

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 12 Jul 2010 01:48:58 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15 wrote on Sun, 11 July 2010 14:29Carrierll wrote on Fri, 09 July 2010 00:21Hmm, we have strict gun control laws, and there are incidents about once every decade...

Not convinced.

The problem with using Great Britain as an example of how gun control "works" is that, while gun-related crime has gone down, the rate of violent crime has stayed pretty much the same. The criminals are just using different weapons now... and it's become illegal to defend yourself using any kind of weapon at all, even an improvised weapon that you only picked up because the other guy had a knife. Yours is the only country I know of that claims to have an epidemic of "knife crime"- and none of the laws that have been passed to deal with it have done any more good than the gun laws have. The sad fact is that attaching crime statistics to the type of weapon used only serves to associate all crime with that type of weapon in the minds of the people... with predictable results. "Save a life, bin that knife!" Right- until all the knives are gone and the criminals revert to something else. Pretty soon it'll be illegal to make a fist.

Of course, in Great Britain, there's also the issue of many people believing that authority comes down from the government rather than up from the people- thus whenever a new, more restrictive law gets passed, the average person shrugs their shoulders and says "they must have had a good reason." As similar as our societies may appear, we must remember that they are host to radically different cultures. Frankly, I'm surprised it took this long for the Supreme Court to produce a definitive Second Amendment ruling... or that a ruling was ever needed at all.

nikki6ixxlt is bad when undesirable people have easy access to some very dangerous, concealable weaponry. It then escalates to something worse when good, decent people need to buy those same weapons in order to feel safe.

It also means it's easier for crooks and criminals to send up arms and ammo to my country where firearms are heavily regulated. Because of that, more gang wars and power in the hands of outlaws in cities like mine and Toronto will make for more drugs heading down to your border in order to buy... firearms!!

I do love how gun control advocates always state it as "need to buy weapons in order to feel safe" as though the gun were a snake-oil cure. It is a tool- if you know how to use it, it will do what it was designed to do. Hiding under a bed makes you "feel" safe- guns give you the means to ensure your safety.

Regardless of whether or not the presence of a weapon escalates any given confrontation, the police cannot be relied upon to defend the people. There are not enough of them; hiring enough of them would bankrupt the municipality- thus when you really need them to be there, they often are several minutes away. Yes, most of the time the bad guy is just looking to make off with some of your stuff, but you have no way of knowing what their intentions are. They could be telling the

truth when they claim they won't hurt you if you hand over your wallet... but then again, they might just kill you to eliminate the possibility of you identifying them later. Every single confrontation with a criminal has the potential to kill you. I don't believe I'm ever going to be okay with the notion that it's somehow better to toss the dice and let them decide whether or not I live long enough for the cops to arrive.

As for guns crossing borders- first, banning guns in the US will not reduce crime in Canada. If your criminals want for weaponry, they will find other sources. Look at Mexico- despite what their government claims, most of the cartels' weapons are not coming from up here. Grenade launchers? RPGs? Sorry- they're as illegal here as there. Automatic weapons? Try again; they're so rare here that most gun owners have never even met someone who owned one. As for small arms, wanna guess which country Glocks, Sigs, HKs, Tauruses, Berettas, and half a dozen of the other most popular guns aren't made in? Do your bloody homework.

The absolute bottom line is that the threat of possibly being arrested if there just happens to be a cop near enough to respond in time (assuming you get the chance to call them at all) is not an effective deterrent. Streetcorner security cameras are no deterrent either- they'll be long gone by the time anyone makes an ID. The threat of immediate bodily harm or death, on the other hand, is a very effective deterrent. Yes, the bad guy will sometimes decide that he still has a chance after you produce a gun. Yes, the bad guy will sometimes still win. However, that is much better than the bad guy having success almost guaranteed. Remember that the scumbag wants to survive the encounter as much as the victim does; if he thinks he's going to be in danger of being killed if he picks you as his target, then more often than not he will choose not to target you.

Consider also that in order to make the news, any defensive use of a gun must include that gun being fired. Nobody cares about all the times the bad guy took off running the second it came out of the holster- which is, truth be told, what usually happens. Even notoriously right-wing Fox doesn't care to report such incidents- unless there's blood or at least a bang involved, it will never be seen on TV and you'd be lucky if it made page 5 in the paper.

You can keep your gun control. I'd rather be able to defend myself and the people I care about if some scum-sucking douchenozzle decides he's entitled to take what's ours- including, I might mention, our lives.  
bravo kind sir

---