



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 13, 2022

Huh?! NY Times Uses SHOTGUN Shell Images to Promote an Anti-AR-15 Article

“The editorial board is a group of opinion journalists whose views are informed by expertise, research, debate and certain longstanding values,” reads a short bio under the by-line of a Saturday *New York Times* [article](#) on guns. Strangely, though, that “expertise” and “research” didn’t inform the editorial board that they probably shouldn’t use *shotgun-shell* images to promote an article inveighing against AR-15-style semiautomatic rifles. After all, trying to fit a shotgun shell into a standard AR chamber is a bit like Michael Moore trying to get into your five-year-old’s bathing suit.

The misstep brought mockery from Twitter users. Per [Fox News](#):



“Complains about AR15s...with a picture of shotgun shells. This is hysterical,” Club for Growth senior analyst Andrew Follett wrote.

FabrikaCr/iStock/Getty Images Plus

“I find it amusing,” Townhall.com columnist Kurt Schlichter responded to a tweet pointing out the shotgun shells reading, “I am once again begging the MSM journalists to take just a couple of basic firearms class [sic] to avoid dumba**ery like this.”

Conservative writer A.G. Hamilton wrote, “Does the entire NYT really not have one editor that can review gun-related articles to notice something as basic as using a picture of shotgun shells for an article about AR-15s? Definitely inspires confidence about the contents of the article.”

Republican consultant Nathan Wurtzel replied to the Times’ negative comments about the AR-15 saying, “Nah. Just a really good gun for home



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 13, 2022

defense. That's all."

The *Times'* shotgun-shell picture is below.

The AR-15 has become a talisman for some right-wing politicians and voters. "That's a particularly disturbing trend at a time when violent political rhetoric and actual political violence in the United States are rising," writes the editorial board. <https://t.co/xLqthLEkSA>

— New York Times Opinion (@nytopinion) [December 10, 2022](#)

The most charitable explanation here is that the *Times* thought that *any* weapons-related photo would suffice for the article. But weighing against this theory is that an AR-15 image would have been far more powerful. What's more, firearm ignorance is mainstream-media status quo.

There was, for example, the reporter in my region who years ago used the term "high-capacity ammunition." When I informed her there was no such thing — at issue were "high capacity magazines" — she accepted the correction humbly. But she also essentially said that she couldn't do better until her bosses paid her to go to a gun range.

Then there's outright deceit, such as when *Daily News* reporter Gersh Kuntzman fired an AR in 2016 and [claimed](#) that the "recoil bruised my shoulder." (In reality, the weapon has less kick than most any other firearm; *tiny girls can fire it comfortably*.)

As for the *Times*, it writes that the "AR-15 has also become a potent talisman for right-wing politicians and many of their voters." Its editors also assert that a "growing number of American civilians have an unhealthy obsession with 'tactical culture' and rifles like the AR-15" — and, actually, they have a point there:

The Left is terribly obsessed with them.

What else do you call it, after all, when people fear — and fixate on as unusually dangerous — a weapon that

- is small caliber;
- has less "killing power" in its standard configuration than most hunting rifles (stats are [here](#));
- fires one shot per trigger pull just like any other semi-automatic weapon;
- is [used in a minuscule percentage](#) of crimes (the FBI reports that "personal weapons" — hands, fists, and feet — are [used to kill](#) more people yearly than rifles of *any* kind); and
- has so little stopping power that some states disallow its use for deer hunting.

Yes, all five of the above lines describe the AR-15.

Despite this, the *Times'* "research-" and "expertise"-oriented editorial board writes, "When used in mass shootings, the AR-15 makes those acts of violence far more deadly," without providing any evidence or reasoning to back up this assertion. In reality, a semi-automatic shotgun loaded with magnum #00 buckshot would be *far* more effective against soft targets at close range (the typical mass-shooting scenario).

The paper also opines that as "we've seen at libraries that host drag queen book readings, Juneteenth celebrations and Pride marches, the Second Amendment's right to bear arms is fast running up against the First Amendment's right to peaceably assemble. Securing that right, and addressing political



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 13, 2022

violence in general, requires addressing the armed intimidation that has become commonplace in public places and the gun culture that makes it possible.”

Actually, securing the right to peaceably assemble requires addressing the issue of politicians who prohibited anti-lockdown protests while endorsing BLM demonstrations, of government January 6 prosecutorial zealotry designed to frighten citizens into not protesting against the feds, and of left-wing mobs on college campuses shouting down conservative speakers.

Twitter respondents made related points. “Consequence-free rioting[,] arson, looting, and violence became the talisman of some Left-Wingers immediately following George Floyd’s murder,” [wrote](#) Michael A. Lewis. “I don’t recall a NYT opinion piece about that.”

Explaining this “oversight,” “Conspiracy Theorist” addressed the editors and stated, “You don’t care about political violence. Quit gaslighting.”

The *Times* concluded its article writing, “The only hope the nation has for living in and around so many deadly weapons is a political system capable of resolving our many differences without the need to use them.” Sounds like a great idea. Here’s a good start:

Stop with the two-tiered “justice” system in which conservatives get charged and leftists get off; stop hurling fightin’ words, such as Nazi and fascist, at normal Americans; stop calling parents upset about schools sexualizing their kids “domestic terrorists” — and stop stealing elections.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.