

## Clarification

Some have asked why Florenz Plassmann and John Whitley's paper, *Confirming "More Guns, Less Crime,"* 55 STAN. L. REV. 1313 (2003), appeared in the *Review* as a joint paper by Florenz Plassmann and John Whitley when it had been circulated on the SSRN as a joint paper by John Lott, Florenz Plassmann, and John Whitley.

Specifically, there has been some confusion over the following passage in Ian Ayres and John J. Donohue III's paper, *The Latest Misfires in Support of the "More Guns, Less Crime" Hypothesis*, 55 STAN. L. REV. 1371 (2003):

But after seeing this Reply to the original Lott, Plassmann, and Whitley paper, Lott asked the *Stanford Law Review* to take his name off the work. We hope that this indicates that the arguments in our Reply have caused the primary proponent of the more guns, less crime hypothesis to at least partially amend his views.

*Id.* at 1374. This passage could give the impression that Dr. Lott had asked the *Review* to take his name off the work because he had lost confidence in the validity of the arguments in the original Lott, Plassmann, and Whitley paper. The Editors believe this impression is mistaken. The Editors take full responsibility for not recognizing the implications of this language, for failing to give a full explanation of the situation to Profs. Ayres and Donohue, and for not asking them to revise the passage.

Dr. Lott had asked the Editors that his name be removed in response to a continuing disagreement between him and the *Review* over certain revisions that Profs. Ayres and Donohue had made in the course of editing their paper. Dr. Lott indicated to his junior coauthors that, although he was prepared to withdraw the paper from the *Review* and attempt publication elsewhere, he did not want to impose on them the cost of possibly losing the publication, and offered to withdraw his name from the paper. Profs. Plassmann and Whitley indicated to the Editors that they fully understood and agreed with Dr. Lott's dissatisfaction, but they decided to accept Dr. Lott's offer and proceed with publication.

The Editors feel that the impression that some have gotten from Ayres and Donohue's Reply piece is incorrect, unfortunate, and unwarranted. The Editors regret the confusion.

*The Editors*