
Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 20:56:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 29 April 2008 13:39Quote:Most homicide's are unintentional and happen when emotions are running high, when this happens it doesn't matter what type of person you are or how much gun training you have, emotions rule you, you do not rule them and when they take control of you, people suffer or die.

So every person is a potential murderer, given the right trigger? No, I don't buy into that. Certainly, there are circumstances which would cause each and every person to lose control of their emotions. However, it is not true that all capacity for rational thinking disappears when emotion takes over, and it is the choice to follow reason over emotion and regain control which defines the strength of a person's character. Anybody can just let go and allow their emotions to drive them to do horrible things- but knowing the difference between right and wrong and making a conscious decision not to allow that to happen is never beyond our ability.

Quote:The likely hood of you killing a person is increased when firearms are around and are accessible, this is a well known and provenfact.

Negative. The liklihood of you killing a person is entirely dependent on whether or not you allow your passions to usurp control from your brain. The temptation to kill will be present or it won't be based on what kind of person you are, not on whether or not you have the tools to make your sick impulses easier to carry out. Even if you're already a killer, having a gun around doesn't make you more likely to kill- it just makes it easier for you to kill. On the other hand, that same gun also makes it easier to prevent death- namely yours, your family's, and that of your fellow human being.

Quote:The same can't be said when firearms have been removed, the chances of you killing a person is reduced to a great extent when you do not have access to firearms or other weapons of deadly intent, this is also a well known and proven fact among expects in the field.

"Weapons of deadly intent?" You make it sound as if the presence of a weapon creates intent. I know for damned sure that isn't how it works with my mind, seeing as how I've a growing collection of weapons and haven't once had so much as an inkling of a desire to kill. How can you be so certain that it is true of anybody at all? Where is the evidence that the tool engenders in a person's mind the will to use it? Again, the presence or non-presence of a gun does not make a person more or less of a killer. Either the will to take a human life exists, or it doesn't- based on character.

Quote:This doesn't mean, if you remove or ban firearms, homicide in whatever form will stop, but the statistics of homicide with a firearm would drop like a bomb.

Funny, that, seeing as how the states and municipalities with the least restrictive gun laws also seem to have the lowest violent crime rates- with any kind of weapon or lack thereof, not just guns. Coincidence? Not really- the criminal mind is a selfish one, and the most basic selfish human impulse is self-preservation.

Quote:But firearms that are mag fed, drum fed, belt fed, high rate firing weapons, armour piercing bullets/shells, military sub-machine pistols/weapons, assault rifles and anything else that is a military class weapon and small pistols that can be easy hidden should be banned.

Oh boy, it's the "assault weapons" ban all over again. Mechanical differences, barring an actual manufacturing defect, do not in any way impact the lethality of a gun. Whether I have a silencer or a flash suppressor or a pistol grip on my rifle does nothing to at all to change the lethality of the bullet that comes out of the muzzle when I pull the trigger.

Fully automatic weapons, which are in an entirely different category, have long been illegal without a specially issued federal permit- and yet we see them used in violent crime all the damned time. What about those two whackos out in California that took on the entire LAPD for hours with drum-fed fully automatic weapons, you say? Guess what: neither of them had said permit. Those weapons were illegally owned. So are the weapons used in most of the gang-related homicides in this country, regardless of type.

On armor-piercing bullets- already illegal. Highly illegal. So are hollow-point rounds in many places, which-if you ask me- is rather silly since they (unlike armor-piercing or even standard ball ammo) have the least potential for pass-through and thus the least potential for collateral damage.

As for those easy-to-hide handguns? Well, they also happen to be a top-rate means of self and home defense. I'm profoundly grateful that you don't get to decide gun policy, because there are an awful lot of people who would be dead right now if you had your way- because you would have taken away the weapon that enabled them to kill or incapacitate their attacker.

Quote:Hunting Rifles, Shotguns, Range firing rifles, pistols for sport shooting, should be allowed, but with very tough rules.

I'm wondering how much of this wonderful plan of yours is based on personal preference and how much is rooted in practicality. Something tells me that these weapons are the ones you have an interest in shooting, and hence don't consider to be inherently dangerous. I could be wrong, of course, but It's more than a little suspicious that you'd allow weapons for every use except personal defense.

Quote:Firearms should be locked up in a metal box, ammo should be locked elsewhere, weapons should never be left loaded.

Yes, because a gun locked in a metal box with a full clip on board is definitely going to pull itself out and shoot somebody. The only reason the separate storage rule even exists is because some moron somewhere left a loaded gun in an unlocked case and someone else came and did something stupid with it. It doesn't even make sense- there's a pretty huge leap from unlocked to locked, and having to open two different cases to prepare your weapon makes it just that much harder to use it if you need it to prevent... well, you know, your own death. Or do you think that the scum breaking into your house has their gun in a locked case in their backpack, with its ammo out in the glovebox just in case? Here's an example of a rule that reeks of terminal stupid.

Here's my proposal: Keep your sporting weapons locked up away from their ammo- fine. However, keep your defensive weapons loaded and ready in a case that, while securely locked,

can be quickly unlocked if you need it- at which point you'd chamber a round from your already loaded mag and be prepared rather than still be fumbling for the ammo when Shady Bob busts down your bedroom door. As long as you don't hand out keys or combinations to people who you wouldn't trust with a gun anyway, you're never going to have a single problem with gun storage safety. Ever.

Quote:So, you enforce these rules on a state, how do you remove all the now very legal weapons, for the first month, everyone has a chance to hand them into your local police station, where you are registered and ticked off, anyone who is registered with a firearm and hasn't handed them in after this time, would get a visit from the Police to find out what the story is.

Or, instead of that- to borrow a quote- "You can have my guns when you pry them from my cold, dead fingers." The day my state sends police to come collect my guns is the day I cry foul- loudly- and pack up for greener pastures on the other side of the river. For that matter, I'd rather leave the country entirely than continue to live in it after guns were banned. Fortunately, it doesn't look like that will be happening any time soon because we have nice groups like the NRA who have the *ahem* political firepower to protect our rights to keep and bear physical firepower.

Quote:The whole process could take a few years to complete, since there is fewer weapons, crime with firearms, would also be reduced.

The process would take forever and a day to complete, and since there would be fewer people able to defend themselves adequately, crime would increase quite a bit. Meanwhile, the public-sheep that they usually are- would conveniently forget how much lower crime rates were when they *had* guns, and instead turn to Big Brother security solutions like they've got over in London. Smile for the camera, folks!

Quote:Since "people" think they need to protect themselves from the people who use guns for unlawful reasons, I would allow self-defence weapons like pepper spray be allowed or some other defence weapon that is none-lethal but very effective at disabling a person.

Pepper spray is only useful within knifing distance and tasers can be fired at exactly one target, and still at a very limited range. Both are great ways of dealing with single, unarmed assailants without recourse to lethal means... However, if you run into more than one attacker or *gasp* an assailant with a gun, you're really up shit creek without a paddle. A gun of your own makes a fine paddle in those shitty situations, but since you now don't have one because you're an honest, law-abiding citizen, you're fucked sideways.

Weapons as a means of self-defense, ranked by ability to incapacitate immediately and fully:

1. Gun
2. A friend with a gun
3. Taser
4. Club or Knife
5. Pepper Spray/ Mace. And some folks are resistant to it.

Quote:The system is not perfect but it would reduce death of criminals by firearms.

Fixed.

Oh gee, it looks like my cynical streak is showing again.

Nicely put.

Quote:5. Pepper Spray/ Mace. And some folks are resistant to it.
Lol Quagmire.
