

GUN CONTROL
Sunday
December 23, 2012

Over the years, I've heard hundreds of arguments about why guns should be regulated, and how such regulation should be implemented. Unfortunately, I've yet to hear a single solution that takes into consideration the numerous reasons for owning a gun, as well as the violence the regulations purport to eliminate. Unfortunately, this appears to be one of those problems in which there aren't any solutions, but which people will nevertheless find themselves arguing anyway until they're blue in the face, and in some cases, getting themselves into physical altercations. Before anyone proceeds any further, perhaps we need to examine the reasons for owning guns in the first place, and then you might better understand the need to hold onto them.

The other day, PBS featured part of an interview with New York City Mayor, Michael Bloomberg. In it, he made the statement that no one other than law enforcement or the military should be permitted to own any weapon capable of firing more than a single bullet per pull of the trigger, or any round capable of piercing a bullet-proof vest or armor. In support of his argument, he said that, in hunting a deer, there's no need for an armor piercing bullet, as he can't remember the last time he seen a deer wearing a bullet-proof vest, and that if you couldn't hit the deer with the first pull of the trigger, then God must not have wanted that deer killed.

I have no clue how Mayor Bloomberg knew God's intentions in this matter. Maybe being Mayor of a city the size of New York gives you some sort of special powers, but putting that to the side for a moment, his argument completely fails to take into consideration the reasons for the second amendment of the US Constitution, the right to bear arms. Contrary to popular opinion, our founding fathers didn't create this amendment because of the need to defend against marauding Indians and outlaws. It was created to ensure that the citizens of this country would always be able to rise up and throw off an oppressive government necessary. With this in mind, the issue of armor piercing bullets and assault weapons takes on a whole new meaning, a meaning which Mayor Bloomberg seems to have completely missed in his interview. But then, I'd expect no less from a puppet of the government.

If your goal is to defend you or your home from an unwarranted violations, then chances are pretty good you're going to want something that's not only easily accessible, but which is easy to use in a confined space. Pulling out a rifle or an assault weapon might be a bit of an overkill, and there might not be enough space to maneuver your weapon quickly in the confined spaces of your home. If you're going hunting in the woods, a handgun is the last thing you're going to want to use. You're going to want something accurate and reliable from a distance, something like a rifle. However, both of these weapons are extremely inadequate when going up against people armed with assault weapons of their own, tanks, armor piercing rounds, helicopters, etc. And if you're one of those people who're saying that this will never happen in this country, then you've already missed the point. The fact that this is a well armed society is enough to make even the most bloodthirsty government stop in its tracks and rethink its intentions. Knowing that their citizens is armed to the teeth is probably the best deterrent in the world, not just for our own corrupt government, but for all the other countries who can't stand us. They know that if they do invade us, they have to fight through the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast guard, National Guard, militias and the individual citizens, all of whom have weapons and are more than willing to use them to defend their country, their home and their lives.

Let's put aside the issues of corrupt governments and foreign invaders for a moment. There's another reason to own a weapon, and that's to defend yourself from those who seek to make a victim out of you. For the most part, these criminals are always going to be better armed than you ever dreamed of, a problem that will only worsen the more guns are "regulated." Believe it or not, guns act like one of those blue ADT® signs you so frequently see in people's front yards. The average criminal is going to see the sign and move on to an easier target. He's not stupid. He has no wish to unnecessarily risk getting hurt or caught, so why take a chance? It's not as if there aren't plenty of other victims who are either unable or unwilling to defend themselves.

"The proof," as they say, "is in the pudding." Take a look at the shooting that took place in Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. According to the media, the shooter waited until his mother was asleep, stole her gun, killed her and then took her guns and ammunition with him to an elementary school. Everyone wants to know **why** he did what he did, but the answer couldn't be any plainer to me. Begin with how he obtained his weapons. Rather than simply stealing them when his mother's back was turned, he waited until she was asleep before killing her. He didn't want her coming after him. And **why** did he wait until she was **asleep**? **BECAUSE SHE HAD GUNS!** Not only that, but he knew better than anyone that she possessed not only the skill, but the dedication to use them to protect herself or someone else. That's good incentive, no matter how sane, or insane you are.

Once he'd shot and killed his mother, he was torn between the feelings surging through him. No doubt that part of him was horrified by his actions. Somewhere deep in his mind, he knew his life had just changed forever. At the same time, he felt a massive surge of power and control coursing through his veins, and he wanted more of it before the police took him into custody. With these thoughts running through his mind, he needed a target rich environment, but one he'd be safe in until he'd finished. Notice that he didn't choose a high school filled with gang members or a police station. Instead, he chose a place sure to be filled with innocent victims, people **incapable** of fighting back. He knew Sandy Hook Elementary, knew it because his mother worked there, and because he'd attended school there as a child. It's as simple as that, and there's no need to further complicate things as so many in the media have tried to do.

No matter what your feelings on gun control, we can all agree that this was a senseless tragedy, one that should have been avoided, and which needs to be avoided in the future. The question is **how** to avoid it. Some want to push for stricter gun control laws, but if someone really wants a gun, you can bet they'll find one. After all, isn't it possible for a child to go out and buy cocaine on their neighborhood street corner? And that's a drug that's completely illegal, not just restricted to certain qualifying adults.

So what's the solution? I don't think that there's any single answer, but rather, a combination of things we can do. For starters, we need to rethink the construction of our schools. Things like secured sally ports with remote monitoring and armored doors is an excellent start, as are bulletproof windows. I'd also ensure that the doors are capable of being secured from the inside, and again, the doors and walls would be capable of keeping most ammunition from penetrating into the classrooms.

Inside the classrooms, there would be a closet, used for traditional purposes when there's not an emergency, but when the situation calls for it, the closet could double as a panic room. In these closets, and behind the teachers's desks, there would be a hidden, wall mounted safe equipped with a gun and some ammunition. Those teachers who were interested would receive firearms training, and in the event of an emergency, they'd have the time they needed to hide their students in the closet/panic room and take their weapon out of the safe. In the even they didn't have an opportunity to retrieve the weapon from the safe behind their desk, they'd have another chance to get one from the safe in the closet/panic room.

No matter how we feel about gun ownership, we can certainly agree that at the end of the day, if someone wants a gun bad enough, (s)he's going to get one. With this in mind, perhaps it's time we started thinking about how to protect ourselves when we see them coming, instead of complaining that he shouldn't have been able to get one in the first place. Don't get me wrong though, if you can come up with a better solution, one that addresses the needs of the gun owners and those who want to regulate gun control, then I'm all ears.

Shawn L. Perrot CDCR# V-42461
CMC-East Cell# 6326
P.O. Box 8101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93409-8101

Page 4
Sunday
December 23, 2012