for
7 warfare, angry, alienated individuals can commit mass murder for reasons that are
8 simply personal. Mass murderers no longer require collaborators to rally to a cause.
9 For example, they can kill large numbers of people simply because they feel
10 slighted at school, because they don't get along with their coworkers, because they
11 were rejected romantically, or because they simply want to make a name for
12 themselves. And since it is impossible in our society—indeed, in any society—to
13 ensure that no one is angry or alienated, restricting access to extended magazines
14 and certain classes of semiautomatic firearms mitigates the risk to every American.

15 60. For these reasons, local governments have enacted bans on the sale of
16 semiautomatic rifles with features that enhance their military utility, as the federal
17 government did from 1994 to 2004. And local governments have banned the sale
18 of large capacity magazines, because they allow mass murderers to prolong their
19 attacks before citizens or law enforcement can intervene—usually when the shooter
20 is reloading. For example, the shooter who wounded U.S. House Representative
21 Gabby Giffords in Tucson, Arizona, in 2011 was able to fire 31 rounds with a
22 Glock 19 semiautomatic handgun in a matter of seconds before bystanders could
23 disarm him as he changed magazines. Every one of those rounds hit an individual,
24 killing six and injuring twelve.¹²⁸

25
26
27 ¹²⁸ “2011 Tucson Shooting,” Wikipedia
28 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011_Tucson_shooting), accessed Jan. 6, 2023.

1 **V. CONCLUSION**

2 61. From the Founding Generation to the present, the people of the United
3 States and their elected representatives have recognized that there are instances in
4 which the security of the republic and the safety of its citizens require government-
5 imposed restrictions. That is why the majority of states passed and enforced laws
6 against the carrying of concealable weapons, why the federal government passed
7 the Ku Klux Klan Acts during Reconstruction, and why states, municipalities, and
8 the federal government have passed and enforced laws since World War I to restrict
9 ownership or control of modern technologies that enable criminals, terrorists, and
10 malicious or delusional individuals to commit mass murder. Public officials are not
11 required to pass such laws, of course, but historically, they have always retained the
12 ability to do so. There is no evidence in the historical record to suggest that they
13 took their decisions lightly when they imposed these restrictions on weapons and
14 armed voluntary organizations. And mass murders by individuals, including mass
15 shootings, are a recent phenomenon, caused by changes in technology that emerged
16 in the late nineteenth through the late twentieth century. Public officials today are
17 confronting a criminological problem that did not exist in the Founding Era, nor
18 during the first century of the nation's existence.

19
20 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

21 Executed on January 6, 2023 at Dublin, Ohio.

22 

23 _____
24 Randolph Roth

25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

Curriculum Vitae

RANDOLPH ROTH

Department of History
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210-1367

Table of Contents

Personal	2
Education	2
Academic Positions	2
Honorary Positions	2
Professional Honors and Awards for Scholarship	2
Professional Honors and Awards for Teaching	3
Grants	3
Bibliography and Research	4-17
Teaching	18-20
Service	21-26

Personal

Education

1981, Ph.D. in History, Yale University (thesis, "Whence This Strange Fire? Religious and Reform Movements in Vermont, 1791-1843," David Brion Davis and Howard R. Lamar, advisors)

1973, B.A., with honors and distinction, in History, Stanford University (thesis, "Progressive Reform and Socialism in Berkeley, California, 1877-1924," Carl Degler and Barton Bernstein, advisors)

Academic Positions

1985-present, The Ohio State University: College of Arts and Sciences
Distinguished Professor of History and Sociology
1978-1985, Grinnell College: Assistant Professor of History
1978, University of Vermont: Instructor in History
1974-1977, Graduate Teaching Assistant, Yale University

Honorary Positions

2012, Wayne N. Aspinall Visiting Chair Professor, University of Colorado Mesa

Professional Honors and Awards for Scholarship

2013-2016, Member, Roundtable on Crime Trends in America, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences

2012, Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science

2011, Michael J. Hindelang Award, American Society of Criminology, for the outstanding contribution to criminology over the previous three years

2010, Allan Sharlin Memorial Award, Social Science History Association, for an outstanding book in social science history

2010, Outstanding Academic Books, *Choice*

1988, E. Harold Hugo Memorial Book Prize, Old Sturbridge Village Research Society, for distinguished work in the history of rural society

1982, Thorton Rockwell Field Prize, Yale University, for the outstanding dissertation in the Humanities

1982, George Washington Eggleston Prize, Yale University, for the outstanding dissertation in American history

1973, James Birdsdall Weter Prize, Stanford University, for the outstanding senior thesis in history

Professional Honors and Awards for Teaching

2017, Rodica C. Botoman Award for Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching and Mentoring, College of Arts and Humanities

2013, Outstanding Teaching Award, College of Arts and Sciences Student Council

2009, Ohio State University Alumni Award for Distinguished Teaching

2007, Distinguished Teaching Award, Ohio Academy of History

1995, Clio Award, Phi Alpha Theta Honor Society, for Distinguished Teaching in History at Ohio State University

Grants

2013-2014, Research Grant, Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation

2012-2015, Research Grant, National Science Foundation (SES-1228406)

2000, Fellowship for University Teachers, National Endowment for the Humanities

1998-2000, Research Grant and Supplemental Research Grant, National Science Foundation (SBR-9808050)

1992, Fellow, Workshop on the Rhetoric of Social History, University of Iowa

1989-1990, Research Fellowship, Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation

1987, National Endowment for the Humanities, Summer Stipend

1983, Research Fellowship for Recent Recipients of the Ph.D., American Council of Learned Societies

1981, Fred Harris Daniels Fellowship, American Antiquarian Society

Bibliography and Research

Books

American Homicide (an interregional study of violent crime and violent death in America from colonial times to the present). The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press (2009), 655 pp.

The Democratic Dilemma: Religion, Reform, and the Social Order in the Connecticut River Valley of Vermont, 1791-1850. Cambridge University Press (1987), 399 pp.

Edited Volumes

Co-founder and co-director, Historical Violence Database (on-line database on violent crime, violent death, and collective violence). Web address:
www.sociology.ohio-state.edu/cjrc/hvd

American Homicide Supplementary Volume (on-line supplement to *American Homicide*, including detailed appendices on methods, supplemental tables, graphs, and statistical analyses), approx. 750 pp. Web address:
<http://cjrc.osu.edu/researchprojects/hvd/AHsup.html>

Essays on Historical Subjects

“Homicide and the Opioid Epidemic: A Longitudinal Analysis,” co-authored with Richard Rosenfeld and Joel Wallman. *Homicide Studies* (forthcoming).

“The Opioid Epidemic and Homicide in the United States,” co-authored with Richard Rosenfeld and Joel Wallman. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 58: 1 (2021): 1-46.

“Homicide-Suicide by Women against Intimate Partners,” co-authored with Wendy C. Regoeczi, in Todd Shackelford, ed., *Sage Handbook of Domestic Violence* (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 2020), v 1, 318-329.

“Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem: The Relationship between Guns and Homicide in American History,” in Jennifer Tucker, Barton C. Hacker, and Margaret Vining, eds., *A Right to Bear Arms? The Contested Role of History in Contemporary Debates on the Second Amendment* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, 2019), 113-133.

“Does Better Angels of Our Nature Hold Up as History?” *Historical Reflections* 44: 1 (2018): 91-103.

“Criminologists and Historians of Crime: A Partnership Well Worth Pursuing.” *Crime, History, and Societies* 21: 2 (2017): 387-400.

“How Exceptional Is the History of Violence and Criminal Justice in the United States? Variation across Time and Space as the Keys to Understanding Homicide and Punitiveness,” in Kevin Reitz, ed. *American Exceptionalism in Crime and Punishment* (Oxford University Press, 2017).

"Getting Things Wrong Really Does Help, as Long as You Keep Trying to Get Things Right: Developing Theories About Why Homicide Rates Rise and Fall" in Michael D. Maltz and Stephen Rice, eds., *Envisioning Criminology: Researchers on Research as a Process of Discovery* (Springer Verlag, 2015), 143-150.

“Roundtable on History Meets Biology: Introduction,” *American Historical Review* (2014) 119: 1492-1499. Principal author and organizer of the Roundtable.

“Emotions, Facultative Adaptation, and the History of Homicide,” *American Historical Review* (2014) 119: 1529-1546.

“Gender, Sex, and Intimate-Partner Violence in Historical Perspective,” in Rosemary Gartner and William McCarthy, eds., *Oxford Handbook on Gender, Sex, and Crime* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 175-190.

“The Importance of Testing Criminological Theories in Historical Context: The Civilization Thesis versus the Nation-Building Hypothesis,” *Criminology* online: Presidential Session Papers from the American Society of Criminology (2014)

“Making Sense of Violence? Reflections on the History of Interpersonal Violence in Europe,” *Crime, History, and Societies* (2013) 17: 5-26. Richard McMahan, Joachim Eibach, and Randolph Roth. Introduction to a special issue solicited by the Board of Editors of *Crime, History, and Societies*, co-edited with Joachim

Eibach, University of Berne, and Richard McMahon, University of Liverpool.

“Scientific History and Experimental History,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* (2013) 43: 443-458.

“Measuring Feelings and Beliefs that May Facilitate (or Deter) Homicide,” *Homicide Studies* (2012) 16: 196-217.

“Yes We Can: Working Together toward a History of Homicide That Is Empirically, Mathematically, and Theoretically Sound,” *Crime, History, and Societies* (2011) 15: 131-145.

“Biology and the Deep History of Homicide,” *British Journal of Criminology* (2011) 51: 535-555.

“Homicide Rates in the Old West.” *Western Historical Quarterly*. Randolph Roth, Michael D. Maltz, and Douglas L. Eckberg (2011) 42: 173-195.

“American Homicide: Theory, Methods, Body Counts.” *Historical Methods* (2010) 43: 185-192.

“The Historical Violence Database: A Collaborative Research Project on the History of Violent Crime and Violent Death.” *Historical Methods*. Randolph Roth, Cornelia Hughes Dayton, Kenneth Wheeler, James Watkinson, Robb Haberman, James M. Denham, and Douglas L. Eckberg (2008) 41: 81-98.

“Homicide in Florida, 1821-1861: A Quantitative Analysis.” *Florida Historical Quarterly*. Randolph Roth and James M. Denham (2007) 86: 216-239.

“Guns, Murder, and Probability: How Can We Decide Which Figures to Trust?” *Reviews in American History* (2007) 35: 165-75.

“Twin Evils? Slavery and Homicide in Early America,” in Steven Mintz and John Stauffer, eds., *The Problem of Evil: Slavery, Freedom, and the Ambiguities of American Reform*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press (2007), 74-88.

"Rural Communities," in Feintuch, Burt and David H. Watters, eds., *Encyclopedia of New England*. Yale University Press (2005), 53-55.

“Counting Guns: What Social Science Historians Know and Could Learn about Gun Ownership, Gun Culture, and Gun Violence in the United States,” *Social Science History* (2002) 26: 699-708.

“Guns, Gun Culture, and Homicide: The Relationship between Firearms, the Uses of Firearms, and Interpersonal Violence in Early America,” *William and Mary*

Quarterly (2002) 59: 223-240.

"Homicide in Early Modern England, 1549-1800: The Need for a Quantitative Synthesis." *Crime, History, and Societies* (2001) 5: 33-67.

"Child Murder in New England," *Social Science History* (2001) 25: 101-147.

"Spousal Murder in Northern New England, 1791-1865," in Christine Daniels, ed., *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America, 1640-1865*. Routledge Press (1999), 65-93.

"'Blood Calls for Vengeance!': The History of Capital Punishment in Vermont," in Michael Sherman, ed., *Vermont State Government*. Vermont Secretary of State and Vermont Historical Society (1997), 10-25.

"The Generation Conflict Reconsidered," in *American Vistas*, ed. Leonard Dinnerstein & Kenneth T. Jackson. Oxford University Press (7th ed. 1995), 116-127.

"The Other Masonic Outrage: The Death and Transfiguration of Joseph Burnham," *Journal of the Early Republic* (1994) 14: 35-69.

"The First Radical Abolitionists: The Reverend James Milligan and the Reformed Presbyterians of Vermont," *New England Quarterly* (1982) 55: 540-563.

Essays on Methods and Theory

"'To Err Is Human': Uniformly Reporting Medical Errors and Near Misses, a Naïve, Costly, and Misdirected Goal." *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. Charles H. Andrus, Eduardo G. Villasenor, John B. Kettelle, Randolph Roth, Allison M. Sweeney, and Nathaniel M. Matolo (2003) 196: 911-918.

"Is There a Democratic Alternative to Republicanism? The Rhetoric and Politics of Synthesis in American History," in Jeffrey Cox and Sheldon Stromquist, eds., *Contesting the Master Narrative: Essays in Social History*. University of Iowa Press (1998), 210-256.

"Did Class Matter in American Politics? The Importance of Exploratory Data Analysis," *Historical Methods* (1998) 31: 5-25.

"Is History a Process? Revitalization Theory, Nonlinearity, and the Central Metaphor of Social Science History," *Social Science History* (1992) 16: 197-243.

"Ecological Regression and the Analysis of Voter Behavior," *Historical Methods*

(1986) 19: 103-117.

Public History Essays

"Can Faith Change the World? Religion and Society in Vermont's Age of Reform," *Vermont History* (2001) 69: 7-18.

"Wayward Youths: Raising Adolescents in Vermont, 1777-1815," *Vermont History* (1991) 59: 85-96.

"Why Are We Still Vermonters? Vermont's Identity Crisis and the Founding of the Vermont Historical Society," *Vermont History* (1991) 59: 197-211.

Works in Progress

Child Murder in America. An interregional study of murders of and by children from colonial times to the present (in manuscript through early 20th century)

"How Scientific Is Environmentalist History? The Rhetoric and Politics of Speaking for Nature" (essay in manuscript)

Editorial Boards

2014-2017, *American Historical Review*
2012-2016, 1995-2005, *Historical Methods*
2011- , *Homicide Studies*
2004- , *Crime, History, and Societies*

Invited Lectures

"The History of Police Involved Homicides in the United States," Mary Immaculate College & the University of Limerick, Ireland, October 26, 2021.

"Firearms and Homicide in the United States: A History," British Crime Historians Symposium, Leeds University, Great Britain, Scheduled for September 2-3, 2021.

"The History of Cross-National Homicide Rates: What We Can Learn from the Available Historical Data, and Why We Have to Worry about Learning the Wrong Lessons," Bielefeld University, Germany, scheduled for April 29, 2020. Postponed.

“Inequality,” Ashland University, October 16, 2019.

“The History of Gun Violence in America,” Shasta Seminar, Wesleyan University, October 28, 2017.

“Why Guns Are and Aren’t the Problem,” Ashland University Center for the Study of Nonviolence, Ashland University, April 1, 2017.

“Firearms and Violence in American History,” Aspen Institute, September 15, 2016, Washington, D.C.

“Homicide in the United States: The Long History and Recent Trends,” The Donald and Margaret Sherman Violence Prevention Lecture, Jerry Lee Center of Criminology, University of Pennsylvania, April 10, 2015.

“The History of Child Murder,” Andrew Young School of Public Policy, Georgia State University, January 28, 2014.

“The Causes of Homicide,” National Institute of Justice, December 2, 2013.

“Biology, History, and the Causes of Homicide,” School of Law, University of Buffalo, October 10, 2013.

“Bio-Historical Co-Evolution and the Biology of Social Behavior: The Prospects for a New Institute on History and the Sciences,” Max Planck Institutes, Berlin, Germany, June 27, 2013.

“Deterrence, Judicial Tolerance, and the Homicide Problem in America,” Robina Institute of Criminal Law and Justice, University of Minnesota, April 26, 2013

“Child Murder in America: A History,” Population Studies Center and Department of History, University of Michigan, April 8, 2013

“America’s Homicide Problem,” Northwestern University School of Law, November 16, 2012

“American Homicide,” Aspinall Lecture, Colorado Mesa University, April 5, 2012

“Quantitative Analysis of the History of Crime and Violence: Achievements and Prospects,” Keynote Address, Conference on “Making Sense of Violence,” University of Bern, September 8, 2011

“Can We Learn to Play Well with Others? Enlisting the Humanities, the Sciences,

and the Social Sciences in the Study of Violence.” Conference on Emerging Disciplines, Humanities Research Center, Rice University, February 25, 2011

“American Homicide,” Washington Forum, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, May 25, 2010

“Can We Learn to Play Well with Others? Enlisting the Humanities, the Sciences, and the Social Sciences in the Study of Violence.” Presidential Plenary Address, Southwestern Social Science Association, Houston, Texas, April 1, 2010

“Homicide on Florida’s Antebellum Frontier,” Robert and Rose Stahl Criminal Justice Lecture, Lawton M. Chiles Center for Florida History, Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Florida, March 25, 2010

“Homicide in the American Backcountry, 1717-1850,” Keynote Address at the “From Borderland to Backcountry Conference: Frontier Communities in Comparative Perspective” at the University of Dundee, Scotland, July 7, 2009

“Research Strategies for Studying the History of Crime and Violence,” Seminar on Crime and Criminal Justice, Northwestern University School of Law, Nov. 15, 2007

“American Homicide: Its History,” Ohio State University at Newark, Nov. 6, 2007

“American Homicide: A Political Hypothesis” and “The Case for Social Science History,” Northern Illinois University, April 4-5, 2007

“What Historians Can and Might Learn from Legal Sources.” Seminar in Early American History, Northwestern University, Jan. 31, 2007

“Why Is America a Homicidal Nation? A Political Hypothesis,” lecture in the Historical Approaches in the Social Sciences series, State University of New York at Binghamton, Oct. 12, 2006

“The History of American Homicide,” Winter College, Ohio State University, Sarasota, Florida, February 24, 2006

“The Role of Small Arms in American History,” Small Arms Working Group, Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, Columbia University, June 2005

“Why is the United States So Homicidal Compared to Other Western Democracies? A Political and Psychological Hypothesis,” Center for Historical Research and Documentation on War and Contemporary Societies, Belgian Ministry of Scientific Research, Brussels, Belgium, December 2004

"The History of American Homicide," Center for Law, Policy, and Social Science, Moritz College of Law, Ohio State University, November 2004

"Peaceable Kingdoms? Harmony and Hostility in the Early American Family," Plenary Session, Society of Historians of the Early American Republic, July 22, 2004

"American Homicide," Department of History, Miami University, March, 2004

"Slavery, Freedom, and the History of African-American Homicide." School of Law and Department of History, University of Chicago, January, 2003

"American Homicide," School of Law, Stanford University, February, 2003

Workshop of the Study of the History of Homicide, Department of History, Stanford University, February, 2003

"American Homicide," Social Science Faculty Seminar, Stanford University, February, 2003

"American Homicide," School of Law, Northwestern University, September, 2003

"American Homicide," School of Law, University of Chicago, November, 2002

"Twin Evils?: The Relationship between Slavery and Homicide," Department of History, Yale University, May, 2002

"The Puzzle of American Homicide," School of Law, Northwestern University, November, 2001

"Why Northern New Englanders Seldom Commit Murder: An Interregional History of Homicide in America," and "The Historical Database Project on Crime and Violence in America," two lectures presented at the Charles Warren Center, Harvard University. May, 2000

"Understanding Homicide in America: An Interregional Approach," presentation to the Early American History Seminar, University of Pennsylvania, October, 1999

"Can Faith Change the World?" Keynote address, Conference on Reform in Antebellum Vermont, Vermont Historical Society, September, 1999

"Why Northern New Englanders Seldom Commit Murder," presentation to the

Center for Research on Vermont, the University of Vermont, and the Vermont Council on the Humanities. The presentation was televised in Vermont. It also made the evening news in Burlington and an AP wire story on my presentation was printed widely in newspapers in New Hampshire and Vermont, April, 1999

Papers Delivered at Professional Meetings (recent)

“The Difficulty of Counting the Number of Children Killed in Homicides in the United States, 1959-Present.” Social Science History Association, November 23, 2019, Chicago.

“Police Involved Homicides in Ohio, 1959-1988,” American Society of Criminology, November 13, 2019, San Francisco, with Wendy Regoczi and Rania Issa.

“Can Criminologists and Historians of Crime Work Together More Fruitfully in the Future?” Social Science History Association, November 3, 2017, Montreal.

“Comparing Data Sources on the Police Use of Lethal Force,” American Society of Criminology, November 15, 2017, Philadelphia, with Wendy Regoczi and Rania Issa.

“The History of Mass Murder,” American Historical Association, January 6, 2017, Denver.

“The Historians’ Role in Criminal Justice Research,” American Society of Criminology, November 16, 2016, New Orleans

“Police and Security Guard Involved Homicides in Ohio, 1959-1988,” American Society of Criminology, November 18, 2016, New Orleans

“Why History and Biology Matter to One Another: The Epigenetics of Social Behavior,” American Historical Association, New York City, January 4, 2015

“The National Homicide Data Improvement Project, 1959-Present: Why Research in Multiple Sources Changes Dramatically Our Understanding of the Incidence and Character of Homicides in the United States,” American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, November 19, 2014

"The Relationship between Guns, Homicides, and Suicide in American History," Organization of American Historians, Atlanta, April 4, 2014

“Situating Crime in Macro-Social and Historical Context,” Presidential Panel, American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, November 22, 2013

“Has Violence Declined since the Middle Ages?” Presidential Panel, American Society of Criminology, Chicago, November 15, 2012

“The Sudden Appearance of Sexual Serial Killers in Late-Nineteenth Century America,” Organization of American Historians, Houston, March 20, 2011

“The Biology of Social Behavior” at the annual conference of the Society of Historians of the Early American Republic, Philadelphia, July 15, 2011

“Measuring Feelings and Beliefs that May Facilitate (or Deter) Homicide,” at the American Society of Criminology meeting in Washington, D.C., November 16, 2011

“Measuring Feelings and Beliefs that May Facilitate (or Deter) Homicide,” at the Social Science History Association meeting in Boston, November 20, 2011

“Author Meets Critics” session on *American Homicide* at the European Social Science History conference in Ghent, Belgium, April 13, 2010. Discussants: Manuel Eisner, Peter King, and Pieter Spierenburg

“The Relationship between Guns and Homicide in American History,” American Society of Criminology conference in San Francisco, November 18, 2010

“Author Meets Critics” session on American Homicide at the Social Science History Association conference in Chicago, November 20, 2010. Discussants: Richard McMahon, Douglas Eckberg, Donald Fyson, and John Carter Wood

“Does Honor Hold the Key to Understanding Violence in the Early Republic,” Society for Historians of the Early American Republic, Springfield, Illinois, July 2009.

“The Difficulty of Reconciling the Homicide Counts in the National Center for Health Statistics Mortality Data and the FBI Supplementary Homicide Reports,” Social Science History Association, Long Beach, California, November, 2009

“Homicide in American History,” Ohio Academy of History, Dayton, Ohio, April 12, 2008

“Quantification and Social Theory in the Study of Crime and Violence,” in the Presidential Panel on “History in the Social Science History of Association: Disciplinary Developments,” Social Science History Association, Chicago, Nov. 15-18, 2007

“Are Modern and Early Modern Homicide Rates Comparable? The Impact of

Non-Emergency Medicine,” Social Science History Association, Chicago, Nov. 15-18, 2007

“How Homicidal Was Antebellum Florida?” Gulf South History and Humanities Conference, Pensacola, Florida, Oct. 6, 2006

"Probability and Homicide Rates: Why We Can Be Certain the Nineteenth-Century West Was Violent." Social Science History Association convention in Minneapolis, Nov. 2-5, 2006

“The Historical Violence Database: A Collaborative Research Project on the History of Violent Crime and Violent Death.” Social Science History Association convention in Minneapolis, Nov. 2-5, 2006

“Big Social Science: What Could We Learn about Violent Crime If We Had Enough Money to Study It Properly? Possibilities for Collaborative Research Projects,” Social Science History Association, Portland, Oregon, November 3-6, 2005

Reviews

T. Cole Jones, *Captives of Liberty: Prisoners of War and the Politics of Vengeance in the American Revolution* (American Historical Review, 2021).

Chris Murphy, *The Violence Inside Us: A Brief History of an Ongoing American Tragedy* (Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Books, 2020).

Jeffrey S. Adler, *Murder in New Orleans: The Creation of Jim Crow Policing*. (Punishment and Society, 2020).

Heidi J. Osselaer, *Arizona’s Deadliest Gunfight: Draft Resistance and Tragedy at the Power Cabin, 1918*. (Western Historical Quarterly, 2020).

Iain McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World*. (Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 2011).

Heather Cox Richardson, *Wounded Knee: Party Politics and the Road to an American Massacre*. (Journal of the Civil War Era, 2011).

Bill Neal, *Sex, Murder, and the Unwritten Law: Gender and Judicial Mayhem, Texas Style*. (New Mexico Historical Quarterly, 2010).

Gordon Morris Bakken and Brenda Farrington, *Women Who Kill Men: California Courts, Gender, and the Press*. (Pacific Northwest Quarterly, 2010).

- Jack D. Marietta and Gail S. Rowe, *Troubled Experiment: Crime, Justice, and Society in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800*. (William and Mary Quarterly, 2010).
- Mark R. Pogrebin, Paul B. Stretesky, and N. Prabha Unnithan, *Guns, Violence, and Criminal Behavior: The Offender's Perspective*. (Criminal Justice Review, 2010)
- Nicole Rafter, *The Criminal Brain: Understanding Biological Theories of Crime*. (Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 2009.)
- Laura Browder, *Her Best Shot: Women and Guns in America* (Winterthur Portfolio 2007).
- Paul M. Searls, *Two Vermonts: Geography and Identity, 1865-1910* (Vermont History, 2006).
- Anu Koskivirta, *The Enemy Within: Homicide and Control in Eastern Finland in the Final Years of Swedish Rule, 1748-1808* (English Historical Review 2005).
- Irene Quenzler Brown and Richard D. Brown, *The Hanging of Ephraim Wheeler: A Story of Rape, Incest, and Justice in Early American* (H-SHEAR, 2003).
- T. D. S. Bassett, *The Gods of the Hills* (New England Quarterly, 2001).
- Karen Halttunen, *Murder Most Foul: The Killer and the American Gothic Imagination* (H-SHEAR, 1999).
- Charles E. Clark, *The Meetinghouse Disaster* (Journal of American History, 1999).
- Nicholas N. Kittrie and Eldon D. Wedlock, Jr., *The Tree of Liberty: A Documentary History of Rebellion and Political Crime in America* (Journal of the Early Republic, 1998).
- Robert E. Shalhope, *Bennington and the Green Mountain Boys: The Emergence of Liberal Democracy in Vermont, 1790-1850* (Reviews in American History, 1997).
- Daniel Doan, *Indian Stream Republic: Settling a New England Frontier* (Journal of the Early Republic, 1997).
- Thomas H. Jeavons, *When the Bottom Line is Faithfulness: Management of Christian Service Organizations* (American Historical Review, 1996).

- N. Prabha Unnithan, *The Currents of Lethal Violence: an Integrated Model of Suicide & Homicide* (Justice Quarterly, 1995).
- Edward Jarvis, *Traditions and Reminiscences of Concord, Massachusetts, 1779-1878* (Journal of the Early Republic, 1995).
- Charles Hoffman and Tess Hoffman, *Brotherly Love: Murder and the Politics of Prejudice in Nineteenth-Century Rhode Island* (American Historical Review, 1994).
- Richard Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (Pennsylvania History, 1994).
- Michael Bellisiles, *Revolutionary Outlaws: Ethan Allen and Vermont's Struggle for Independence* (William and Mary Quarterly, 1994).
- David G. Hackett, *The Rude Hand of Innovation: Religion and Social Order in Albany, New York, 1652-1836* (American Historical Review, 1992).
- Nat Brandt, *The Congressman Who Got Away With Murder* (New York History, 1992).
- Tamara Plakins Thornton, *Cultivating Gentlemen: The Meaning of Country Life Among the Boston Elite, 1785-1860* (American Historical Review, 1991).
- George M. Thomas, *Revivalism and Cultural Change: Christianity, Nation Building, and the Market in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (Pennsylvania History, 1991).
- Richard D. Brown, *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusion of Information in Early America, 1700-1865* (The History of Education Quarterly, 1990).
- William J. Gilmore, *Reading Becomes a Necessity of Life: Material and Cultural Life in Rural New England, 1780-1865* (Vermont History, 1990).
- Ruth Alden Doan, *The Miller Heresy, Millennialism, and American Culture* (Journal of the Early Republic, 1988).
- William Lynwood Montell, *Killings: Folk Justice in the Upper South* (International Journal of Oral History, 1987).
- David R. Kasserman, *Fall River Outrage: Life, Murder, and Justice in Early Industrial New England* (Journal of American History, 1987).
- Robert J. Wilson III, *The Benevolent Diety: Ebenezer Gay and the Rise of*

Rational Religion in New England (New England Quarterly, 1985).

Languages

German
Spanish
French (reading)

Quantitative Skills

Probability and Statistics (including econometric techniques of political analysis, exploratory data analysis, and log-linear and logit analysis)
Calculus and Analytical Geometry
Linear Algebra and Nonlinear Dynamics
Differential and Series Equations
Abstract Algebra

Teaching

Graduate

History 7000	Topics in American History to 1877
History 7003	Readings in the Early Republic and Antebellum America
History 7650	Studies in World History
History 7900	Colloquium in the Philosophy of History, Historiography, and the Historian's Skills
History 8000	Seminar in Early American History

Undergraduate

History 2001	American Civilization, 1607-1877 (and Honors)
History 2015	History of American Criminal Justice
History 2650	World History since 1914
History 2800	Introduction to Historical
History 3164	World History since 1914: Readings
History 3193	Individual Studies / Research Internships in History
History 3700	American Environmental History
History 4650	History of Violence: Readings in World / Global / Transnational History
History 4675	Global History of Violence: Research Seminar
History 5900	Introduction to Quantitative Methods in History
History 598	Religious and Reform Movements (Senior Colloquium)
History 598	Research Seminar on Violent Crime and Death in the U.S.
History 557.02	Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democracy, 1800-1840 Thought
History 282	American Religious History

Publications on Teaching

Founder and contributor to *Retrieving the American Past*, Department of History and Pearson Publishing, a flexible, problem-oriented publication for teaching classes in American History. Author of modules on “Violent Crime in Early America,” “Marriage in Colonial America,” and “Growing Up in Nineteenth-Century America.”

Ph.D Students Supervised

Daniel Vandersommers, “Laboratories, Lyceums, and Lords: Zoos, Zoology, and the Transformation of Humanism in Nineteenth-Century America,” August 2014. Recipient of a Presidential Fellowship, 2013-2014, the most prestigious

University fellowship for senior graduate students. Assistant Professor of History, University of Dayton.

Michael Alarid, ““Caudillo Justice: Intercultural Conflict and Social Change in Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1837-1853,” June 2012. Assistant Professor of History, University of Nevada at Las Vegas.

Matthew Foulds, “Enemies of the State: Methodists, Secession and Civil War in Western Virginia, 1844-1865,” December 2011. Former Assistant Professor of History, Shepherd University

Jeanette Davis Mantilla, “Hush, Hush Miss Charlotte: Twenty-Five Years of Civil Rights Struggles in San Francisco, 1850-1875,” April 2000. Administrator in Charter School Division of the Department of Education, State of Ohio

Ken Wheeler, “The Antebellum College in the Old Northwest: Higher Education and the Defining of the Midwest,” January 1999. Professor of History, Reinhardt College. Author of *Cultivating Regionalism: Higher Education and the Making of the American Midwest* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2011)

Ross Bagby, “The Randolph Slave Saga.” July 1998. Librarian and independent scholar

Marianne Holdzkom, “Parody and Pastiche Images of the American Revolution in Popular Culture, 1765-1820,” May 1995. Professor of Social and International Studies, Southern Polytechnic State University

David Thomas, “Religion in the Far West: Oregon’s Willamette Valley, 1830-1850,” November 1993. Professor of History, Union College

Recent Senior Honors Thesis Students Supervised (recently)

Maggie Seikel, “The Great Depression in More Ways than One: Why Do Americans Commit Suicide More Often during Economic Crises?” (Anticipated 2021).

Margo Hertzler, “Police Involved Homicides in Ohio, 1959-1988.” (Anticipated 2021).

Laura Janosik, “Homicides Involving Women in Ohio, 1959-1988.” (2020).
Prospective applicant to graduate school in history.

Ben St. Angelo, "How Labor Disputes Led to Violence: Personalities, Paternalism, and Power at Republic Steel in Youngstown, Ohio: 1937." (2017). Ph.D. student in History at Ohio State University.

Sarah Paxton, "The Bloody Ould Sixth Ward: Crime and Society in Five Points, New York" (2012). Ph.D. candidate in criminal justice history J.D. candidate at the Moritz School of Law at Ohio State University (twin degree program).

Kristen Gaston, "Restoration of the Cuyahoga River" (2012). Ph.D. candidate in Environmental History at the University of Cincinnati.

Alexandra Finley, "Founding Chestnut Ridge: The Origins of Central West Virginia's Multiracial Community" (2010). Ph.D. candidate in early American history at the College of William and Mary. Recipient of the first Annual Prize at Ohio State for the outstanding senior honors thesis in the Department of History.

Service

Service in Professional Organizations

2018-present, Allen Sharlin Book Prize Committee, Social Science History Association

2013-present, Grant Review Board, Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation

2008-present, Editorial Board, *Crime, History, and Societies*.

2011-present, Editorial Board, *Homicide Studies*.

2014-2017, Board of Editors, *American Historical Review*

2014-15, 2016-17, Program Committee, American Society of Criminology

2014-2017, Research Awards Committee, Ohio Academy of History.

2011-2014, Chair, Distinguish Teaching Award Committee, Ohio Academy of History

2010-2011, Allan Sharlin Memorial Prize Committee, Social Science History Association

2010- ,Ohio Violent Death Reporting System Advisory Board

2010-2013, Advisory Board, Society for Historians of the Early American Republic

2008- , Society for the Scientific Detection of Crime, Columbus, Ohio

2009-2011, Youth Violence Prevention Advisory Board (Columbus)

2003, Nominating Committee, Social Science History Association

2002- , Co-founder and co-director, Historical Violence Database

1995-1997, ABC-Clio America: History and Life Award Committee, Organization of American Historians

1987-1993, Chair, Methods and Theory Network, Social Science History Association

1987, Program Committee, Social Science History Association

Reviews of Manuscripts

American Historical Review
Journal of American History
William and Mary Quarterly
Journal of the Early Republic
Social Science History
Journal of Interdisciplinary History
Historical Methods
Journal of Women's History
Journal of the Family
Crime, History, and Societies
European Journal of Criminology
American Journal of Sociology
Sociological Quarterly
Criminology
Criminal Justice Review
Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology
Law and Social Inquiry
Homicide Studies
International Criminal Justice Review
International Journal of Law, Crime, and Justice
Law and Society Review
City and Community
Eras Review
Western Historical Quarterly
Canadian Journal of Sociology
Journal of the Gilded Age

Memberships in Professional Organizations (current)

American Historical Association
Organization of American Historians
Social Science History Association
European Social Science History Association
American Society of Criminology
Homicide Studies Working Group
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Service at Ohio State University

Department

2006-2010, 2018-present, Undergraduate Placement / Enhancement Officer

1994-2015, 2018-present, Undergraduate Teaching Committee

2017-2018, Chair of Grievance Committee

2015-2017, 1991-1993, Chair of Graduate Studies

2012-2013, Chair of Undergraduate Studies

2011-2013, Advisory Committee and Salary Committee

1987-1991, History Department Promotion & Tenure Committee

College of Humanities

2007-2009, Curriculum Committee, College of Humanities

2002-2005, College of Humanities Computing Advisory Committee

1996-1997, College of Humanities Committee on the Center for the Study and Teaching of Writing, 1996-7; Affiliated Faculty Member, 2000-

College of Arts and Sciences

2006-2009, Alternate, Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate

2006- , Advisory Board, Criminal Justice Research Center, Department of Criminology and Sociology

2004- , Fellow, Center for Law, Policy, and Social Science, Moritz College of Law

2000- , Fellow, Criminal Justice Research Center, College of Social and Behavior Sciences

Graduate School

2018- , Graduate Awards Review Committee

Ohio Department of Higher Education

2020- , Transfer Assurance Guide Review Panel, Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network

Service at Grinnell College

Chairman, African-American Studies Committee

Rosenfield Program on Public Affairs Committee

Faculty-Trustee Committee

Community Service

2001-2008, Chair, Community Services Advisory Commission, City of Dublin: advises City Council on all matters concerning utilities, policing, transportation, parks, recreation, waste management, etc.,

2004-present, Green Team, environmental projects volunteer organization, City of Dublin

2003-12, Committee to create an Indian burial mound and pioneer historic park at the Wright-Holder earthworks, City of Dublin

1997-present, Assistant Scoutmaster, Troop 299, Dublin / Citizenship Merit Badge Counselor / Eagle Scout Association / Philmont Staff Association / Distinguished Service Award, 2014 / Meritorious Service Award, 2006 / Bridge Builder Award, 2002

1997-2003, Good Schools Committee, Dublin City Schools, campaign committee for school bond and levy issues

1995-2005, President, Citizens for Dublin, city-wide association of civic association officers and city commission members

1995-1998, Vice-Chair, Transportation Task Force, City of Dublin

1995-1997, Community Plan Steering Committee, City of Dublin

1988-present, President / Vice President / Trustee, East Dublin Civic Association

1987-present, Nature Conservancy / Volunteer Service Awards / Volunteer Crew Leader

Outreach / Media Appearances

Testimony to Oversight Committee of the Ohio Senate, December 22, 2020, on so-called “Stand Your Ground” laws.

B.R.E.A.D. (an interfaith organization dedicated to Building Responsibility Equality and Dignity), January 13, 2020, on gun violence in central Ohio.

Testimony to Federalism Committee of the Ohio House of Representatives, June 12, 2019, on concealed carry laws.

Worthington Senior Citizen Center, Inequality in the U.S., April 15, 2019

Canfield Residence Hall, Discussion of History of Criminal Enterprise in the U.S. with Undergraduate Students, April 10, 2019

“Gun Ownership in Decline,” *Columbus Dispatch*, December 11, 2017.

“How the Erosion of Trust Leads to Murders and Mass Shootings,” invited editorial, *Washington Post*, October 6, 2017

“Mass Murder in American History,” CSpan-3, April 2, 2017

All Sides with Ann Fisher, WOSU Radio, “Mass Murder and Terrorism,” December 9, 2015 and June 13, 2106; “The Recent Rise in Homicide in the United States,” March 14, 2017.

Consultant for the TLC Channel, “Who Do You Think You Are Anyway?” 2013-2014

Appeared on the CSPAN Book Channel on September 1, 2012 (<http://www.c-span.org/LocalContent/Columbus/>)

Appeared on the History Channel, “Seven Deadly Sins,” January 3, 2009 (A&E Home Video)

“It’s No Mystery: Why Homicide Declined in American Cities during the First Six Months of 2009,” History News Network, November 22, 2009

(<http://cjrc.osu.edu/researchprojects/hvd/AHSV/It's%20No%20Mystery%2011-22-2009%205-2010.pdf> and <http://cjrc.osu.edu/researchprojects/hvd/AHSV/It's%20No%20Mystery%20Further%20Thoughts%201-1-2010%205-2010.pdf>)

Radley Balko, editor of reason.com, named *American Homicide* the best book of 2009 (<http://reason.com/archives/2009/12/30/the-year-in-books>)

“American Homicide,” address to Columbus Rotary Club, October 24, 2011

Radio interviews: Execution Watch with Ray Hill on KPFT Houston, Texas, and WPFW Washington, D.C., Nov. 10, 2009; Focus 580 with David Inge, WILL, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, December 7, 2009; RadioWest with Doug Fabrizio, KUER and XM Public Radio Channel 133, Salt Lake City, Utah, Dec. 17, 2009; The Mark Johnson Show of the Radio Vermont Group, WDEV, Waterbury, Vermont, Dec. 30, 2009; The Current with Anna Maria Tremonti on the CBC, Toronto, Canada, January 6, 2010; The Marc Steiner Show on WEEA in Baltimore, January 26, 2010; by ABC Radio, Sydney, Australia, interviewed on March 3, 2010 for broadcast the week of March 8, 2010; by the Extension with Dr. Milt Rosenberg on WGN Radio 720 AM Chicago, broadcast December 9, 2010; the Gil Gross Show, KKSF Radio 910 AM, San Francisco, July 27, 2012; and The Marc Steiner Show on WEEA in Baltimore, December 17, 2012; *American Homicide* was the subject of an editorial by op-ed writer Gregory Rodriguez in the *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, April 12, 2010 (<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-rodriguez12-2010apr12,0,3217212.column>)

American Homicide was the subject of an editorial by Raina Kelley in *Newsweek*, Nov. 5, 2009 (<http://www.newsweek.com/id/221271>).

American Homicide was cited favorably in the *New York Times Sunday Magazine* in an article by Jeffrey Rosen, "Prisoners of Parole," January 10, 2010; and in the *Washington Post*, Nov. 22, 2009

Newspaper articles: quoted and/or reviewed in the *Washington Post*, the *Washington Times*, the *National Review*, the *Economist*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Boston Globe*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *New York Times*, *New York Newsday*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and the *Columbus Dispatch*, which ran a front-page article on Roth's work in a Sunday edition