

Club Grubbery - Raw transcript of interview:

2026-02-11 Graham and John speak with John Lott

Hi, everyone. Uh, Monday, the 9th of February. Good day, John. How are you, my friend?

Couldn't be better. Good, good.

Oh two Johns. We got two Johns.

That makes about

that. No, that's okay. That's okay. Um, great to have you back on Johnny Lata, as I said. Uh, uh, Monday the ninth and, uh, we're back into it. And we have a very special guest with us tonight.

Uh, we have John Lot PhD, who's the president of the Crime Prevention Research Center in America. Um. Uh, John Lot is on a tour of Australia at the moment. He's been speaking all over the place. This interview is lined up for us by Professor Gigi Foster, and we thank you for that. And so, John lot, thank you for joining us.

Uh, we know it's been a very busy schedule, so we appreciate your time. Um, just briefly before we get into your background, uh, can you tell us what you've been doing in Australia? What's been the main purpose of your visit?

Uh, obviously you had the attack in Bondy Beach. There's been a lot of movement here to kind of change, uh, different laws that are there and I deal a lot with crime.

And so the issues are, you know, it's interesting to me that, uh, Australians are so misinformed. On so many different issues, such as, uh, a lot of Australians seem to believe that they have a very low crime rate. In fact, the violent crime rate in Australia is much, much higher than the violent crime rate in the United States.

Um, and there's a lot of misinformation about what happened to the crime rates after the, uh, uh, confiscation occurred in 96 and 97 Really. Statistical malpractice on people's parts. It's kind of hard to even explain how, uh, that much misinformation could be out there on those things, but we're, I'm happy to talk about those things.

Well, that's incredible and we're gonna want to, uh, pick your brains on those subjects. But tell us about, uh, crime Prevention Research Center and in the States, and how long have you been operating and what's your primary function?

Well, uh, crime Prevention Research Center has been around since 2013. Uh, it's basically a group of academics who do research on crime type issues from policing to gun control to vote fraud. I mean, if it's a crime type issue, there's a good chance that we've looked at it. We have academics who are affiliated with us, who have been at Harvard.

Uh, the Wharton Business School, university of Chicago, university of Michigan, Emory, other places like that. And we basically know where the data is. Myself, I've been an academic most of my life. I've had positions at Stanford, university of Chicago,

and we've just had some technical difficulties with our guest and wifi, uh, reception in, uh, in Canberra, uh, probably being jammed, Johnny Lauder from, uh, the Australian Signals Directorate.

But we have, uh, back with us, uh, John Lott, who has explained why he's in Australia and what he's been doing. And, um, John, you were explaining to us the, uh, the work that's being done by the Crime Prevention Research Center in the States and what you're up to there.

Well, thanks. Yeah. Well, we're basically a group of academics who do research on crime and a variety of crime issues from policing to gun control to.

Vote fraud. If it deals with crime, then there's a good chance that, uh, we've looked at it to some extent. And I, myself, uh, had been an academic most of my life I've had research or teaching positions at Stanford, university of Chicago, the Wharton Business School, UCLA, Yale Rice. I was chief Economist for the United States Sentencing Commission in Washington.

And more recently, I was the senior advisor for research and statistics in the US Department of Justice. And we have other academics at, uh, at William and Mary, uh, is our research director. Uh, we have people who have been affiliated with Harvard, uh, the Wharton Business School, university of Chicago, university of Michigan.

So we basically know where the data is, and that's, uh, what we try to do is try to educate people on ways to save lives.

Well, it's been, uh. Already what you've revealed about, uh, the situation in Australia being, uh, largely misrepresented in the wrong direction. Uh, we can't wait to unpack some of that, um, with you.

Johnny Larder.

Yeah. John, I, uh, I had to, uh, take note of the fact that you said you're at the, uh, A NU Australia National University this afternoon. Right? Uh, is, uh, how were you received down there? Uh, because, uh, that would be one of the most. Leftist teaching, uh, establishments in Australia.

Uh, in fact, I kind of enjoy giving academic seminars to people who might disagree with me on things.

Uh, that's how you make academic papers stronger by having people who feel strongly about these issues. It was a lively seminar. Uh, people were extremely courteous though, and uh, you know, I think most people a lot of people liked the paper and the re and the comments that I made. Uh, you know, I think, uh, they were surprised 'cause I think even a lot of the academics didn't know a lot of things, you know?

So, for example, Australia has a very high violent crime rate. You know, for some reason though, Australians seem to think that you guys are a relatively safe country. I mean, in terms of homicides, you're low compared to the United States, about two per hundred thousand. The United States is someplace this last year between about 3.9 and four per a hundred thousand, but murders only make up less than 1% of violent crimes.

You know, if you look at other things. Uh, the rates are extremely high in, in Australia, and you know, you have to understand there are two measures that you have of crime. One is crimes report to police, and another one is total crimes. And we know most crimes aren't report to police. So if you take something like rapes and sexual assaults, for example.

Uh, and the United States, about 45% of rapes and sexual assaults are reported to police in Australia. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, it's 19%. That's a pretty huge difference, and when you have differences like that, it makes you kind of. A little bit careful and understanding that you just shouldn't compare the number of reported crimes across countries.

But that's pretty much all the media here seems to focus on and not the measures of toll crimes. So if you look at rapes and sexual assaults in Australia, according if you compare the survey data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics with the similar survey data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics in the United States.

The rape and sexual assault rape here is about three times higher than the rape in the United States.

Wow.

Uh, assaults are about twice as high. Um, and, and the problem with these numbers even then is the way the Australian Bureau of Statistics counts it is they just asked, have you been victimized?

They're not counting the number of times you've been victimized. So somebody may have been sexually assaulted twice. They may have been robbed twice. Well, with the Australian Bureau of Statistics numbers, that's counted as only one case in the United States. It's counted as two cases then if it happened twice.

And so when you say it's three times higher in Australia for rapes and, uh, sexual assaults or assaults themselves are two times higher. Um, that's. It's even much worse than that when you realize how they count them differently in Australia.

John, if you could, if you could touch on, I guess, um, uh, the main point of you coming out here has been to talk to the Australian government, hopefully, and, uh, and, uh, administrators about what happened at Bondi, perhaps why it happened and how it could have been prevented.

Um, that seems to be a burning issue in Australia at the moment. We have security agencies who have clearly lost their way on this. Uh, gun control in Australia is being held up as the best in the world, and yet most Australians think it's just crazy. We have more laws in this country than I think the rest of the world put together, especially around guns.

Um, could that have been, could Bondi have been prevented if people were allowed to carry arms?

I think so, uh, in fact that's with a seminar that I gave today at a NU dealt with that. But, you know, first, before we get into that, just kind of go through the mythology with regard to, uh, the 1996 and 97, uh, uh, confiscation because people seem to believe that that made Australia safer, and that's simply not the case.

Uh. The, the general discussions there involve simple before and after averages and things like firearm homicides or firearm suicides. And what you have to understand is that looking at simple before and after averages can be extremely misleading. And let me give you an example. Let's say. You had firearm, homicides were falling or crimes were falling over the entire range at ex in a perfectly straight line.

You could pick any point along that line, and the after average is gonna be below the before average. But when you look at it and what you're gonna see is that it's falling exactly to the same rate beforehand and afterwards. I don't see any change. And what you'd wanna look at is, does it fall at a faster rate?

Does it fall at a slower rate? Is there some discontinuity that occurs in the line? But you would know that just simply looking at before and after averages isn't very useful. And, and academics understand that. And the problem that you have is that, uh, in Australia, uh, for 15 years prior to the confiscation.

Firearm homicides and firearm suicides were falling. Um, and firearm homicides actually stopped falling. Were basically flat for about eight years after the confiscation. So I look at that and I say, well, I could see why the after average is below the before average, but it's simply a function of the fact that firearm homicides were falling beforehand, not that they were falling afterwards.

And so what you'd want to do. Um, you know, if anything I would go and argue. It looks like it falling and stopped falling. That looks like it was bad. It doesn't look like it was good. And you have something similar happen with regard to firearm suicides, uh, because firearm suicides were falling beforehand.

They fell afterwards, but at a slower rate. And again, that looks like it's, uh, counterproductive. But there are other problems that you have here. One is you. You really shouldn't just look at firearm suicides or firearm homicides. You should look at total suicides. You should look at total homicides and the, and the problem is, is that, for example, for suicides, there are many different ways for people to commit suicide.

There are places around the world that have banned either all guns or all handguns, and they may see a drop in firearm suicides. But they don't see any change in total suicides. People simply switch into other ways of doing it and, and the problem is, if you look at total suicides, total suicides in Australia actually went up by 20% after the confiscation.

Now, I'm not gonna go and argue that the confiscation caused more people to go and commit suicide, but it sure as heck is inconsistent with these claims that the confiscation, you know, reduced suicides in the country. And also with regard to firearm homicides after the confiscation, firearm homicides act, or total homicides actually went up.

And again, that's inconsistent. And then, uh, there are many other points they can make, but I'll just make one other. And that is what happened to gun ownership over time when you had the confiscation gun ownership in Australia fell by about 29%, but people were able to go and buy guns again afterwards.

And by at least 2010 and probably well before that, um, the gun ownership rate in Australia was well above what it was before the confiscation. And so if that's true, and you would think gun control advocates would then argue, well, you should have seen an immediate sharp drop in firearm homicides and suicides, and then an increase over time as the gun ownership rate went up.

But that's not what you see at all. You don't see anything even remotely similar to that happening over time. As I say, it was falling and then it stopped falling. There was no big sudden sharp drop that occurred, and then an increase. Mm. So I look at that and it's just absolutely amazing to me that you don't have academics and others pointing out the problems with the, the claims there.

But, you know, you Prime Minister John Har Howard, and you've had many others. Just keep on repeating that, saying, well, you know, the after average is below the, before average with like no academics pointing out. I mean, I'm, we're not even doing. Very sophisticated discussions here. We're just saying, you know, this is just not, doesn't make any sense the types of claims that are being made.

John, there was obviously political benefit to, uh, those decisions being made. Uh, do, do you think it's possible that the state or the governments have been involved in, in, in creating these events? You know, I'm not. Saying in their entirety, but whether it's just by failing to do something or, or are they just random events that they've capitalized on?

Well, I mean, I've studied these around the world and um, and I've read diaries and manifestos for many of these mass murders. And one thing that's very clear when you read these, uh, ba ba, first of all, there's basically two types. There are those who are just suicidal. They feel unappreciated and they want people to know that who they were.

Uh, and then you have others that like the Bondi uh, massacre where they have a political goal and they want to get publicity there too. So the one common feature for both of these is they wanna get attention. And these guys may be crazy in some sense, but they're not stupid. Their goal. Is to get media attention.

And they know the more people they kill, the more media attention that they're gonna be able to get. And they know, and they explicitly talk about this, if they go to a place where guns are banned, it's gonna be much easier for them to go and kill lots of people and get more media attention. So the question is, how do you stop this?

Well, the way you stop it is by convincing them that they're not gonna get much media attention because they're not gonna be able to go and kill people. And the way you convince them that they're not gonna be able to kill many people is by convincing them that somebody will be able to arrive on the scene quickly with a gun in order to go and stop them.

So, you know, you have about 93% of the mass public shootings in the United States, uh, occur in places where guns are banning. Uh, and I have to say, one of my biggest pet peeves with the media is that the media will go

and talk about the diaries and manifestos for these mass murders. They'll go and say, and this mass murderer talked about, uh, you know, other mass murderers.

And that's true. What they leave out is what they learned from those other mass murders, and they explicitly will say that they're going after places where guns are banned because they've learned from other mass murders that it's easier for them to go and kill more people and thus get more media attention.

So. You know, uh, and, and you just see this time, after time after time in their diaries and manifestos, and yet you will search in vain for any media discussion, uh, about this. And I think it's really, the whole gun control debate would likely be very different if the media was less biased in terms of how it covered this or, or other issues that are here.

Um, and, but you know, here's the irony that you face and that is. You create these gun-free zones that goes and causes these attacks. 'cause they actually serve as magnets for these attacks. And then rather than going and undoing the gun-free zone, they go and they double down on more gun control and. You look around the world, there are number of countries that have had stricter gun control than, uh, Australia's had, uh, that have had really bad mass public shootings.

And, uh, you know, the problem is, uh, when people are planning these attacks, you know, six months or two years or longer in advance, it's very difficult to stop them from getting ahold of weapons. Um, you know, uh. I don't know exactly how long in advance the Bondi beach, uh, murders were, but it was substantial.

I mean, obviously one of 'em went to the Philippines for training, uh, that was there. Uh, you know, presumably they were planning it well before, uh, he went there for the training. So when somebody plans these types of things long in advance, it's very difficult. Whatever gun control laws you have in a place to go and stop them.

And, and the problem that you have to realize when you're dealing with gun control laws is they're often most likely to be ab obeyed by law abiding citizens, not the criminals. So I, I'll just give you one simple fact that I think's very important and that is there a, a number of places around the world that have either banned all guns or all handguns, and yet there is not one single time.

Either all guns or all handguns have been banned, that murder rates go down or even stay the same every single time, that either all guns or all handguns have been banned. Murder rates go up and they go up by often very large amounts immediately after the ban goes into effect. And this is simple reason for that.

And this applies to gun control laws generally, and that is. If you ban guns, it's gonna be, or the most law-abiding citizens who are gonna obey it. You may take a few guns away from the criminals, but if you're primarily disarming law-abiding good citizens, you actually make it easier for criminals to go into make crimes.

Unbelievable. You, you, um, I, I've read some, uh, some material you published on data in, um. In the states where civilians have actually been able to bring to a halt, uh, a large number of mass shootings because they were armed. Can you elaborate on some of those stats for us?

Yeah. Well, we collect these cases, um, since 2020, uh, there's been some, like 52 cases where police have said that because of the presence of a concealed carry permit holder, they stopped a mass public shooting.

These cases rarely get much news attention. Uh, you know, and again, I think if the media were to cover some of these, uh, the whole debate would be different. But, uh, for example, you, you probably heard of the Pulse nightclub shooting at the time, uh, in Orlando, Florida. It was the worst mass public shooting in US history anyway.

Uh, and that was getting news coverage for months afterwards. Um. Saturday, one week later, exactly one week later, uh, there was another similar attack like that in South Carolina, and, uh, three people were shot. A fourth

person was being shot at when a concealed carry permit holder pulled out his gun seriously wounded the attacker and stopped the.

Well, the, the attacker still had 125 rounds of ammunition on him from, from his writings. It was pretty clear that he planned on killing as many people as he could at that time. But there was a difference between Florida and South Carolina. Florida was one of 10 states that banned people being able to carry permanent concealed handguns and establishments that earn more than 50% of their revenue from selling alcohol.

Um, by contrast. Uh, uh, South Carolina was one of the 40 states that allowed people to go and carry permanent concealed handguns in those types of establishments. But, you know, basically you just got local news coverage about the event that was there in South Carolina. You would think maybe they would be sensitive.

They'd say, well, we just had an attack in, in, uh, Florida, and this could have turned out to be different. Why didn't it turn out? Why did it turn out to be so different? But they done, you don't see news stories like that. You, I'm sure you know about the Parkland School shooting in Florida. Uh, well, shortly after that in Titusville, Florida, not.

Very far away, very close. There was an elementary school event at a park right next to the school, and, uh, uh, hundreds of students there, hundreds of parents. Uh, you had, uh, teachers there and staff. And, uh, a man came up, started firing his gun. Fortunately, uh, because it was in a public park, uh, as opposed to being inside the school, there was somebody there who had a concealed carry permit.

And he was able to use his gun to shoot and seriously wound the attacker ending the attack. Now, fortunately, nobody was killed there, but one can only imagine if the permit holder wasn't there and people had been killed. The kind of international news story that that would've created on that as it was again, you basically just got local media coverage there and, uh, you see this time, after time after time where.

Because somebody was able to stop it before anybody or only a few people were killed, you know? But in part because somebody stopped it, it just doesn't seem to be newsworthy.

Mm-hmm. John, you said, um, uh, recently that Australians are dramatically more likely to be victims of violent crime than Americans.

I mean, you're obviously. Uh, backing that up with the stats that, uh,

well, people go to the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Yeah. But what's, what's the underlying cause of that? I mean, I know the statistics obviously say that's the case, but is that because we don't bear arms?

I mean, look, here's the deal.

If you wanna reduce crime, you have to make it riskier for criminals to commit crime. And you can do that with higher arrest rates, higher conviction rates, longer prison sentences, but you can also do it by letting victims be able to go and defend themselves. You know, it's, there's a consistent pattern there about let's make it risky for criminals to go and commit crimes.

I was talking with the prosecutor the other day and she was telling me that, uh, only about half of, uh, of. In New South Wales, only about half of those who are charged with, uh, rape or sexual assault end up being prosecuted. And, and I don't know what percentage, but not a huge percentage end up being convicted.

And so, you know, you gotta make it risky for people to go and commit crime. And, you know, if, if you can't depend upon law enforcement, and anybody who's read my academic work knows that I think. Law enforcement and prosecutors are extremely important in reducing crime. Uh, the question is, what else can you do?

And, and the thing is, if my research convinces me of anything, it's basically two groups of people who benefit the most from owning guns, the people who are the most likely victims of violent crime. And in the United States, that tends to be poor blacks who live in high crime urban areas. Uh, but the other group of people are people who are relatively weaker physically, women and the elderly.

You're almost always talking about a young male criminal doing the attack, and when a man is attacking a woman, there's a lot larger strike difference that exists there on average than when a man is attacking another man, and the presence of a gun represents a much bigger relative change in a woman's ability to go and protect herself.

Than it does for a man. I mean, they both benefit, but women who behave passively are about 2.4 times more likely to end up being seriously injured than a woman who has a gun.

Mm-hmm. It's amazing. I was in, uh, I was in the States in March, uh, this, uh, last year and, uh, I attended a church in Tennessee and, um, a number of the people there had had, uh, concealed weapons.

And, uh,

right. Well, I mean, you know, a lot of, uh, places of worship, uh,

it's,

uh,

rabbis have encouraged themselves. So I was just in Bondy Beach and I went to the synagogue that was right nearby there. And, uh, uh, they have a guard in front now. Uh, and I guess they're hoping that he's gonna be able to get a weapon to be able to carry, but, you know, here's some of the problems. Uh, he's has to be in uniform according to Australian law.

He's basically has to be in the front of the building that's there, and that really makes it very difficult for him to do his job. Uh, I, I don't think people appreciate what an incredibly difficult job police have form. Uh, attackers have real tactical advantages. Uh, they can go, if they see somebody in uniform, they can either wait for the person in uniform to leave before they attack.

Or they can move on to another target themselves. Uh, both of those make it less likely that the attacker's going to be there when, uh, when, uh, the police are gonna be there when the attacker attacks. But you also have a situation where if they do insist on attacking there, who do you think they're gonna kill first?

They're gonna go and shoot the guy who's in uniform because he's the one guy that they know is gonna be able to stop them. And so. What you need to do is, uh, you need to make it hard to identify these people. So you mentioned concealed carry permit holders. That's the beauty of that there, because then the killer doesn't know who it is that they have to be on guard against and who they have to try to take out first.

And you know, it could be somebody behind them or to the side or in front. They have no idea. And that makes it much riskier for them to go and do the attack.

Have you, uh ha Have you been well received by any politicians at all since you've arrived in

Australia? Uh, yeah. There was a politician I talked to today.

Uh, Alex, um, let me see. Alex Tic, right, exactly.

Alex Tic. Yeah.

Yeah, he's one of the show. He was, he that went, that went, went well. He was, uh. And I guess tomorrow I'm supposed to talk to Malcolm Roberts. Um, so tomorrow morning, uh, and I gave a talk at the parliamentary building in, uh, new South Wales on, uh, Thursday night, I think it was.

Uh, and that seemed to be, there were several politicians who were there and that seemed to be well received. So, uh, you know, you just do what you can on this stuff. I'm happy to talk to as many who want to talk to me.

We would dear, love our prime Minister to call you in and have a chat that might be useful.

But, uh, we don't have a Prime Minister that does that kind of thing.

Well, I'd be happy to talk to him.

You'd be happy to talk to him. Um, getting away from, uh, violent crime. Um, I want to, I want come back to hate crime a bit later on, but you mentioned in your opening statement that you also deal with voter fraud,

right?

Well, I mean, we, we've looked at voter fraud type things.

Yeah.

You know, there are other thing, uh, you have also property crime. We can talk about property crime, some, but the, uh, but yeah, we've looked at vote.

And, and what have, what have you come up with, especially given the allegations made by the previous or the administration in their first term?

Well, I think, look, uh, the United States is fairly unique in terms of, uh, not having people have to provide IDs at all in many parts of the country. I know Australia. Is also relatively lax in, in this way compared to some other countries. But you know, you look at Europe for example. There are 47 countries in Europe.

46 and a half of them require government issued photo IDs in order for people to go and vote. Uh, and, uh, you know, Canada does, uh, Mexico does. Uh, all South America basically does. Um, and you know, you have to have IDs in order to go and do most anything, you know, open a bank account or, uh, uh, buy alcohol or buy a gun or whatever you want to go and do.

Um, and there are reasons why they do that, because they're worried about people lying about those things. Well, you know, you have the same types of concerns with regard to, uh. Voter IDs, uh, and there's evidence that a lot of fraud has occurred in the past. Uh, you take, uh, Northern Ireland, for example, uh, uh, Margaret Thatcher when she was in charge, uh, first Institute, IDs that were there, and then Tony Blair, uh, realizing that people were counterfeiting, the IDs, uh, went even further to have them have to use government issued photo IDs.

And it turns out, uh, sinin fey later on, uh, after kind of the statute of limitations ran out, kind of openly acknowledged that, you know, maybe about 10 to 13% of the votes there were fraudulent that were occurring. That can affect a lot of outcomes in political races that you have. And so, you know, it's not really obvious to me why you wouldn't want to go and, uh.

You know, go and, and, and make sure that the person who's voting is who they say they are.

Um, John, um, it's, it would be clear to, I think most people who keep an eye on anything that's happening in the world, that the world has never seemed to me to be more divided than it is now. And there's a lot of, uh, pent up anxiety.

There's a lot of pent up frustration, especially around governments, uh, overreacting. Government's over governing the people. A lot of people are getting very annoyed and very upset, and some of them are turning to violent acts and that's happening around the world. Have you noticed an uptake of that kind of crime?

Uh, well, I mean, uh, yeah, I, I. We had done some data looking at mass public shootings around the world, uh, over the 20 years from, uh, 1998 through 2017. We haven't updated it since then, but, um, basically, uh, uh, there was an uptick in those types of mass public shootings around the world over that period of time.

I, I suppose I wouldn't be surprised, uh, to see it continuing to increase after that. And, uh, you know, uh, I'm sure you know, part of what you're bringing up is, is a reason for that.

I was staggered after, uh, the Charlie Kirk assassination to see some surveys conducted at universities in the States where a large number of people questioned, um, said basically that it, they didn't see any problem with you killing somebody who disagreed with you.

Uh, pretty scary. I mean, you like to think people actually don't mean what they're saying on those things, but uh, you know, it's one thing to say something. It's another thing to actually do it.

Mm-hmm. And it's scary times, that's for sure. Johnny.

John, um, how, how do we, how do we fix this stuff up? I, I mean, you know, you are talking about the, the crimes in relation to, uh, serious stuff with, with, with the guns and, uh, and the serious crimes in Australia that, that are being misrepresented, uh, to, to the, to the public here by, by the, uh.

By the establishment. And you know, this is what we've seen worldwide through, uh, COVID. Uh, I mean, we've got a headline, uh, today in the Australian that says, uh, was Epstein a Mossad agent? New files deep and mystery over Israel. So who's gonna clean all this mess up? Right? Expose all these people.

Well, some of that's above my pay grade, but, um, at least with regard to, uh, people being able to go and protect themselves.

You need to make it clear that government's important. Police are important, but they are limited. Police virtually always arrive on the crime scene after the crimes occurred that raises questions about how people should protect themselves and, and simply telling people behave passively. And a being the criminal isn't very good advice.

And you have to, you know, I, I, I see some of the. Gun groups here in Australia, I think they're making really dumb arguments. I, you know, they talk about farmers and that's fine, and they talk about people doing target shooting. But the problem is, is the vast majority of people in the middle of the debate, they don't care that much about those things.

They care about safety and, and unfortunately, they're being convinced. They'll be safer by essentially going bad, uh, guts that are there. And what you need to explain to them is that people have to be able to go and protect themselves. That's an important way of making it risky for criminals to go and commit crime and.

I think, uh, the gun groups are making the wrong arguments. Look, uh, we had something similar a couple decades ago in the United States with the National Rifle Association, the National Rifle Association. Their argument was always that, uh, you, uh, uh, you have a, a right, a constitutional right to have a gun.

And the type of people who would like to join the NRA. That was a good argument for them. They loved that argument. But the problem is, while that argument may get you a lot of members, that's not an argument that's going to go and help you convince people in the middle of the debate because people in the middle are willing to trade off freedom for safety.

I don't make freedom arguments. That's not what got me involved in this. That's not what I care about. To me, what I care about is safety, and I think if you. Let the other side claim the safety mantle that's there, and don't explain to people that this is actually making them less safe. You're gonna lose the debate

ultimately.

That's where it all ends up, isn't it? Because you know, in Australia, if you defend yourself, if, if you are, uh, if you have a home invasion and you happen to injure,

right, you're gonna be in

trouble or main one, you're in big trouble. You know, you end up in

more trouble. Yeah, I know. Well, so you're. You've let things get to the point now where, uh, you're really behind the eight ball in terms of making the argument that's there.

You're gonna have to change the debate and just say, look, look at how high the violent crime rate is. Look at how high, uh, rapes and sexual assaults are. Look at how high assaults are in Australia. Why is this? What can we do to stop this? You guys don't even let people have a pepper spray or go and have, uh, stun guns and things like that.

You know, maybe you need to start small in terms of some of these things, but, you know, uh, you know, even mace has its limits. Uh, if it's raining or if it's windy, it's not gonna be very useful if the guy you're using it against, uh, has had it used item before. People develop resistance to it over time. Um, also it doesn't instantly incapacitate people.

You know, you spray it on somebody and it may be 30 seconds before, uh, they're incapacitated. A lot of harm can happen in 30 seconds, and so, you know, is it better than nothing though? Yeah, they can be beneficial. Uh, I wouldn't use it in a small enclosed space because it's just as likely to affect the person who's using it as the person it's being used on, but.

You know, uh, they won't even let people use things like that for protection. It, it's, uh, what I think needs to be done is people need to go and explain to, uh, Australians that look this notion that you think Australia's a really super safe country. That simply false. Okay, this is a very violent country.

Um, you know, you have, it's not just violence, you have high property crimes. The burglary rate in Australia is about two and a half times, at least the burglary rate in the United States. So I'll give you, '

cause people, people in the US have got guns,

right? Well, I think that's part of it, but you, you have very limited data here in Australia.

But, uh. One, the UK has some data that you guys don't have, and so let me make a comparison. The uk, the burglary rate isn't quite as high as it is in Australia, but it's about twice as high as the US rate. The thing is, in the uk, 59% of the time that a burglary occurs that people are at home when the burglary takes place.

In the United States, it's about 13% of the time. The other thing I'll just mention is that burglaries that occur in the UK tend to be in the evening, you know, 8, 9, 10 o'clock at night. In the United States, the burglaries tend to

be at two in the afternoon. Uh, I'll mention one other point and that is American burglaries spend about twice as long case a home before they break in compared to their British counterparts.

How do all these things fit together? Obviously, you are already on track there, and that is the fact that. American burglars want to avoid getting shot, and so they go and they break into homes in the middle of the day when people are less likely to be home and when even then when they break in, they spend twice as long chasing a home.

To make doubly short that nobody's home in the UK, they like to break in in the evening, why do they like to break in the evening? The reason why they like to break in the evening is they want people to be home. And the reason why they want people to be home is they want to be able to force the people to go and tell them where their valuables are.

So, you know, you have a real problem there and uh, uh, you have, it's a educational thing, but you're gonna have to, first of all. Get people to understand that you got a serious crime problem here. I mean, I was just talking to a group of, uh, college students the other day, uh, here, uh, some young women and, uh, you know, they weren't surprised that women weren't reporting sexual assaults and rapes, you know, because they said, you know, it's embarrassing to come forward to do it.

Uh, they also weren't very convinced that anything was gonna happen. You know, that, uh, the people weren't gonna be prosecuted and successfully prosecuted. And so, you know, they were not surprised, you know, that they would think people, women would think twice before they would come forward with that.

That's not, that's not the type of country I would think most Australians would wanna live in if they knew about that.

Yeah. Sadly, that is the case. And, uh, I heard stats recently that only 4% of um. Sexual assault crimes actually see a conviction.

Yeah. I, I don't, I don't know what the numbers are on that, but it's just, uh, I I wouldn't be surprised if it was that low.

Yeah. Well, um, we know you've got a very busy schedule ahead of you. We really appreciate having you on the program, uh, John Lot. It's been great. Um, when you, are you heading back stateside?

I head back on Wednesday morning, but, uh, look, people can find all this and more on our website@crimeresearch.org, crime.research.org.

They can sign up for email blasts that we send out once every two weeks so people can go and see the research and see the interviews and some other things that I've done here in, uh, yeah, in Australia.

Well, we certainly appreciate your time and coming out. We might close with a prayer, Johnny Ladder, eh.

Sounds good

Lord, father in heaven, we've been talking about man's inhumanity to his fellow man and father God, we just need your Holy Spirit in this country More than ever, Lord, things aren't getting better. They appear to be getting worse, and um, there's no substitute for compassion. There's no substitute for grace and mercy.

So we ask for that in abundance as we deal with these matters. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

Amen.

Alright. Uh, Johnny Latti, you've often been hurt to say

you just couldn't make this stuff up.

You couldn't make this stuff up. Stay outta the trees everyone. John lot have a wonderful, uh, remaining stay in Australia.

We hope you're successful and, um, we'd love to catch up with your stateside when we can.

Okay. Well thank you very much for your time. I appreciate

it. Thanks for having us. Bye-bye.

Thank you.

And, uh, Johnny, that was a very interesting interview.

Yes, mate. Well, I, I'd love to see who the, uh, attendee list, uh, were at the Newso Wales State Parliament. Uh, I, I'd be very surprised if Chris Mins, uh, uh, was, uh, one, one of the, uh, people at that, uh, at that event.

Well, I'm sure you know somebody who could tell us who was there.

I bet John Ruddick was there.

I bet John Ruddick was there. And I bet there was very few politicians, uh, that actually took the time to come and listen to an expert about guns. And that just sums up where we're at. I think hoodie, uh, that, uh, you know, they're making decisions on the fly that are, uh, they, they think are going to get them politically reelected and that are, uh.

Uh, comfortable with the electorate. Uh, and I think John basically just summed it up when you bullshit to the public. Um, you can run your own destiny, can't you?

You can. And that's it. So let's hope that, uh, he gets a bit of traction in the remaining couple of days. Uh, big thanks to Gigi Foster for organizing that for us.

Yep.

Um, she's a champ. There's no doubt about it. Johnny, some great interviews coming up. Uh, we've got interviews from Sweden. Is our next one, uh, Canada, the USA Great Britain. Uh, these are all lined up over, they're about two or three days apart, so we're gonna bring you some excellent content in the next, uh, few weeks.

So stay with us and, uh, we'll see you next time on Club Grubby. Bye for now.