

Gun Violence Testimony

My name is John Marciano. I am a fifteen year veteran of the U.S. Navy. Much of my service was in Navy Coastal Warfare and Maritime Civil Affairs. I was deployed twice since 9/11; to Kuwait in 2004-05 and to Africa in 2010. During this time I received a substantial amount of training and operationally employed small arms of various calibers. My written testimony today is focused on the functionality of various weapons and how that functionality might apply to gun violence.

Despite the confusion engineered by gun control groups with terms like "assault weapon", civilian owned semi-automatics are functionally quite different than true military grade weapons. Military "select-fire" weapons are capable of shooting at 750-900 rounds per second. A trained shooter can perhaps fire 60-90 rounds from a semi-automatic rifle.

[This](#) rifle is functionally just as deadly as [this](#) rifle. They are both semi-automatics and in the hands of an evil spree-style killer will do similar damage. The components that are often banned on semi-automatic "assault weapons" are purely cosmetic or have no bearing on the lethality of the weapon.

- Despite what is shown in the movies, pistol grips only allow for easier-long term carry of a rifle. Shooting from the hip is neither more accurate nor more deadly with a pistol grip versus a traditional rifle grip.
- Flash suppressors do not hide a muzzle flash completely. They just reduce the flash to minimize night vision damage while shooting at night. Muzzle breaks only prevent muzzle rise and allow for more accurate shooting. Both banned features are completely meaningless when spree-style killers shoot innocents from across a room.
- Collapsible stocks do not make a rifle measurably easier to conceal, but do allow for a shooter to customize a rifle to fit his or her arm length.

As for weapon magazine sizes, restricted magazine capacity will hurt defenders far more than it will hurt aggressors. An aggressor, be he (or she) a home invader, a spree-style killer, or just an average "lifestyle" criminal will almost always have the element of surprise. He will be physically and psychologically prepared for combat. He will often have avenues to illegally acquire standard capacity (i.e. more than 10 round) magazines. Should he only have low capacity magazines (i.e. 10 rounds or less) he will carry more of them to inflict maximum damage.

A defender will almost always not have the element of surprise. He (or she) will likely not be physically or psychologically prepared for combat. A law abiding defender will be restricted to the low capacity magazines. This restriction will most definitely hurt the defender. Whether it's a homeowner in the middle of the night or a CCW holder protecting his family, restricting the capacity of the defender's weapon will put him in a distinct disadvantage. In addition to the challenges and obstacles of self-defense under stress, perhaps fighting after just being woken up, in one's underwear, barefoot, groggy from sleep, an added obstacle of restricted magazine capacity is added by the state will do harm to law-abiding citizens.

In conclusion, I urge you to uphold the right to self-defense guaranteed by both our state and federal constitutions. I too want to see want to see a reduction in gun violence, but as it has been shown in the past, rifle cosmetics and magazine size restrictions do not accomplish this.