

The rate of homicides in the U.S. will not decrease
by restricting gun ownership.

By: William J.T. Monette-Pentz

Submitted to:

Classical Conversations
Challenge IV Capstone Project
April 19, 2026

Discussions about violence, especially in the United States these days, often center on firearms. Because the nation has one of the highest levels of civilian gun ownership globally, many policymakers and news voices that influence the general public believe that reducing access to guns is the most effective way to lower homicide rates across the country we call home. From this perspective, widespread firearm availability increases the chance that violent encounters turn fatal, meaning that limiting access should directly decrease killings. Although this argument seems logical at first glance, a substantial group of sources of both domestic and international research indicates that the connection between gun availability and overall homicide rates is far more complicated.

Evidence from around the world suggests that Firearms tend to influence the way violence is carried out rather than how frequently it occurs. Nations with higher levels of gun ownership may have a large proportion of homicides involving firearms. Yet, their total homicide rates are often similar to those of countries with far fewer guns. This pattern implies that the level of violence is shaped more by structural factors such as economic inequality, organized crime, institutional effectiveness, and social stability. In environments where these conditions foster violence, individuals may use whatever weapons are accessible, whether guns, knives, or other means.

A similar trend appears within the United States. Some states with relatively high gun ownership maintain low homicide rates, while other areas with lower ownership levels experience significantly higher violence. These differences are often linked to socioeconomic conditions, population density, gang activity, and broader crime patterns rather than firearm availability

alone. Additionally, large-scale reviews of academic research frequently find weak or inconsistent evidence connecting gun ownership directly to overall homicide rates.

Recognizing these broader influences is critical when evaluating policies aimed at reducing violence. If factors like poverty, weak institutions, and organized crime are the primary drivers of homicides, then policies focusing on only limiting weapons may have a limited impact on the total number of killings. Instead, such policies may mainly affect the methods used in violent acts rather than how often they occur. For this reason, restricting gun ownership alone is unlikely to significantly reduce overall homicide rates in the United States, since violence is more strongly shaped by socioeconomic conditions, institutional strength, and broader crime dynamics than by weapon availability itself.

Cross-National Comparisons

Researchers often study relationships between gun ownership and violence by comparing homicide rates across countries. These cross-national analyses help determine whether nations with higher gun ownership consistently experience more violence. If firearms were the main drivers of homicide, countries with more guns would reliably have higher overall homicide rates.

However, the findings from such studies have more nuance. A large analysis published in 2025 examined over 100 countries from 2000 to 2019. It found that while higher gun ownership was associated with more firearm-related homicides, this relationship did not extend to the overall

homicide rate once factors like economic inequality, governance quality, and crime levels were taken into account.

Critics often highlight that the United States has both High gun ownership and relatively High firearm homicide rates compared to other developed nations. Well, this is true, but it does not necessarily prove that gun ownership causes higher overall violence. Countries such as Switzerland, Norway, and Finland also have relatively high gun ownership but maintain extremely low homicide rates. These examples suggest that gun ownership alone does not determine a nation's level of violence. Instead, factors like social stability, effective governance, and lower levels of organized crime appear to play a more significant role.

Constitutional Gun Rights and Homicide Outcomes

Another way to explore the issue is to compare countries with constitutional protections for gun ownership. If legal rights to Firearms inherently lead to higher violence, nations with such protection should show similar homicide rates.

In practice, there are wide variations. The United States, Mexico, and Guatemala all include constitutional language supporting gun ownership, yet their homicide rates differ dramatically. The United States typically reports around 5 to 6 homicides per 100,000 people, Mexico has rates of nearly 25 to 28, and Guatemala often falls between 17 and 22.

These differences are largely explained by factors unrelated to gun ownership itself. In Mexico, high homicide rates are closely tied to cartel violence and organized crime, while Guatemala

faces challenges from gang activity and the constitution. In these contexts, firearms are simply tools used within broader conflicts.

Some argue that legal access to guns drives violence regardless of other conditions. However, evidence suggests that many criminals obtain Firearms through illegal means rather than lawful purchases. Even in countries with strict gun laws, Black markets and trafficking networks can supply weapons. As a result, constitutional protections alone do not reliably predict homicide levels.

Research Reviews and the Academic Consensus

Because individual studies can produce varying results, researchers often rely on large-scale reviews that examine many studies at once. These reviews often provide a clear understanding of overall trends in the research.

One well-known Source is the RAND Corporation, which regularly evaluates scientific studies on gun policy. Its analysis covered policies such as background checks, assault-weapons bans, and concealed-carry laws. Across many of these areas, RAND frequently finds that evidence is limited, consistent, or inconclusive regardless of its impact on overall homicide rates.

This does not mean gun policies have no effect, but rather that their impact is difficult to isolate. Some studies find modest effects in certain contexts, while others detect no measurable change.

Critics often argue that reducing gun access should logically reduce total killings. However, some research suggests that " substitutional effect, " where individuals intent on violence may turn to other methods if firearms are less accessible. In this case, the method changes, but overall levels of violence remain relatively stable.

Media Narratives and Public Perception of Gun Violence

Public understanding of gun violence is often shaped not only by data and academic research but also by media coverage and political messaging. High - profile mass shootings and tragic individual incidents receive extensive attention, which can create the impression that such events are more common than they actually are. Well, these events are undeniably serious and impactful. Still, they represent a relatively small share of total homicides in the United States, which are more often linked to factors such as gang activity, interpersonal disputes, and concentrated urban crime.

This imbalance in coverage can influence how people perceive the relationship between gun ownership and violence. When firearm-related incidents dominate headlines, it may reinforce the belief that guns are the primary driver of overall homicide rates, even if broader statistical patterns suggest a more complex reality. As a result, policy discussions may become more reactive, focusing on highly visible events rather than underlying trends.

Researchers have noted that public opinion on crime often fluctuates independently of actual crime rates. For example, periods of declining crime do not always correspond with reduced public concern, especially when media coverage remains intense. This gap between perception

and reality can make it more difficult to evaluate policies objectively, as emotional response may overshadow empirical evidence.

Understanding the role of media narratives is, therefore, important when analyzing the gun violence debate. While media coverage plays a crucial role in informing the public, it can also shape the framing of policy discussions, emphasizing certain aspects of violence over others. A more balanced understanding of crime—grounded in comprehensive data rather than isolated incidents—can contribute to more effective, evidence-based approaches to reducing violence.

Variation Within the United States

Patterns within the United States further illustrate the complexity of the issue. If gun availability were the primary driver of homicide, states with higher ownership rates would consistently have higher homicide rates.

In reality, this pattern is inconsistent. States like New Hampshire, Vermont, Idaho, and Wyoming are often estimated to have high levels of gun ownership, yet they maintain some of the lowest homicide rates in the country.

Critics argue that increased gun prevalence should raise violence everywhere, even if not always obvious. However, state-level analysis often shows strong connections between homicide rates and factors like poverty, inequality, and urban density. Areas with concentrated poverty and high population density tend to experience more violence regardless of gun ownership levels.

Urban Concentration of Violence and Geographic Patterns

Another important factor in understanding homicide in the United States is the highly uneven geographic distribution of violent crime; rather than being spread evenly across the country, homicides often concentrate in specific cities, neighborhoods, and even individual blocks. This pattern suggests that violence is driven less by broad National factors—such as overall gun ownership—and more by localized conditions.

Research consistently shows that relatively small numbers of urban areas account for a disproportionately large share of homicides. Within those cities, violence is frequently concentrated in communities facing persistent poverty, limited economic opportunities, and higher levels of gang activity. These localized environments often experience cycles of violence that are reinforced by social networks, retaliation patterns, and reduced trust and institutions.

Importantly, many of these high-violence areas already operate under stricter gun regulations compared to surrounding regions. Despite these regulations, elevated homicide rates often persist, indicating that the presence of firearms alone does not fully explain the concentration of violence. Instead, underlying socioeconomic conditions appear to play a more significant role in shaping these patterns.

This Geographic concentration also helps explain why National averages can sometimes be misleading. While the United States as a whole may have a certain homicide rate, the figure reflects a wide range of experiences across different regions. Some communities experience very low levels of violence comparable to those in other developed countries, while others face significantly higher rates.

Understanding these Geographic patterns reinforces the broader argument that violence is influenced by a complex set of factors beyond gun ownership alone. Addressing concentrated urban violence, May therefore requires targeted, community-specific strategies focused on economic development, education, and crime prevention, rather than broad policies applied uniformly nationwide.

International Cases With Strict Gun Laws

Another common argument is that strict gun laws should reduce homicides by limiting access to weapons. While this idea is intuitive, international evidence shows that strict regulations do not always lead to lower violence in high-crime environments.

Countries such as Venezuela and Brazil have experienced very high homicide rates despite relatively low levels of legal civilian gun ownership. Much of this violence is driven by organized crime and weak institutions.

All those stricter laws may reduce legal access to firearms, but criminals in these environments often obtain weapons through illegal channels. As a result, restrictions on lawful ownership may have a limited impact on the weapons used by criminal groups.

Historical Trends in the United States

Historical patterns of the United States also challenged a simple link between gun ownership and homicides. From the early 1990s through 2019, the country experienced a major decline in violent crime and homicide rates.

During the same period, civilian gun ownership remained high, and concealed carry laws became more permissive in many states. If gun availability alone determined homicide rates, the trend might have gone in the opposite direction.

Well, multiple factors contributed to the decline—including economic improvements and policing strategies—but the data complicates claims of a straightforward causal relationship.

Methodological Reviews

The quality of research methods is another important consideration. Some studies rely on simple correlations, which cannot establish causation.

Our view of 41 studies found that they often had more rigorous analysis, often to test for no consistent relationship between higher gun ownership and overall homicide rates. These studies use Advanced methods to control for confounding factors.

Some studies report positive correlations, but critics argue that these findings may reflect weaker methodologies that fail to account for broader social conditions.

Method Versus Frequency of Violence

A key distinction in research is between the method of violence and its frequency. Gun availability appears to affect how violence is carried out, but not necessarily how often it occurs.

Countries with high gun ownership tend to have more firearm-related homicides, while those with fewer guns see more killings involving other weapons. However, total homicide rates may remain similar.

Well, Guns can increase the lethality of specific incidents; broader social conditions still determine how often violent conflicts arise.

Institutional Strength and Social Conditions

The strongest predictors of homicide rates are the strength of Institutions and overall social stability. Countries with effective governance, low corruption, and more equal economic systems tend to have lower violence.

Nations like Switzerland, Norway, Finland, and Iceland illustrate the pattern. Despite relatively high gun ownership, they maintain low homicide rates due to strong institutions and social cohesion.

Criminal Gun Acquisition

Another important issue is how criminals obtain firearms. Research shows that many offenders acquire guns through illegal channels rather than legal purchases.

These include theft, black market transactions, and transfers from acquaintances. Because these methods bypass legal systems, restricting lawful ownership may not significantly limit criminal access.

Defensive Gun Use

The use of little firearms in self-defense remains one of the most debated aspects of gun policy. All discussions often focus on the risk associated with gun ownership; the potential for defensive use introduces additional complexity into the issue. Surveys and Studies have suggested that Firearms are used defensively in a significant number of incidents each year, with estimates ranging widely depending on methodology.

In many of these cases, the firearm is not discharged. Instead, its presence alone made it a potential attacker, preventing a crime from occurring. This deterrent effect is difficult to measure precisely, as incidents that are prevented often go unreported; nevertheless, even conservative estimates indicate that defensive gun use occurs frequently enough to be a meaningful factor in the broader discussion of violence.

Critics argue some estimates overstate the frequency of defensive use due to limitations in survey-based research; however, even if the higher estimates are discounted, the existence of defensive guns suggests that Firearms may have both risks and potential benefits. This dual role complicates efforts to assess their overall impact on public safety.

Findings from John Lott's Research

One of the most frequently cited contributors to the debate over gun policy and crime is John R. Lott Jr., whose work has focused extensively on the relationship between firearm laws and public safety. In his research, particularly in the book *More Guns, Less Crime*, Lott examines the effects of “shall-issue” laws, which require authorities to issue permits to applicants who meet basic legal criteria.

Lott’s Central findings are that states adopting shall - issue laws often experienced reductions in certain types of violent crime, including homicide, robbery, and aggravated assault. His analysis suggests that when more law-abiding citizens are legally allowed to carry concealed firearms, potential offenders may be deterred from committing crimes due to the increased risk of encountering an armed victim. This argument aligns with the broader economic theory of crime, which holds that individuals weigh risks and benefits before engaging in criminal activity.

In addition to deterrence, Lott’s research emphasizes that concealed carry permit holders are statistically among the most law-abiding segments of the population. Because obtaining a permit typically requires a background check and legal eligibility, those who carry firearms legally are unlikely to contribute significantly to crime rates. As a result, expanding legal access to concealed carry may increase defensive capacity without substantially increasing criminal misuse.

Lott’s Findings have played a significant role in shaping policy debate, particularly during. When states considered expanding gun rights. Supporters of less restrictive gun laws often cite his work

as evidence that increased legal gun ownership does not necessarily lead to higher violence and may, under certain conditions, contribute to reductions in crime.

At the same time, his conclusions remain the subject of ongoing academic debate. Critics argue that some of his models rely on assumptions that may not fully capture the complexity of crime trends; other researchers have produced differing results using alternative methodologies. Nevertheless, Lott's work remained one of the most influential and widely discussed contributors to the literature on gun ownership and crime, and it continues to be a central reference point in discussions about the potential effects of expanding firearm access.

City-Level Handgun Bans

Urban handgun bans have produced mixed results. Cities like Washington, D.C., and Chicago implemented strict restrictions but still experienced high homicide rates.

These outcomes suggest that restricting legal gun ownership alone does not automatically reduce violence.

Recent Crime Trends

Recent policy changes provide additional insight. After 2022, several states expanded legal carrying rights, while some predicted increased violence, national homicide rates declined between 2023 and 2025 following the pandemic spike.

Conclusion

The relationship between firearms and violence remains highly debated. While guns are involved in many violent incidents, research suggests that gun ownership alone does not determine overall bond levels.

Cross-national comparisons, Historical trends, and research reviews consistently show that broader structural factors—such as inequality, organized crime, and institutional strength—play a more significant role. Firearms may influence how violence occurs, but not necessarily how often it occurs.

This does not mean gun policies are irrelevant, but focusing solely on weapon availability risks overlooking deeper causes. Addressing underlying social conditions may ultimately be more effective than reducing violence or restricting firearms alone.

Works Cited

Ammo.com. "Defensive Gun Use Statistics." Ammo.com, 2024.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. Criminal Victimization, 2022. U.S. Department of Justice, 2023.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. WISQARS: Fatal Injury Reports. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2024.

Doughlas. Defensive Gun Use in the US. 2nd Amendment Firearms Academy LLC, 2025, <https://www.2afirearmsacademy.com/defensive-gun-use-statistics/>

Federal Bureau of Investigation. Crime in the United States, 2022. U.S. Department of Justice, 2023.

Morgan, Rachel E., and Jennifer L. Truman. Criminal Victimization, 2022. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2023.

National Institutes of Health. "Defensive Gun Use in the United States: Estimates from the National Crime Victimization Survey." PubMed Central, 2024.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Income Inequality Data. OECD, 2024.

Pew Research Center. "America's Complex Relationship With Guns." Pew Research Center, 2017.

Small Arms Survey. Estimating Global Civilian-Held Firearms Numbers. Small Arms Survey, 2018.

The New Yorker. "The Shoddy Conclusions of the Man Shaping the Gun Rights Debate." The New Yorker, 2015.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Global Study on Homicide 2023. United Nations, 2023.

World Bank. World Development Indicators. World Bank, 2024.

World Bank. "Intentional Homicides (per 100,000 People) – Brazil." World Bank, 2024.