



## Episode 1,101: How to Respond to School Shootings

Guest: Larry Correia

**WOODS:** You are quite a successful and prolific novelist, and yet here you are on my podcast talking about gun rights. How is that coming about?

**CORREIA:** Well, back before I became a writer, I was in the gun business for many years. My background, I was an NFA dealer. I was an SOT. I owned a gun store in Utah. I was a concealed weapons instructor for about a decade. I taught a lot of people, did a lot of training, love competition shooting. I wrote nonfiction for gun magazines, that kind of thing. And one of the things that I started doing many years ago back when I was still a concealed weapons instructor was I taught school teachers and school employees and college students for free. My personal philosophy was my state, Utah, allowed concealed carry in school, and so I started teaching these people, so I figured I wanted more people with skin in the game. Firearms instructors, we've got kids in school too, so I started training people.

And then a few years ago, back in 2012, I wrote a big article about my experiences doing that in the aftermath of Sandy Hook and explaining the concept of armed school teachers or allowing concealed carry in school. And it went viral and it blew up kind of huge and a lot of people read – well, a couple million people read that. And so that's how I've kind of wound up on various gun podcasts ever since [laughing].

**WOODS:** Well, this article you wrote, I mean, you've written a number of pieces on gun control, but somebody sent me this one, and I'm going to link to it at [TomWoods.com/1101](http://TomWoods.com/1101). And then you told me before we started that within a very short amount of time, it had been viewed a million times? That's unbelievable.

**CORREIA:** Yeah, well, it just kind of struck at the right time. And also, I think part of it was people really do want to stop this kind of thing. They want to stop this kind of thing, but most of the solutions bandied around are nonsensical. All they do is infringe on people that obey the law and do nothing to stop the people that don't. So I was proposing a solution that is quick, easy, free, and available tomorrow. And I know that – actually, I probably can't talk about who has called me about this, but over the years I've talked to a lot of different legislators from a lot of different states who've contacted me about trying to get this in their own states. I know a lot of school districts – depending on how the state is structured, a lot of school districts have adopted allowing concealed carry in their schools. I've talked to sheriffs that have deputized people in order to get around their state laws. And it's all basically – it's just in order to install speed bumps. It's no different than having a fire extinguisher or a seatbelt. They don't prevent accidents, but once a bad thing is happening,

they help. And that's all we're trying to do here, and I was just trying to spread information about it, and it's worked for us in this state for a very long time.

**WOODS:** Tell people which state that is.

**CORREIA:** Oh, yes, I'm in Utah.

**WOODS:** Okay.

**CORREIA:** The way our concealed weapons law is set up is back in I believe it was the mid '90s or so when our concealed weapons licenses went into effect here, the way it read it was okay for state employees or school employees to carry a gun, yet most of the places they worked for, the school districts would fire them if they found out. So it was okay in principle but not in practice. Then we had an attorney general in the early 2000s who basically threw down with the governor because the governor would fire state employees if he found out they were carrying at work, and our attorney general said, *Look, we're a state entity. We must obey state law.* And so there was a big battle between the attorney general and the governor, and schools got roped into that too.

And so basically all it is now is the way our concealed weapons licenses are set up is that you are allowed to carry a firearm if you have a valid permit at your state job or at your school job. And so a lot of people think that we're talking about mandating teachers carrying guns. No one is asking for teachers to carry mandatory. It's not for everyone. It's a thing that's for certain people who volunteer for it. But we've had these teachers that they were carrying guns literally everywhere else except for work because work was a gun-free zone. So this went into effect, and we've had teachers carrying guns now for — I don't know the exact date this went into effect, but probably about 15 years now, I'd guess.

And we also have this on universities, the state universities. Private school, it doesn't matter. They're a private entity. They can do what they want. But the state schools or universities have to obey this also. When I first got involved in gun rights, they brought me in as a concealed weapons instructor, and I testified against the University of Utah at our state legislature, because they were attempting to circumvent this law. They were attempting to put special gun bans into place to keep guns off of campus. And we beat that pretty thoroughly, and so ever since, Utah has allowed guns in school.

**WOODS:** All right, I've got a bunch of questions to ask you about that, because the students these days are out there protesting and having demonstrations, and what's odd to me — but I guess it shouldn't be — is that their immediate instinct is to think the federal government should solve this problem. Instead of saying something like, *How about the school administration take a look at what our security options are?*, which would be how normal people would respond to a situation like this — look at the local institution and say what can you do — like, if there were a mass shooting in Walmart, nobody would think we've got to go to the federal government. We'd think Walmart better beef up its security or figure out how to handle this. So first of all, they're looking in the wrong place. But one of the pushbacks against the type of thing you're suggesting is that, if a teacher had a gun, then wouldn't it be easy, relatively speaking, with a gun in the classroom for a student to grab it, and then you have more episodes? That's what I've heard.

**CORREIA:** Yeah, they throw out a lot – I call it the Dracula-riding-Godzilla defense, and what I mean by that is any scenario that you postulate, they will postulate a worse scenario that's a no-win. So the teacher will have a gun, but the student will just take it away. Or you won't be attacked by just one crazy guy; you'll be attacked by ten crazy guys, and you can't possibly stop that, so why bother even trying? And so the next thing you know, you're having to defend against Dracula riding a Godzilla and it's basically impossible.

But in reality, when we actually look at how this has unfolded, the beauty of concealed carry is that no one knows who's armed. You have the firearm on your person, but it's hidden. And like I said, once again, it's not for everybody. It's voluntary. So it's for people who are willing to put in the effort to learn how to do this correctly. Concealed carry, your gun doesn't really get snatched. It's not out there in the open. You don't telegraph that you have it. Cops are more likely to have their guns snatched than a concealed carry person, because the gun is out there in the open. That's why cops carry in retention holsters and they're trained on how to retain their firearms.

So for the first part, no one's going to know the teacher has the gun. And second off, most kids aren't trying to snatch guns from teachers anyway. And let's be honest, the kids that are going to do that are the ones that are showing up armed anyway and they're bringing their own from home. So it's kind of one of those non-arguments they can just throw at any horrible scenario.

I had one today where they said that, "Well, your pistol will do no good when the bad guy has a rifle." And I can tell you for certain as a guy who's done training and as a guy who's played the bad guy, that is very much not true. You enter a room and someone starts shooting at you, I don't care how you're armed. It messes up your plans. And also, what we've discovered with these guys is the best way to stop the event once it's in process is an immediate, violent response. Usually what happens is that bursts their fantasy bubble, and they'll either hunker down and stop killing people, or they'll surrender, or oftentimes they'll kill themselves, because their fantasy has been ruined once they meet violent resistance.

Now, violent resistance can either come from someone who's present and already there, so it's fast, or that violent resistance can come from a responding cop, which could be several minutes away, or in the case of our last one, never. That just disgusts me. I work with a lot of cops, and every good cop I know is really, really angry right now with what happened in Florida. But the clock is ticking once these events start, and you can either interrupt them early or you can interrupt them later.

**WOODS:** Well, as a matter of fact, there's an interesting statistic in your article I hadn't known about that really, strongly makes this case. You say, "The average number of people shot in a mass shooting event when the shooter is stopped by law enforcement is 14. The average number of people shot in a mass shooting event when the shooter is stopped by civilians is 2.5." Very, very interesting statistic. Now, maybe it's obvious to some, but why should that be?

**CORREIA:** Well, what it is is the only way to stop these guys is by responding, it's by giving them a violent response. That's what stops the event. And if the event is interrupted by someone who is already present, there's no response time. They're already there when the shooting starts, and so they're going to be able to engage that guy right away. It's going to ruin his fantasy in the first minute. If you have to wait for law enforcement to arrive, then

what's going to happen is it's going to take however long that takes. Good police response time in America is in like the four-minute range, but as we saw in Florida, you could have terrible police response time and the guy will sit outside in his car. So really, the clock is ticking when these things happen, and the longer they have to act in uninterrupted, the more people they're going to harm.

I know of so many scenarios that never, ever make the news. Back when I was instructing – I retired in 2008, so I am out of date, and I actually don't know what that statistic is today because there have been many events since. But as of 2008 when I was doing this, we had one mass shooting in Utah that got the news because it had a significant body count. It was a mall called Trolley Square. A guy came in. I think he shot about 12 people before he was interrupted by an off-duty police officer in plain clothes who was there shopping, and he was killed. That one got all over the national news because it fit the narrative and it had a sufficient body count.

But in that same time frame, we had a whole bunch of incidents where someone went on a rampage and was interrupted early. Those events never, ever make the news, anything beyond the local news. We had one – KSL is our big media company here in Utah, and there was a woman who went on a rampage there, and I think she maybe shot one or two people there before she was interrupted by a permit-holder who caught her and stuck a 45 against her head and she decided to surrender.

And we had an event at a grocery store where a guy went on a stabbing rampage and was stopped by a permit holder in the first minute. I mean, these things happen all the time all over America. Back when I wrote that article in 2012, in the same week as Sandy Hook, there had been an event in Texas that was derailed in the first minute, and I think only a couple people got shot. It's the same thing over and over again.

Guns are not perfect. They aren't going to stop these events from happening. But a fire extinguisher doesn't stop fires from happening either; it just helps you deal with the damage faster than waiting for the fire department. It's the same thing with applying CPR or doing first aid. It's not as good as a trauma surgeon. It's not going to cure the problem, but it can save lives. Concealed carry is no different, and it's all about how long it takes for us to get a response there. And if that response comes from us, we're better off. If that response comes from outside, we have to wait for it. It's really simple. It's just simple math.

**WOODS:** What does CCW stand for? Is it concealed carry something?

**CORREIA:** Yeah, carry of a concealed weapon, and so it's usually –

**WOODS:** Ah, okay.

**CORREIA:** Yeah, it's shorthand abbreviation. Like in many states, it's actually CCL, concealed carry license, or something of that nature.

**WOODS:** Okay.

**CORREIA:** Just CCW is kind of Internet shorthand, mostly.

**WOODS:** Okay, okay, because I want to read a paragraph from your piece. You say:

"Over the course of a couple years I taught well over \$20,000 worth of free CCW classes. I met hundreds and hundreds of teachers, students, and staff. All of them were responsible adults who understood that they were stuck in target rich environments filled with defenseless innocents. Whether they liked it or not, they were the first line of defense. It was the least I could do."

That is I think a common-sense way of thinking about it, that this is the situation we're in, who knows how or why we got here, we didn't have — well, now I'm getting off on a tangent, but we didn't have school shootings in the 1950s. That's an interesting thing, where guns were much more readily available even in the schools. There were rifle clubs. People brought guns to school. It never even occurred to anybody that there would be a mass shooting. Just the other day, the Orlando Antifa group tweeted out the claim that maybe the reason we have these mass violent episodes is the patriarchal, hypermasculine culture in America. And I said, "Okay, then why didn't we have more shootings in the 1950s?" No response, because there is no response to that answer.

**CORREIA:** Yeah, if anything, we were far more hypermasculine in the 1950s than we are now.

**WOODS:** Right, right.

**CORREIA:** Honestly, there's a wide variety of causes, and the thing is, if it's not one cause, it's something else, and everybody has their different cause. Some people are just straight-up evil. Then again you have terrorist events, where they do have a very direct motivation. Sometimes it's a revenge thing. Sometimes it's just a breakdown of the nuclear family or this person wasn't hugged enough as a kid. I mean, I don't know what it is, but what matters in that moment is stopping them.

**WOODS:** Right.

**CORREIA:** That's one thing I've had in this argument a lot with people lately. They always come back to me and say, *You want to do this, but that's just a Band-Aid. That doesn't stop the underlying root cause.* Well, the underlying root cause is that some people choose to do evil. And if Jesus Christ and Buddha weren't able to get people to stop being evil, I don't know what they expect the government to do.

**WOODS:** But also, banning guns is also a Band-Aid, because that doesn't get to the underlying — The underlying cause is not the prevalence of guns. The underlying cause is that somebody's deranged enough to want to do this.

**CORREIA:** True. Also, if you look at it, honestly, all around the world, there are events like this where there are mass killers because they're trying to make some sort of statement, and they're not always with guns. In places where there aren't guns, how many times have we seen now from Japan and China where there'd been mass stabbings where they've killed 20+ people with knives? We have bombs all over the world where you can't get guns; you use bombs. Bombs are easy to make. Anybody who does basic chemistry can figure that out. We have trucks now as the new favorite. We've seen that all over the world. We've seen that

repeatedly in European countries that have extremely strict gun control. You get a big truck and you drive it through the mall.

And so people get hung up on the tool because they want something easy to blame. They want an easy solution. And there is no one, easy solution. And plus, banning guns in America is fundamentally, logistically impossible at this point. And the way technology is going with 3D printing and home machining, it's even more impossible.

**WOODS:** Yeah, forget it.

**CORREIA:** I mean, we import into this country millions of tons of drugs. I'm sure if the government put their mind to it and ruined our freedoms and threw millions of us in prison that we could probably create just as bustling a gun trade as we have a drug trade, and it would accomplish nothing because the people that want to inflict mass casualties would just get a Ryder truck and fill it with ammonium nitrate fertilizer. I mean, we've seen this everywhere over and over again.

**WOODS:** Right, right. So again, if you're looking for root causes and stuff, the idea that — it just goes to show the incompatibility of the claim that we have to get to the root of this, but then all they want to do is get rid of the implement, as if the implement is the obstacle standing between a lunatic and a terrible outcome. He'll come up with another implement. Now, there are other theories too. There are questions about the types of drugs some of these people are taking that may lead to this kind of behavior, but you do get —

Well, I have a couple of devil's advocate objections that I want to throw at you. In a lot of states, you would find — we all know what the political leanings in general of most school teachers are. It's not very subtle or difficult to uncover. So I wouldn't be surprised if I found a number of school systems where there wasn't a single teacher who would volunteer for this and in which they would ostracize anybody who volunteered.

**CORREIA:** That is very possible, and unfortunately, once again, I'm an advocate of freedom and volunteering. I don't want to force anyone to do anything that's against their will, and that's on them. That said, I would be shocked if that was the case. What I've found in even the bluest of blue states, there's always somebody there, and odds are they would need to keep it secret. I mean, if this was a law, you wouldn't tell your coworkers because they would ostracize you and make fun of you and say you're a baby killer and so on and so forth.

But I think most schools in America you can find people — usually they're going to be vets. They're going to be veterans. They will have served their country. They'll have some basic experience. Or they will have grown up in a manner where they are simply not buying into the nonsense about gun control because they grew up in an environment where they know that's silly. And that could be a country living where they grew up on the farm with guns, or on the other hand, I've seen this a lot — they grew up in the inner city and they understand how gun control actually works, where only the bad guys have guns. And I'm pretty sure that you could find someone.

And the thing is that if there's not anyone there, that isn't ideal, but the thing is, if the mass shooter knows that this is no longer a gun-free zone and knows there might be someone there, that might cause them to pick a different target, or it might cause them to do

something entirely different. You notice these guys always attack gun-free zones. They never role up and attack a police station. Well, okay, there were a couple instances where really motivated bad guys have attacked cops directly, armed people. But these people, very seldom do they ever attack places where people were able to fight back effectively.

They always attack places where people aren't armed. They strike against schools, gun-free zones. They strike against political rallies, gun-free zones. They strike against malls and shopping centers and movie theaters that have signs on the door saying, "No guns allowed." Earlier I mentioned our mass shooting here in this state, and very specifically on the door of that mall they had a bunch of rules, and one of the rules was no firearms allowed.

It's just the nature of things. These violent predators are looking to make a statement. They're looking to kill as many people as possible. They're not looking to get shot, so they're going to go where there's no guns. So even if you don't get a single teacher in your blue state, blue school district to sign up, they're still going to think there might be, because once again, you don't advertise. You don't say who does and who does not.

**WOODS:** Right, so nobody's going to know.

**CORREIA:** Yeah, and then again, also, I've been surprised. I've taught over the years some people that really shocked me, that do not share my politics at all, yet they still reach across the aisle in that they don't want to be defenseless. I've taught some little, blue-haired lunch ladies over the years, and I have taught people from all different walks of life, because self-defense is a fundamental human right. It belongs to all of us.

**WOODS:** All right, how about this? Assault weapons, is what people say. We need to get rid of so-called assault weapons. Or we need to have super-duper restrictions on them or age restrictions on people getting guns and whatever. Maybe that would have prevented this outcome. Because what they would say is this idea that we're going to have guns available in society and there's a possibility that somebody could get into a school, but then what we'll do is we'll have more guns in the school, we'll have the teachers have guns – I think some of these people would say is that's convoluted. Why don't we go the more direct route of trying to limit the supply of guns, particularly in the hands of crazy people? So what we'll do is we'll restrict certain types of weapons and we'll try and make it so that you have to be a little older to get them. What about that solution?

**CORREIA:** Yeah, I went through that in great depth on my blog, because what it comes down to is there's a few steps to this. It's how serious they want to go. And at the low level, they talk about just banning an assault weapon. So the first question I have for them is: okay, define assault weapon. What does that mean? And they say everyone knows what it means. Well, you can't write law based upon feelings. You need to give me specifics as to what things make something an assault weapon and what things you intend to ban by law.

Because what they don't realize is we have done this before. We have banned what they considered assault weapons. We did so for ten years back under Bill Clinton, and that law sunsetted under George Bush. And they studied it extensively. The Justice Department studied it. Everybody studied it. And it made absolutely no difference. So they could add more features. They can declare different things. People always bring up the AR-15 because it's AR-15s that get used in these crimes. But the thing is that's also because the AR-15 is the

single most common gun in America now. It'd be like drunk drivers often drive Fords. Yes, Fords are very common.

So the thing is if you want to ban something specific, you've got to decide what you're going to ban, but really what it comes down to — and I go into this in great detail in that article — there's not a lot of difference between these firearms and what they would not consider a firearm. They're mostly cosmetic features. And then there's a few specific things, like being semiautomatic or taking a detachable box magazine that basically encompasses most guns and really encompasses almost all guns that are used for self-defense. And what happens then is if you're banning all of those, you're basically banning the idea of armed self-defense.

But let's go ahead and let's take this farther. Let's say that a lot of people want to ban guns entirely. All right, fine. Now, the problem there is technologically and logistically it's impossible. Plus, that's a line that a lot of Americans are not willing to cross, and if you do so, people are going to resist. Like, for example, New York has an assault weapons ban, and I believe — and this is New York, one of the bluest blue states in America. It's absolutely politically dominated by New York City. And even in New York, the compliance rate on this — of course no one knows what it is for sure, but the estimated compliance rate on this is miniscule. It's like 5% of gun owners are actually complying with this law. And that's one of the bluest states in America.

What do you think is going to happen when you tell the people of Texas or Wyoming or Alabama that they have to turn in their guns? It ain't going to happen. I mean, there's only 700,000 cops in America, and honestly, half of those are on the gun owners' side. So I don't know who they think is going to go door to door, kicking doors in to take these guns from people?

And I see people who are like, *Well, the government has drones and tanks and bombers and they'll just like* — No, that isn't going to happen. These are the same people that got upset about rules of engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan, but all of a sudden they're willing to carpet bomb Dallas. I mean, basically they're looking at a logistical impossibility. And it's also coming from the same people that love things like sanctuary cities or they love states having medicinal marijuana in defiance of the federal government, yet they seem to think that it's going to easily work the other way and everyone's just going to comply and turn their guns over. They're not going to. And if you push it, it will turn ugly. And I think most reasonable people understand that, because —

**WOODS:** Well, I —

**CORREIA:** Oh, go ahead.

**WOODS:** I was just going to say I just saw today — I can't remember where, but somebody was pointing out that on Twitter — which must be a horrible place to be these days. I can't imagine it.

**CORREIA:** I left a couple years ago when I found out I had been shadow banned.

**WOODS:** Oh, funny, yeah. I mean, I'm on there because I might as well. It's a free outlet. But good grief. And sometimes when I take on crazy people, it becomes good fodder for my

emails to my email list, so that's at least something. But I guess you can find a number of people who, when being told, *Look, there are short-term and potentially long-term practical steps you can take to beef up security in schools*, they outright reject this because they say we're waiting for gun control. So in other words, we're going to keep the kids vulnerable for the time being until we get the political solution we want, a political solution that is almost certain to fail that we're almost guaranteed not to get. Why are these the great moral exemplars for all of us when they have no interest in doing any practical thing in the immediate term other than sit and wait for legislatures to do something? What kind of an idiot recommends that?

**CORREIA:** It's a very smug and disingenuous method of arguing in that they set themselves up as if they have the moral high ground because they're proposing a magical, feel-good solution that will never work in the real world, yet because of that, they think that they're the better person. I propose a nitty-gritty solution that's available tomorrow and it's free. They hate it because it goes against their fundamental worldview, even though all the evidence on this shows on my side that it works fine.

And problem is, though, it's a religious thing for these people, where they take the moral high ground, they can state whatever they want as if it's fact, and anything we say, obviously, well, we hate children and want them all to die. It doesn't matter how many thousands of hours of my time I donated to training people and helping people. I'm still the bad guy because – and I've had people tell me this – by teaching armed self-defense, I was victim-blaming. I was putting the onus upon the victims – which, if you think about it, is a childish and asinine argument, yet that person would immediately claim the moral high ground. And this is actually coming from another famous science fiction author [laughing]. Now, that was a good one. That was a good one. But I embarrassed him pretty thoroughly.

**WOODS:** Good.

**CORREIA:** See, so they declare these things and I say, whenever people tell me stuff like this, I always tell them I can't wait for a unicorn to slide down a rainbow and give me world peace, because that's about as likely. And it's funny because they will throw out the most asinine arguments ever, and I see all this obfuscation. The one I've seen recently is a lot of people say they're trying to make it mandatory for teachers to carry guns, and then they go through all the reasons that that's absurd. The problem is that that's a straw-man argument, because I have yet to see anyone seriously on my side or any serious legislator saying make it mandatory. Every single one of us has said make it voluntary for those people who would choose to do so anyway. So they create a straw man and then they argue against this false straw man and then they declare victory.

So it's very silly out there, and I think what's happening is a lot of us have been having this same argument for a long time, so tempers are getting frayed and it's becoming harder and harder for us to remain polite.

**WOODS:** What do we do about the claim – first of all, I've dealt with a lot of the standard arguments over and over that we hear in these situations and other episodes, like for example, European countries, and they say European countries have it great and that's probably because they have stricter gun regulations. Do you have a response to that kind of argument?

**CORREIA:** Well, yeah. It's interesting because they always bring up European nations and they always cherry-pick which nations to go to. They never compare us to Brazil. They never compare us to Honduras or Mexico or even China or countries with strict gun control but high murder. They always try to cherry-pick countries that – and a lot of times it's countries that don't even report their crime in the same way we do. I see them compare us to Australia a lot because Australia had one mass shooting, banned guns, confiscated them, and they haven't had any mass shootings since. Well, the thing is they didn't have any mass shootings before. They were extremely rare there. That was all they ever had. So it's like they took this one statistical blip and said, "Look, we've had nothing since."

It's interesting too, though, because they always talk about Europe like it's this place where violent crime doesn't happen. I was just in Europe last year, and I went to five different countries. And it was interesting. While I was in Paris, France, they had four-man military patrols on the streets of Paris armed with FAMAS rifles. Four men in camouflage, full-battle-rattle patrols in the streets of Paris. When I was in Prague, it was usually two- or three-man patrols with CZ BREN rifles. So they actually have literally armed soldiers patrolling the street because of the terrorist attacks they've had, but that doesn't count, apparently.

And it's interesting because they actually do have European school shootings. There have been several, the most famous being the Anders Breivik shooting in Norway, where I believe he killed something like 70 people, which is an astronomical number. But that's a country with exceedingly strict gun control. Or as I said earlier, you go to France and they just rent a truck and drive it through the mall, through a bunch of shoppers.

And so it's funny because they bring up these things, they always bring up like, *Well, Europeans* – or they bring up London, they bring up England. They said, *Well, British cops don't even carry guns*. That is not the case. The street-level guys don't carry guns, but they have armed response teams everywhere. I saw multiple times where two-man patrols were walking around the streets of Shepherd's Bush with MP5s. That was completely normal.

And also they have this thing there too, where they way that they report their crime is very different than in America. So my understanding is the way the British home office reports murders is they only report the murders that have been solved and there's been a conviction. Then it's done. Then they can count it as a murder. Before that, it's just a death. So their murder stats are drastically underinflated when they compare them to America, where we've got a body, it wasn't natural causes, it goes into the murder category. So they're comparing apples to oranges across cultures. And we have a third of a billion people. Most of Central Europe would fit into Texas. We are an entirely different thing. But it doesn't stop them. It's just disingenuous arguing, and they truly love it.

**WOODS:** Let's shift gears completely because I'd like people to know a little bit more about you, actually, because here you are making pretty darn good arguments and yet this is not really your full-time gig these days, anyway. So what exactly is it that you do do? What is Monster Hunter Nation?

**CORREIA:** That is my blog, [MonsterHunterNation.com](http://MonsterHunterNation.com), and also what I refer to as my fan base. My real job, I'm a novelist. I'm a writer. I write science fiction and fantasy novels for Baen Books. I've been doing that for about ten years now. I'm a *New York Times* bestselling author. I am best known for the *Monster Hunter* series, where it's – my background, once again, is guns and military contracting, and so it's a series about military – basically, think Blackwater

for monsters. They're military contractors that take care of monster problems and get paid bounties. So it's urban fantasy. I also write epic fantasy. I have a series, the first book is *Son of the Black Sword*. It's set in kind of a world based loosely upon India. A whole lot of fun. I have a 1930s alternate history superhero series called *The Grimnoir Chronicles*. So I do a little bit of everything. I've got about 19 books out now. I think I'm at — book number 19 is coming out this year. So that's my day job now.

**WOODS:** That's absolutely amazing, and you're able to make a living at it, which makes me want to talk to you about all different things that I'd better control myself or we could easily do another episode on it. But it's very rare to come across a full-time writer who really makes a go of it. As I said before we went on, any time I tell somebody I'm an author, the person in the back of his mind is thinking, *Oh, you mean unemployed* [laughing]. Actually, I've sort of made a go of being an author, as it turns out, but it's not easy.

**CORREIA:** No, it is not easy. It's challenging. It took me several years to get good at it, and that's actually when I retired from my military contracting job about five years ago, I've just been doing this. And I'm doing rather well, actually, and it's a lot of fun, and it's funny because I started out and my initial audience was a bunch of gun nuts because I was a moderator on a couple of different gun forums, so the very first place I ever sold one of my books was on Internet gun forums to other gun nuts. And to give you an idea of what my fan base is like, at one point I was the number-one bestselling author in Baghdad and Bagram [laughing].

**WOODS:** Wow, I can't claim that.

**CORREIA:** So this just gives you an idea of what my fan base is like: big action/adventure, and I get all the technical stuff correct. So it's a lot of fun. It's a really fun job. And I invite people to check out my stuff, and we have a big, active Facebook page with a bunch of fans, and I invite people to check it out. We like to say we're a gun club with a book problem or a book club with a gun problem.

**WOODS:** Well, either way, sounds good to me. [MonsterHunterNation.com](http://MonsterHunterNation.com) is the site. I'll link to that at [TomWoods.com/1101](http://TomWoods.com/1101), and then after you and I finish I'll ask you to give me a few titles in particular that you'd like me to link to and we'll put those up on that page as well. Of course we're also going to link to your article on guns. This is really tremendous stuff here, and that point about forums, I've advised people on that in the past, that if you're trying to build an audience, get involved in forums in your topic. And don't just immediately go in there and say, "Buy my book." No one's going to want you to do that.

**CORREIA:** Oh, no, people hate that.

**WOODS:** Contribute to it. Yeah, contribute to it, and then people will like you and it's a way to get an audience of people who are super concentrated in whatever it is you're doing. Well, great, all right, so [MonsterHunterNation.com](http://MonsterHunterNation.com) is where to go to talk to Larry. I love about your site that there's no way to reach you on it. You cannot contact you at all. I can't quite go that far, but on my business card when I give out business cards, my phone number is not on it and I felt like that was pretty hardcore, to have no phone number. You can email me, but I don't want to talk to you on the phone because it takes an hour and I just don't want to do it. But you have taken it to the next level, my friend. But your Facebook group I think is where somebody from my own Facebook group was finally able to get through the different layers to

finally reach you and get you on this show, and I'm glad they somehow navigated it. But I don't recommend others try that. Don't try that.

**CORREIA:** No, I didn't do that at first. I did that after many years, because what happened is I just got to the point where a big part of my day-to-day activity was responding to emails and messages from people, because once you cross this critical threshold where you have so many fans – and don't get me wrong. I love my fans. But they felt the need to, like, tell me everything [laughing].

**WOODS:** Right. Or ask you questions –

**CORREIA:** And there's not enough hours in the day.

**WOODS:** Right, or ask – I mean, I don't mind questions, but questions that a Google search could have answered, you don't really need me for that.

**CORREIA:** Well, the other thing for is every time there was a gun control argument anywhere in America, they were like, *Ooh, Larry, come get involved.*

**WOODS:** Oh, I know, yeah. Or even more: *I'm in a fight with somebody on my Facebook page. Could you jump in and help?* This is the most pointless use of my time imaginable.

**CORREIA:** Yet we still wind up doing it once in a while, don't we?

**WOODS:** All right, you weren't supposed to say that part, because that is entirely true. By the way, as we depart, the last thing I'll say because I forgot to mention it is sometimes when you talk about guns and schools, people will be repelled by that because they just don't like the mixture of so many guns around children. But yet people have given the counter example of Disney World, which is pretty well regulated in terms of security, yet there isn't a gun in your face everywhere you turn. But you feel like if there were an incident, you feel pretty confident that they have done drills and they know exactly how to handle it. And that's at Disney World where Mickey Mouse is, for heaven's sake, and they make it work.

**CORREIA:** Oh, yeah, I'm pretty sure they have a pretty legit SWAT team, I would be. I don't know for sure, but it would not surprise me at all if Disneyland had some really well-trained individuals ready to go.

**WOODS:** Yeah, to me that's fascinating, is what private institutions behind the scenes are doing. A lot of times public institutions will be very ostentatious and open about this or that, but I feel much safer walking around in Disney World than I do on a lot of the government streets in a lot of cities. I'd rather be in Disney World.

**CORREIA:** Definitely, definitely. And I would totally, 100% agree with you there.

**WOODS:** All right, I'm going to let you go. I hope people will visit you at [MonsterHunterNation.com](http://MonsterHunterNation.com) and buy a book and join your tribe, so to speak. Thanks so much for your time.

**CORREIA:** Thanks a lot. Thanks for having me on.