

Questions for the Record from Senator Charles E. Grassley
Hearing on “Constitutional and Common Sense Steps to Reduce Gun Violence”
March 23, 2021

Dr. Suzanna Gratia Hupp

Former State Legislator and Author
Lampasas, TX

1. Thank you for sharing your terrible experience as a victim of a mass shooting. You are very brave taking this experience and using it to help others. What do you think it would be helpful for those who have not been in this situation to know?

This is a very difficult question to answer succinctly. To be as brief as possible, I think people need to understand that evil exists. One can argue that many of these predators come from bad homes/environments, or perhaps they are mentally ill and off their meds. But here’s the catch: at the moment that deranged person is leveling his weapon (whatever that may be) on your grandchild’s forehead, his “reasons” don’t matter. His home-life or mental health status aren’t important. And it is incumbent upon YOU, to protect the innocent life by any means you have available.

A handgun truly is “the great equalizer.” It gives the elderly lady in a wheelchair a fighting chance against the thugs wanting to rob/beat/rape her. A gun is not a guarantee, but it changes the odds.

2. When states and localities advertise areas where firearms are not permitted, do you believe this makes those locations safer?

I have known for decades that advertising an area as “Gun Free” is a neon invitation for people who want to rack up a high body bag count.

Nearly without exception, these dreadful mass shootings have occurred where guns weren’t allowed. If guns are the problem, why haven’t any of these events happened at NRA conventions, skeet and trap shoots, or the dreaded gun show...places where there are thousands of guns in the hands of law-abiding, Second Amendment-supporting men and women?

There have been so many incidents thwarted by a “good guy with a gun.” But they are largely ignored.

By the way, I have an idea for a bill that could prove to be interesting. I believe in private property rights just as I believe in the Second Amendment. That includes business owners. But I would love to see legislation that says if you take away my right to defend myself in your establishment, then you have taken on both the responsibility AND THE LIABILITY for keeping me safe. Let’s make it clear that families of victims in those scenarios have the right to financial compensation. I think the result would be more businesses rethinking their policies.

And finally, I would like to share with you that my husband is a PhD Neuropsychologist and specializes in forensics. He has been expert testimony on many capital cases and has been directly involved in the aftermath of several mass shootings. He firmly believes that most of these

shooters can be apprehended before the deed without violating established rights. He is currently working on protocol that we'd like to see put in place across all 50 states. I would be happy to elaborate if you would like. Your support and voice could make all the difference.

Thank you for inviting me to testify, and for the follow up questions. If I can be of future service, please don't hesitate to reach out.

Senator Josh Hawley
Questions for the Record

Dr. Suzanna Gratia Hupp
Special Advisor, Office of the Texas Attorney General

1. Should the popular framing of gun violence as a “public health” issue, in order to do justice to all relevant data, better account for defensive gun use by law-abiding firearms owners?

The question is not entirely clear to me, but I will be happy to make some general statements regarding the subject. Without knowing all of the background as to why “gun violence” has been placed in the public health category, I certainly have misgivings and suspicions. It certainly appears that it was classified that way to send a policy message that guns are in the same category as disease, something which completely negates the multiple tens of thousands of defensive, life-SAVING uses each and every year. Dr. Gary Kleck (PhD), a self-proclaimed liberal who didn’t like guns (from my own conversations with him), did research that suggested guns are used defensively 45 times more frequently than they are used in crime. But of course, that is rarely mentioned.

The CDC has no more business making policy regarding my Second Amendment rights than they have regarding my freedom of speech or religion.

2. In your view, why do proponents of increased gun control so regularly advocate for measures that, on their face, would not have prevented or mitigated any particular mass shootings?

There is no short answer to this question, and this answer is a bit of an oversimplification, but I believe there are two primary reasons for their response.

- A. I think that after a horrific event, it is human nature to seek to control the future and prevent further harm. First, there are those terribly short-sighted people that just want to “do something.” They have no idea what to do, but they have to “DO SOMETHING.” So for them, going after the tool a killer uses is just easiest, and deflects from their lack of imagination. (I will say that this group could easily be deflected from gun control legislation if they were given something to vote FOR and that they could show their constituency that they “did something.” I mention a mental health protocol at the end.)
- B. Second, there is a smaller, more dangerous group of people that recognize it as an opportunity to strip citizens of their power, at which point they can be lorded over as subjects instead of Free People. (I don’t think there are a bunch of guys in a smoky room plotting to take over the world. But if you make the ground fertile enough, I do think those people exist.)
- C. I think there is also a third group of people who understand that the government/police cannot protect you in those moments when seconds matter. These folks also have a basic knowledge of history and often know why the Second Amendment was put in place to begin with.

3. In your view, what are the principal misunderstandings harbored by American legislators about firearms regulation in the United States?

Short of requiring they pass a basic history test before taking the oath of office (wouldn't that be fun?), I believe there are probably just a few "misunderstandings" that the media helps proliferate that could be corrected with a consistent response to anyone that misleads, either intentionally or unintentionally.

A. Nearly every interview or conversation I have with a reporter, or anyone else, starts with semi-automatics. It flabbergasts me the percentage of educated people who, when I ask them (and I encourage you to do so) they think that semi-automatics are machine guns. If you ask, they'll say things like, "Well, you know, you pull the trigger and it goes RAT-a-TAT-a-TAT-a-TAT..."

Ex. A lawyer friend of my son's asked him, "Ethan, nobody wants to take away your guns. But surely you don't think people should have semi-automatics?!" I had to step in and explain to her what a semi-automatic is. And I also told her (the lawyer) that every single woman I know that carries, carries a semi-automatic. So yes, in fact, you ARE talking about taking my guns.

If you took a poll of your fellow legislators, I'll promise you that the majority think an AR-15 is fully automatic. (By the way, these are popular with women because they don't have a big kick/recoil.)

B. Same lack of knowledge about the made-up term, "assault weapon." We seem to have conceded that term. And of course, it is meaningless (but dangerous to leave uncountered.). I think this is one reason why people get very suspicious. When there appears to be no logic applied to the legislation, gun owners get defensive. Again, if you poll your cohorts, you will find that the majority think that the AR in AR-15 stands for Assault Rifle. It doesn't.

C. I do not think that the average Congressman has any idea how often personal firearms are used successfully in self-defense. They should hear it over and over again. (In advertising, they say someone has to hear something 54 times before it sticks.) And of course, these incidents are under-reported because often, the firearm just needs to be displayed or reached for, and the bad guy disappears.) Frequently, a police report isn't even made.

4. What, if any, steps should Congress take to ensure that firearms manufacturers and dealers are not cut off by financial services institutions for allowing Americans to exercise their Second Amendment rights?

I have an idea for a bill that could prove interesting. I believe in private property rights just as I believe in the Second Amendment. That includes business owners. I would love to see legislation that says if you take away my right to defend myself in your establishment, then you have taken on both the responsibility and the LIABILITY for keeping me safe. Let's make it clear that families of victims in those scenarios have the right to financial compensation. I think the result would be more businesses rethinking their policies. To restate, while I don't think the business owner is responsible for the shooting, they DO have culpability if they take away my ability to defend myself and my family.

And finally, I would like to share with you that my husband is a PhD Neuropsychologist and specializes in forensics. He has given expert testimony on many capital cases and has been directly involved in the aftermath of several mass shootings. He firmly believes that most of these shooters can be apprehended before the deed without violating established rights. He is currently working on protocol that we'd like to see put in place across all 50 states. I would be happy to elaborate if you would like. Your support and voice could make all the difference.

Thank you for inviting me to testify, and for the follow up questions. If I can be of future service, please don't hesitate to reach out to me.