

Gun (Firearm) Survey
February 8, 2013, 3:51 p.m. CST

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS (sent to 46 persons on personal mailing list; as of Feb 12 9 a.m., 23 have responded, 11 men and 12 women). A reasonable inference for this group would be that they would be highly negative towards guns, generally:

THE QUESTIONS.

Three provocative statements on the Gun Issue received Friday, Feb. 8 from individuals prompt these questions to the 46 of you on my P&J list. [NOTE: these statements are included after the final response for this compilation].

I really hope you take the time to answer these, and I'll tally, and get back to you, including the provocative statements I refer to:

THIS IS AN EASY SURVEY. But point out any parts that might be confusing, or pertinent questions I left out. I may use this same survey later with my larger family group, to help provoke thought and conversation.

OTHER THAN BELOW, RESULTS WILL NOT BE KEPT, NO ONE WILL BE NAMED.

1. Do you (and/or someone else in your own home or dwelling) own a firearm(s) ("guns")? Yes or No

A. If you answered "Yes"

1. How many firearms are in your home or dwelling?

a. What kind(s)?

b. Where are weapons kept?

c. If you needed the gun for defense right now, how accessible and/or useful would it be to you?

2. **WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU PERSONALLY USED A FIREARM?**

a. For what purpose?

2. For everyone:

If you could decide, what would "reasonable regulation" of firearms look like?

3. Have you ever used a gun for self-defense (against a person), and in what manner? Or do you personally know of someone who has (other than in war - or one of those stories heard from your cousin about his neighbor's dentist's brother or the like)? Versus, how many people have you been personally acquainted with who were killed by

guns (except for war); how many were due to domestic violence?

Any suggestions about how to make this survey a bit more useful, including questions?

GENERAL RESULTS (There are so many variations in answers to most questions, the best course of action would be to at least scan answers of all 23.)

11 Men and 11 Women responded

7 have firearms in the home, 16 do not

None of their Firearms would be useful if needed in an emergency, due to location, security, operability etc.

Most have used a firearm, but of those, mostly long ago.

Several know someone killed or personally threatened by a gun (including themselves), other than in war; another experienced a very close call when a youngster (stupid kid deal).

RESPONSES: (Presented as received, rough tally at end...because of open-ended nature of question, it is difficult to sort responses into categories.)

#1 - Male: 4 p.m. Feb 8

1. No

A2. 50 years ago, Expert on the M1 Rifle, practiced with Pistol

A2a. U.S. Army

2. Weapons will never be eradicated in this society. The only reasonable solutions are to do everything possible to register all firearms, and insist on weapon security, especially in the home, so that someone can conceivably be held accountable if a weapon is used in a criminal (or improper) manner. "Improper" is a difficult question. See #3.

3. When I was about 10 a bunch of we kids messed around with my Dad's .22, which was hanging on the garage wall, and was off-limits to anyone but him. It was not easy to reach. Of course, a gang of boys 10 years old is not terribly disciplined. One took down the gun (not me), aimed it at another one, and pulled the trigger (we thought it was unloaded). Of course, it wasn't unloaded. Luckily the bullet missed the target kid. I never told my Dad, ever, and he lived another 47 years. We were very, very lucky.

#2 - Male: 4:15 p.m. Feb 8

1. No
- 1A2 Several decades ago for Quail hunting
- 2 Abolish 2nd Amendment, make gun ownership on need basis, not a right.

#3 - Male: 4: 16 pm. Feb 8

1. No firearms at home or elsewhere.
 2. Had learn how to use a Carbine rifle in MN ANG 1958.
 3. Reasonable regulation of firearms?
 - *So many are out there, this question is almost meaningless.
 - *I suppose background checks, no military-style assault weapons but again, they're out there, banning, regulation is almost meaningless.
 - *I maintain that trained armed guards at schools would deter some would-be killers.
- Much better than nothing.
Cost too much?
What price your children's safety and lives?

#4 - Male: 4:34 p.m. Feb 8

Yes
1 gun
Shotgun , 20 gauge
In an unlocked closet in basement. Ammunition kept in a box in a different room.
Since my living quarters are 1 or 2 stories up, I don't consider it a weapon for self defense.

Comprehensive and 100% background checks
Up to date databases of the registrations, applications, mental health and criminal records... allow sellers and police and mental health to have quick access to these.
Ban assault style guns
Ban clips of more than 10 rounds
Require liability insurance on guns.
Move to a very distinct and national gun registration system which includes gun safety education and background checks.
Set up a buy back for old guns at 110% of actual value.
Enforce existing laws.
Fund and maintain mental health.

3. I have never used a gun in self defense. Nor do I know anyone who has. Or been involved somehow.

I have friends from Northern Michigan who have scared off wolves or bears with their guns. And they do worry for safety especially from wolves to themselves and their pets.

#5 - Male : 7:30 p.m. Feb 8

1. No one in our home owns, possesses nor has access to a firearm.
2. This is a difficult question to answer. For starters I would expand background checks. But, for such to be truly effective, all states must be diligent about reporting names of people who are prohibited from possessing a firearm. That would include criminal records and mental treatment records. The latter category should be expanded from what is now covered, people who have been committed for mental health treatment, to include people who have sought treatment for mental health issues and people who family and acquaintances believe are mentally ill. Here I am thinking about Andrew Engeldinger, the Accent Sign Company shooter. His family long ago recognized his illness. But, he cut off contact with them and presumably never sought mental health treatment. How to implement this in a legal and effective way will be a huge challenge..

People living in a household with a person prohibited from possessing a firearm should also be prohibited from possessing a firearm in that household. Any firearms an eligible person does own must be stored at a different location, such as a rod and gun club or with an acquaintance who is eligible to possess. I have an email buddy who is an ardent Second Amendment supporter, but who does not possess firearms in his household since there is a mentally ill person with whom he lives. Here I am thinking about the Sandy Hook shooter..

Limitation on size of magazines.

Limitation on types of high powered firearms available to the public. Here I am as much concerned about police not being overpowered as for any other concern. People who claim the need to possess firearms with high power with which to defend themselves in the case of government tyranny are really demanding the right to be armed to conduct treason, which should not

be recognized as a legal right. Keep in mind our nation's founding fathers did commit treason against King George of England. They only escaped punishment by winning the revolutionary war.

Serious changes in the way mental illness is diagnosed and treated. This would be a massive endeavor, one virtually out of the realm of practical possibility. See, *The Expense of Inequality* by Joseph Stiglitz. Among the many measurements by which our nation is rapidly growing more unequal is the recognition of our collective social needs and the willingness to devote financial resources to address them. Keep in mind that many diagnoses of mental illness cannot be made until the individual reaches the age of late teens or early 20s at the earliest, in other words, adulthood...

Mandatory prison sentences for people who commit gun crimes, such as prohibited possession as by a felon and for people who commit crimes with the use of a firearm, such as aggravated robbery. We should incarcerate such guilty people for 5-10 years. I am not optimistic about the deterrent value of such incarceration, but it will at the least prevent these guilty people from committing a firearm offense during their period of incarceration.

One last observation. Most people who are murdered, by whatever means, are done in by someone they know. It can be a spouse, a relative, friend, co-worker, or a person they have "known" for only a brief time. It can be a person the victim has approached to buy or to sell a controlled substance. The point is that individuals have little to fear about a stranger coming into their home or up to them on the street and killing them. This fact does nothing to comfort the surviving families of Sandy Hook.

Thank you so very much for conducting this important survey. I look forward with great anticipation to reading your results!

#6 - Male: 9:19 p.m. Feb 8

Nothing simple, is.

Please forgive my tone in this, I find it a little terse, but it is intended merely to be serious.

As you know I teach Japanese swordsmanship. This means I have worked out with every kind of soldier, spook, prizefighter, cop, FBI agent, security contractor, etc., etc., and almost all of them are gun experts. The higher-

ranked among us don't put much faith in weapons, and consider the possibility of a violent incident remote, though not impossible. Once while I was present in the home of one of these folks, some strange people began to approach the suburban house in a rather alarming way, and my host *put away his weapon* (of which he has maybe a hundred), jumped up and went eagerly outside to confront them. In shorts and a tee shirt. They went away.

I can pretty much promise you that should any attack on any home occur where weapons are available and ready for use, the results will be ugly and the wrong people will suffer.

The fact is that you can't do anything except what you are trained to do - and I mean well-trained, for years. Otherwise events will move too quickly to get ahead of, and you will be at the mercy of your endocrine system, which is well configured to perpetuate the species but not the individual. Your endocrine system might opt for the "bad guys."

If you are less than fully trained, having a firearm and believing it is an option creates a disabling mental state in almost anybody.

In my opinion discussions of "home defense" with guns is irresponsible. Stupid and dangerous, actually.

Ok, to your survey.

1. Yes.

A1. Two.

A1a. A Remington 12-gauge, and a "Saturday Night Special" that is not operable, I found behind some bricks in a house I was renovating, wrapped in 1960 newspapers, had checked by a cop, and kept as a conversation piece. But it's a gun. Probably once a murder weapon.

A1b. The shotgun has a cable lock through the action, is in a clumsy zippered case, stuck in a corner behind my desk at home. The ammo is in another closet, well out of reach of children, in an old Maxwell House can. I think I have about fourteen rounds left, about half punkin balls, half bird shot, half buck.

A1c. Let's think about this idea of "needing a gun for defense" for a second. I live surrounded by an organic dairy farm, on a dirt road, in a house we

don't lock, that is watched by the neighbors, who know every living soul around here for forty miles, including their genealogy. So if I was to shoot somebody, chances are about 999 to 1 it would be a big mistake. And then, at what point in the situation to you shoot? If you are going to pull out a gun, as is well known, you don't talk, you shoot! And you don't try anything fancy, you aim for the biggest target.

So when do you do that?

Relatives of mine were invaded in their home once, by a couple of pistol-waving meth freaks. It was very bad. Of course they attacked when nobody was there who knew where the guns were or how to use them. Some were roughed up quite a bit and traumatized. But **NOBODY DIED**.

I've been personally held up, shot at and had people on drugs coming in my house waving guns. I've been robbed of all my money and beaten severely. But context is everything: I've also been beaten up by policemen waving guns. Most of the people I've known who carried guns were killed by guns.

The likelihood of this sort of thing happening to you is very small. The likelihood of the home invader turning out to be a couple of dead Jehovah's Witnesses or a maimed meter-reader is extremely high.

A gun narrows down your possibilities to the point where you have no imagination or creativity, 'cause the gun saves you the trouble of exercising those capacities. When you get frightened, you won't even see what you're looking at. You could hit a kid. Your own kid, maybe.

Oh, sorry. The survey.

A2. Three years ago.

A2a. I shot a porcupine that fell out of the pear tree into the dog yard. I then spent about 12 hours burying it and picking up the trail of quills with pliers so the dogs wouldn't inhale them.

2. Reasonable regulation would consist of:

- Federal, not State law, same for everyone;
- Tracking the ammo: micro-marking each bullet so that it is traceable to the buyer;
- Installing RF chips on all firearms so they can be tracked by anybody with a

transistor radio who wishes to avoid armed people;
-Background checks on all purchases (guns and/or ammo), and retroactive background checks: keep your guns if you register them ALL and pass the background check;
-Outlaw "concealed carry";
-Insurance on all firearms, similar to car insurance, based on "driving record" and real actuarial statistics.

Fat chance. We might as well end war. Hmmm... there's a thought...

These days I don't believe the "issue" is guns at all. It's fear. It is in the interest of the corporate elites who own and run this world to have the general population scared out of their wits. It's good for business, not insignificantly for the gun business, but most other business too. They want You to be afraid of your own shadow, keep your head down.

If you get a gun, you will be even more afraid. A gun is a statement that says, "I don't trust my own ability to handle uncertain human situations, so I'm willing to risk killing somebody."

Here's my personal solution to all this: my gun is not an option except if another porcupine shows up in the wrong place. I'm not even going to remember I own it, if some questionable person shows up in my house. I might die. So what? I am a thousand times more likely to die in my sleep. A million times more likely to die by mistake. A gazillion times more likely to die in my car. People are dropping like flies. It's what we do, more or less.

I am happy and at peace.

#7 - Female 10:51 p.m. Feb 8

1. Do you (and/or someone else in your own home or dwelling) own a firearm(s) ("guns")? Yes or No

Does it have to work??

A. If you answered "Yes"

1. How many firearms are in your home or dwelling?

a. What kind(s)?

Hubby's great-grandfather's shotgun is around here somewhere; it doesn't work. (Also a BB gun - which probably doesn't count?)

b. Where are weapons kept?

Hubby has no idea where he put it.

c. If you needed the gun for defense right now, how accessible and/or useful would it be to you?

Accessible/useful, not so much. I personally plan to hit any burglar over the head with the heavy crystal clock my kids gave us.

2. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU PERSONALLY USED A FIREARM?

a. For what purpose?

When I was a young girl and my uncle decided I needed to fire his rifle. It kicked me back on my can and I decided I never wanted any more to do with guns... Purpose: to please the darn uncle.

2. For everyone:

If you could decide what would "reasonable regulation" of firearms look like?

I think that "reasonable regulation" would look about exactly like what Obama proposes.

Any suggestions about how to make this survey a bit more useful, including questions?

Maybe something along the lines of:

Have you ever used a gun for self-defense (against a person), and in what manner? Or do you **personally** know of someone who has (other than in war - or one of those stories heard from your cousin about his neighbor's dentist's brother or the like)? Versus, how many people have you been **personally** acquainted with who were killed by guns (except for war); how many were due to domestic violence?

(I'll answer that last one right now - 2 women and 3 small girls, victims of domestic violence)

This is one of the problems with the usual "gun surveys," by the way. If they ask, Do you have a gun in the house? well, I guess we do. If they ask if you've ever shot a gun, well, I have...

(And I know your REAL reason for the survey, Dick. You are secretly compiling a list of gun owners for the gov'mint so they can come and take our weapons away.)

I'm going to add a comment. I just read the newspaper account of that madman running around So. California gunning for cops. And what struck me is that it said the police shot and wounded two women who were delivering newspapers because their vehicle looked like that of the

shooter. Lordy, when the trained police are so quick on the trigger that they shoot poor innocent women - wouldn't the world be a really fun place if everybody was "packin' heat"??

#8 - Female Feb. 9, 2013 9:37 a.m.

- 1) No
- 2) Universal background checks, ban on assault weapons and large capacity magazines, limit the number of guns any one person can buy in a month, trigger locks, gun safety classes...

#9 - Female Feb 9, 2013 10:30 a.m.

Question 1 -- No.

Question 1A2 - No

Question 2: If you could decide, what would "reasonable regulation" of firearms look like?

Universal background checks, universal registration of firearms, use of assault weapons restricted to police, military.

Question 3

1) Niece's boyfriend fatally shot himself, after threatening to kill my niece and their baby.

2) My very young cousin (5 or 6 years old) shot and killed his sister while playing with daddy's gun.

3) Two of the people in my writing group had parents who committed suicide with guns.

4) One of my editors at the Duluth paper killed himself with a gun (his wife found the body).

I probably can think of others, because I grew up in Colorado, where suicide by gun is very common, as are fatal hunting accidents.

#10 - Female Feb. 9, 2013 11:09 a.m.

dick, you might put this survey into survey monkey...it's something that a lot of people use and I THINK!! it is fairly easy to set up. Thanks for doing this.

1. Do you (and/or someone else in your own home or dwelling) own a firearm(s) ("guns")? Yes or No

NO and they aren't allowed in my home and have also instructed granddaughter on what to do if she's ever in a home and sees a gun lying

around. Did same thing with my daughters.

1A2. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU PERSONALLY USED A FIREARM?

a. For what purpose?

Probably when I was a teenager with my brother shooting at targets--probably a couple of times.

2. If you could decide, what would "reasonable regulation" of firearms look like?

1. a data management collection system that connects all law enforcement agencies in the US with information on people who have been identified as people who shouldn't have guns.

2. more services for people with mental health issues--i think of the parents of the man who murdered two women in Iowa--they had been trying to get help for years and had problems getting that help. It has to be so scary for parents who know they have a potentially dangerous child and where do they go for help?

3. Limit the rounds of ammunition

4. enforce whatever laws are on the books now

5. I could say ban assault weapons, but I honestly don't know enough about guns to even really know what that means.

6. Continue the registration of concealed weapons.

7. Review the laws related to perpetrators of domestic violence and ban them from purchasing guns whether or not they used them in the domestic assault.

8. Review the laws related to DUIs and repeat offenders---the mix of poor judgment of using alcohol and driving should equate to a ban from using guns.

3. Have you ever used a gun for self-defense (against a person), and in what manner? Or do you personally know of someone who has (other than in war - or one of those stories heard from your cousin about his neighbor's dentist's brother or the like)? Versus, how many people have you been personally acquainted with who were killed by guns (except for war); how many were due to domestic violence?

No, I haven't and I don't know of anyone.

#11 - Male, Feb. 9, 2013 12:05 p.m. writing from United Kingdom

All firearms are forbidden in the UK even policemen don't carry them -- except in special circumstances of course.

#12 - Female, Feb. 9, 2013 12:10 p.m.

1. No
2. Universal background check – assault weapons only to be used by police and military, could not be sold to an individual unless all the “insides” were removed so it would be for collectors only.

#13 - Female, Feb. 9, 2013 12:59 p.m.

1. Yes.
 - 1.A. One
 - 1.A.a. Ancient Colt Automatic calibre 25 purse/pocket handgun (last patent date listed: 1917)
 - 1.A.b. Locked up
 - 1.A.c. Not useful (don't know for sure it's not loaded--plan to take to local police dept. to verify it's unloaded)
 - 1.A.2. Never
2. Reasonable: banning semi-automatic assault weapons & clips larger than 10; background checks--no loopholes; improved mental health programs/services and the availability of mental health problems information in background checks.
3. Never used; no personal acquaintance ever killed by a gun.

#14 - Male Feb. 9, 8:29 p.m.

1. No
 - 1.A.2 My goodness...I think 1986, hunting.
2. No private ownership of "assault weapons" (what constitutes an assault weapon would be very broadly defined). No one gets to carry a gun in public, for any reason other than hunting or target shooting, except law enforcement. (I figure that over time, interest in huntin' & shootin' will continue to decline.) In a vehicle, they have to be in the trunk, or something like that.
3. No

#15 - Male, Feb. 10, 2013 10:13 a.m.

1. No.
 - 1.A.2. With my son in an Indian Guides event.
 - 2b. There should be few, they should be under lock and key, they should have trigger locks, there should be very limited magazines, they should be outlawed, except by the police, in any public building, concealed carry laws should be repealed, and background checks for purchases should be strict

and there should significant waiting periods between purchase and acquirement. I have virtually no sympathy for the usual gun advocate arguments. And the second amendment is quite adequate to enforce all my concerns if it is accurately interpreted and enforced.

3. No one and never.

#16 - Male, Feb 10, 2013 11:20 a.m.

1. No

2. Ban Assault weapons (defined very clearly with little room for creative ways around the ban). Universal background checks. Ban large capacity magazines. Require training for gun purchasers. Ban cop killer or armor piercing bullets. Require longer waiting period before purchases of guns. Limit on number of guns bought in a certain time period. Require periodic re-registration of gun purchases with a new background check. Hold on to gun purchase records, shared widely among law enforcement. Require mental health checks on gun purchasers with much better sharing of mental health records of those who mental health professionals believe should not own guns. Ban possession of all guns for anyone convicted of domestic abuse or who has a restraining order against them. Dramatically increase funding for mental health professionals and guidance counselors in schools (elementary, secondary and post-secondary).

3. No and No

#17 - Female, Feb 10, 2013 1:57 p.m.

ANSWERS IN CAPITAL LETTERS.

1. Do you (and/or someone else in your own home or dwelling) own a firearm(s) ("guns")? Yes or No YES

A. If you answered "Yes"

1. How many firearms are in your home or dwelling? I DON'T KNOW I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE GUNS WE HAVE, THEY ARE A COLLECTION MOSTLY FROM MY HUSBANDS DAD.

a. What kind(s)? MOSTLY RIFLES, BUT THERE IS ONE PISTOL

b. Where are weapons kept? LOCKED GUN CABINET, AMMUNITION STORED UNDER SEPARATE LOCK, IN A SPARE ROOM

c. If you needed the gun for defense right now, how accessible and/or useful would it be to you? NOT AT ALL

2. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU PERSONALLY USED A FIREARM? ONCE, MANY YEARS AGO

a. For what purpose? TO TARGET SHOOT SO I'D AT LEAST HAVE A FEEL FOR A FIREARM IN MY HANDS.

2. For everyone:

If you could decide, what would "reasonable regulation" of firearms look like? ALL GUNS REGISTERED, UNREGISTERED GUNS CONFISCATED.

3. Have you ever used a gun for self-defense (against a person), and in what manner? NO Or do you personally know of someone who has (other than in war - or one of those stories heard from your cousin about his neighbor's dentist's brother or the like)? NO Versus, how many people have you been personally acquainted with who were killed by guns (except for war); ONE How many were due to domestic violence? ONE

#18 - Female, Feb 10, 2013 11:42 p.m.

Dick, my answers to your survey

1. Yes: I own my husband's rifle he carried during the war and a pistol he brought back from Germany

a. I am not sure what kind.

b. The weapons are kept securely in a closet in the basement. I don't think anyone knows they are there.

c. It wouldn't be useful at all,

2. I have never used a firearm

2.I would find it very reasonable if anyone who owned or wanted to purchase firearms, (any kind) would be required

to register then and pay a fee. We pay for owning a car or a home.

Everyone should have to take training to own or use a firearm --- even for hunting. get a license similar to a

driver's license and renew it every year or two. Children should have to be 16 so they would understand

the responsibility that goes with using a firearm

Assault weapons should be outlawed, except for law enforcement and armed forces.

Consider: Our forefathers in 1778 enacted a law that went so far as prohibiting the storage of A LOADED GUN in any building in Boston.

It seems in 1778 this law was NOT considered of taking anyone's freedom it was considered keeping people safe.

History of the past has shown us that liberty without regulations can lead to anarchy.

#19 - Female, Feb 11, 2013 6:32 a.m.

1. No.
2. Background checks for everyone, private and other sales. Insurance required for everything but the simplest guns for hunting. Mandatory military service or National Guard and possible other program before one can own more than the simplest hunting rifle or shotgun.
3. No. No. One.

#20 - Female, Feb 11, 2013 8:12 a.m.

Dick, a late responder! I've never owned or used a firearm and am not aware of any self-defense uses that make ownership of assault weapons remotely useful or reasonable.

As for "reasonable regulations," I get frustrated that we continually fail to properly DEFINE THE PROBLEM CORRECTLY first. As with 9/11 - what did we do? We took away toenail clippers and knitting needles, but that wasn't the problem. The problem was a duh - completely unsecure cockpit. Fix that, and you have no takeovers. The other problem was ignoring ground agents like Colleen Rowley who rang the bell over things like people taking flying lessons and not being interested in learning how to land. So - solutions should have included a better way to make use of and analyze ground agent information - has that happened? Or are we still obsessed with taking baby bottles away from moms?

So - reasonable is, to me:

- For the problem of massacres, you need to simply stick to the rules of hunting game and limit clips and rounds. For ducks and deer, you can only have like 3-6 bullets in your gun. Apply that rule to all other guns, and we would not have large scale shootings by individuals; I would stick with limiting rounds and keep pressing the precedent we have for hunting animals. If you limit ROUNDS, then by default you limit assault weapons as they aren't designed to shoot 6 bullets only.
- I think whenever you say BAN, we get a fringe argument. We have more long-term success with regulation and taxation to shape behavior. Bans can be overturned pending the whim of the day.

- For the problem of guns in the wrong hands, I would require background checks (we have to do background checks at churches whenever adults work with you, for goodness sakes - we run checks on people all the time and that's a very mainstream safety check.) I also think all gun owners should have insurance; if your gun is lost or stolen or you sell it, you need to report it, because if it's used in a crime, you could be held responsible. This would greatly limit guns just being handed around. And of course... I would tax the hell of guns and ammunition. They are a proven public health problem costing society a good deal of money, and we the taxpayers should be reimbursed for the risk they pose to us. Really, it's treating guns like alcohol. We no longer ban alcohol - that didn't work. But we severely regulate it. We regulate when people can drink and how much they can drink. We don't say that people's freedoms are limited when they aren't allowed to drink 10 beers and go out and drive - we recognize that some behaviors need to be regulated due to the effect they have on others in society. This is the same for guns. You can have them, but there should be more limits on how they are used.

- We need to take mental health off the table for THIS ISSUE. I like the idea of more support for mental health, but I think it confounds the greater issue of gun violence. While I do think it's a challenge to ID and keep all guns away from mentally ill people, it's much easier to limit access to ammunition, and to slow the import of guns into the wrong hands through insurance and taxation - making guns a regulated purchase like cars, and treating the issue more like alcohol.

My two cents! Thanks Dick

#21 - Female, Feb 11, 2013, 8:43 a.m.

Thanks for keeping this conversaton going...I think violence her at home is the domestic parallel to war abroad.

1. Do you (and/or someone else in your own home or dwelling) own a firearm(s) ("guns")? No*

1A2. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU PERSONALLY USED A FIREARM?

OVER 40 YEARS AGO: FAMILY MEMBER WANTED TO TEACH ME TO SHOOT. I HAD ONE BLESSEDLY BRIEF "LESSON"

2. If you could decide, what would "reasonable regulation" of

firearms look like?

UNIVERSAL BACKGROUND CHECKS (INCLUDING GUN SHOWS) banning ONLINE SALES; PRIVATE SELLER TO FAMILY MEMBERS BUT, liability FOR SELLER IF IT TURNS OUT THAT PERSON WAS FELON OR MENTALLY ILL & SHOULDN'T HAVE GUN; bigger penalties FOR "STRAW PURCHASER" & FOR ILLEGAL GUN TRAFFICKING; limits on bullet clips TO 10.

3. Have you ever used a gun for self-defense (against a person), and in what manner? Or do you personally know of someone who has (other than in war - or one of those stories heard from your cousin about his neighbor's dentist's brother or the like)? Versus, how many people have you been personally acquainted with who were killed by guns (except for war); how many were due to domestic violence?

* Have seriously CONSIDERED buying a gun for self-defense TWICE in my life: after surviving violent crime followed by being STALKED by the perpetrator and getting MINIMAL POLICE response. ULTIMATELY DID not BUY GUN DUE TO SENSE THAT W/ptsd (& IN THE 2ND CASE, VISION LOSS) IT WAS not responsible FOR ME TO HAVE A WEAPON. HOWEVER, I FULLY SUPPORT SOMEONE HAVING A GUN FOR SELF-PROTECTION--especially women WHO STILL can't get proper police protection WHEN VIOLENCE IS DIRECTED AT THEM.

#22 - Male, Feb 11, 2013, 8:45 a.m.

Do you (and/or someone else in your own home or dwelling) own a firearm(s) ("guns")? Yes

A. If you answered "Yes"

1. How many firearms are in your home or dwelling? Six

a. What kind(s)? Four Shotguns and two rifles

b. Where are weapons kept? In a gun safe

c. If you needed the gun for defense right now, how accessible and/or useful would it be to you? Not very accessible. The gun safe is bolted to the cement floor in my garage.

2. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU PERSONALLY USED A FIREARM?

· In November

· For what purpose? Deer Hunting.

2. If you could decide, what would "reasonable regulation" of firearms look like?

- Full background check
- No military style automatic weapons
- Strict limitations on handguns
- Limiting the number of rounds in clips
- Some form or registration on weapons

3. Have you ever used a gun for self-defense (against a person), and in what manner?

- No

Or do you personally know of someone who has (other than in war - or one of those stories heard from your cousin about his neighbor's dentist's brother or the like)?

- Suicide (4 people – all adult male)

Versus, how many people have you been personally acquainted with who were killed by guns (except for war);

- Suicide (3 people – all adult male)
how many were due to domestic violence?
- None

#23 - Female, Feb 12, 2013 8:13 a.m.

No, I do not own a gun. I did not grow up with any. My oldest brother wanted to go hunting, my dad asked the neighbor to take him because he did not want to be involved. He shot the slowest and oldest squirrel out there and we had to eat it after my mother tried to cook the tough old thing. If I would have had to have a gun in the classroom to shoot I would have left teaching...One time a guy parked his Cadillac in front of school to chase his girlfriend, she ran and hid under a table in the kindergarten classroom. We pulled the shades and Police came.

THE PROVOCATIVE STATEMENTS LEADING TO THE ABOVE SURVEY:

1. Feb. 8, 2013 10:45 a.m.

"My good North Dakota buddy, who describes himself as a progressive moderate

conservative (he is against obamacare completely, but he is for 100% universal care; **he owns 26 guns but is completely for the gun control issues**) (it's a north Dakota thing)

He is a farmer, but also a business owner and manager..."

2. Feb 8, 2013 1:14 p.m.

"Get a bunch of calm reasonable people together who actually know something about firearms, hunting and gun safety. All the anti-firearm leaders I have heard or read what they say are clueless. they have no knowledge of firearms. The knowledgeable reasonable people would be able to come up with sane practical laws that would work. The radicals on either side would not be happy but the laws would work and function.

The problems [a long-term friend from another state] writes about are not national problems but local and state problems. Better state laws and enforcement by the state DNR [Department of Natural Resources] is what is lacking there. What has [the friend] done? Does he know what the state regs are? Has he complained to the state DNR? What is the state law concerning hunting on land owned by others? e.g. in WI it is the hunters/trappers/foragers responsibility to know where he/she is. On private land without permission Is trespassing. IN WI large game hunters are required to wear their license which has large numbers on their backs. Just write down the number and call the sheriff. It could go on and on as to smart laws in states where hunting is a big part of the culture.

His problems aren't national problems! They are local/state problems. So do something about it!"

3. Feb 8, 2013 3:31 p.m. (Female 2nd term Legislator in e-letter to constituents, in second term on MN House Public Safety Committee.)

"Guns Legislation: As many of you know, the House Public Safety Committee has been hearing testimony and debate this week on several DFL bills related to gun violence. We met for nearly 12 hours from Tuesday to Thursday and heard many perspectives.

Hundreds of concerned citizens from across the state descended on the Capitol to voice their concerns about the bills which they believe violate the Second Amendment. I have serious concerns with many of these bills. Some would allow confiscation without compensation. Others would cause regulatory problems for our law enforcement departments. And still others would create unfunded mandates on our cities."

ADDITIONAL COMMENT received from one of respondents earlier in this post.

February 10, 2013 5:28 p.m.

I've tried to speak personally about the gun issues, because I think there is way to much finger-pointing going on. I've done my share of it.

Without addressing the contextual questions, the foundational assumptions, the unexamined beliefs I hold, I cannot usefully address the gun questions. All that's left is "is not, is so..." This amounts to "boo" and "yay," which is all a player on the court (or legislator) can hear from the stands, and does not further serious action.

As one who has been subjected to violence, has carried firearms in civilian life, has worked occasionally as an unarmed personal security operative, and who has studied deadly arts for nearly three decades, I recommend that anybody considering a weapon for defense do some introspection on this question:

*

How does carrying a weapon change what I can see as possible or necessary when things get intense?

*

Here is what I know - not opinion, but first-hand, been-there-and-done-that knowledge that I trust and live by:

Nothing can make anybody safe, just as nothing can make anybody happy. Safety and happiness cannot be predicted, ever. They are an attitude, and as such you already have all the say there is in the matter. Be happy and safe now.

If I am afraid, a gun will not make me safe, but will put everyone in range at risk of being shot. Including, especially, me.

I have often come up with creative and effective ways to deal with a situation when unarmed (100% so far: I'm still here).

Carrying a deadly weapon greatly reduces my range of perceived

alternatives.

Here, on the other hand, is my opinion:

Weapons force us into a (false) trade-off between facing uncertainty, and being the arbiter of life and death. I have found it is not worth it to me. Any way I look at it, being armed is much, much riskier in many, many ways, and the main impact is immediate, not contingent on circumstances.

A small percentage of the population has any training with weapons, not to mention conflict resolution. A smaller percentage might be expected to make the right choice about when to shoot another human being most of the time (don't). We hope most of them work for law enforcement.

I should not have dignified the drunks with guns in my woods as "hunters." I'm sorry about that. I know lots of good people who hunt, but don't see them because they don't make noise, they are hunting wild game, and protecting our forests from hordes of hardwood-killing deer. We need them.

But when the gun lobby counts up all the "responsible gun owners" anybody staggering through my woods leaving a trail of beer cans and shell casings gets counted. Without universal background checks (even with them), how would anyone know different?

Slogans are usually a waste of time, but here is one I've always liked:

Against abortion? Don't have one.

As to guns, you can probably paraphrase my current attitude.

TALLY OF ALL RESPONSES - SUGGESTED ACTIONS
(Interpretation of Dick Bernard, others may interpret differently)
n=23

In order of frequency of mention:

14 - Background checks

10 - Ban Assault/Military style weapons from public use

9 ea - Registration of guns

Penalties for misuse/liability insurance

8 - Ban clips over 10 rounds

6 - Assorted mental health concerns/qualifiers

- 4 - Ownership based on need, not right
- 3 ea - Waiting period/Secure storage
Mandatory training for owners
Strong Regulation and Taxation
- 2 ea - Enforce existing laws
No weapons in household where someone disqualified lives
Federal legislation more important than and supersedes State
Tracking and regulating ammunition
No concealed carry
- 1 ea - Adopt all Obama administration proposals
Armed guards at schools
Buy back weapons
Ban armor piercing bullets
Revocable license required similar to drivers license
Strict limits on handguns