
Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 02:41:08 GMT

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

I am just preparing everyone for the worst. John Kerry wants to turn over gun registration in the United States to the U.N. and give them control over our guns. The U.N. will most likely attempt to disarm all the U.S. citizens. Most of you know that Americans feel very strongly over their right to bear arms. When the U.N. begins attempting to disarm Americans this will most likely result in a massive rebellion against the government and U.N.

I personally will join the rebels and begin to fight the government. It is my right to own a gun. A right that all Americans have had for over 250 years. I don't see how changing it now will result in any good or change. Criminals will get guns now matter what, and after the disarming that will most likely never happen peacefully, the normal American will have no protection from criminals and crime will likely rise.

Quote:

NRA And Brady Campaign Agree On One Thing: John Kerry Is Anti-Gun

Friday, October 08, 2004

On October 1, in a true testament to his anti-gun record, Senator John F. Kerry (D-Mass.) earned an endorsement from the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence (formerly Handgun Control, Inc.). For once, the Brady Campaign and NRA are in total agreement--John Kerry is the most anti-gun presidential nominee in history!

"If there was any doubt about John Kerry's true position on the Second Amendment, his endorsement from the Brady Campaign should make it clear," said NRA-ILA Executive Director Chris W. Cox. "John Kerry stands with other gun banners like Dianne Feinstein, Ted Kennedy, and Chuck Schumer--each one commended by the Brady Campaign for their anti-gun records.

"It's shameless and dishonest to spend your entire career voting against gun owners, then try to repackage yourself for a presidential bid," added Cox. "A true hunter and sportsman would never seek and accept the endorsement of groups who advocate banning guns, banning ammunition, banning hunting, and licensing and registering law-abiding gun owners."

The following are just a few of Kerry's votes against America's sportsmen and gun owners:

* Kerry voted to ban most center-fire rifle ammunition, including many common rounds used by hunters and target shooters (Vote No. 28, March 2, 2004).

* Kerry co-sponsored current legislation to ban all semi-automatic shotguns and detachable-magazine semi-automatic rifles, a gigantic step toward bringing Australian-style gun control to the U.S. (Signed on as co-sponsor of S. 1431 on Nov. 21, 2003).

* Kerry voted to hold the highly regulated American firearm industry legally responsible for the illegal acts of violent criminals (Vote No. 24, March 2, 2004; Vote No. 25, March 2, 2004).

* Kerry says, "I think you ought to tax all ammunition more, personally, I think you ought to tax guns." (CNN "Late Edition," Nov. 7, 1993).

* Kerry has a 100% rating from gun-control groups, and is called "a hero" by anti-hunting extremists such as PETA.

"Kerry's numerous anti-gun votes present a red flag for hunters and sportsmen, but this savvy voting bloc will not be fooled by election-year campaign tactics," concluded Cox.

For a full list of John Kerry's Second Amendment-related votes, please visit <http://www.nrapvf.org/kerry/default.aspx>.

MUST WATCH:

<http://www.nrapvf.org/multimedia/Player.aspx?ID=19> <--- About the U.N.

<http://www.nrapvf.org/multimedia/Player.aspx?ID=15> <--- About Kerry

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Aurora](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:09:54 GMT

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

But... he owns a chinese-made AK-47 copy... an illegal one...

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:15:13 GMT

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

where did you find that info?

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:18:14 GMT

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

Meh, there's nothing to fear from the United Nations. That incompetent world government can't even enforce its own resolutions when they've been violated twelve years in a row.

Besides, IF the U.N. tries doing anything to infringe upon the rights of American citizens, we'll simply withdraw all American funding of said world government, and the U.N. can't function when 85% of its total funds are taken away.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Aurora](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:18:14 GMT

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

<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/ic/2004/9/26/111356.shtml>

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:19:49 GMT

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

hydra1945Meh, there's nothing to fear from the United Nations. That incompetent world government can't even enforce its own resolutions when they've been violated twelve years in a row.

Besides, IF the U.N. tries doing anything to infringe upon the rights of American citizens, we'll simply withdraw all American funding of said world government, and the U.N. can't function when 85% of its total funds are taken away.

That is impossible if John Kerry becomes president.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:22:59 GMT

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

AuroraX0<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/ic/2004/9/26/111356.shtml>

sorry for the double post but, that story has already been proven false. Sorry Aurora.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:44:52 GMT

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

OH NO! NO MORE GUNS! Whatever shall people do!

:rolleyes:

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 04:28:57 GMT

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

warrantoOH NO! NO MORE GUNS! Whatever shall people do!

:rolleyes:

^^

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [Panther](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 05:00:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Seriously, the only reason guns are used in the US now are for murder and hunting. Neither of which are especially necessary... don't you think?

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 05:05:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Panther Seriously, the only reason guns are used in the US now are for murder and hunting. Neither of which are especially necessary... don't you think?
No, for protection too. Also, it's in our Bill of Rights. We have the right to bear arms...so we do.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [Panther](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 05:15:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It was originally intended for protection from enemy countries and American Indians. Now the threat is other Americans with guns <_<

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 05:20:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So what do you think removing guns from average American citizens is going to accomplish? Do you honestly think that it will help lower crime rates? Criminals don't abide by the law anyway. What makes you think that they're going to stop obtaining guns to hunt, kill, and commit crimes?

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 05:28:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bigjoe14 So what do you think removing guns from average American citizens is going to accomplish? Do you honestly think that it will help lower crime rates? Criminals don't abide by the law anyway. What makes you think that they're going to stop obtaining guns to hunt, kill, and

commit crimes?

Who the fuck is dumb enough to kill people with a hunting gun, I mean, wtf, even criminals here get their weapons illegally.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 07:01:19 GMT

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

DarkDeminThat is impossible if John Kerry becomes president.
Which is why he's going to lose.

warrantoOH NO! NO MORE GUNS! Whatever shall people do!

You should make that a more accurate statement by saying "Oh no, no more guns for law-abiding citizens! Whatever shall people do???"

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 11:50:53 GMT

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

Yes but what happens when the law abiding citizen gets into a domestic dispute?

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 14:36:56 GMT

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

I declare this to be the Ignorant Thread.

But anyways, the second amendment doesn't just say "The right to bear arms." It says "The right to bear arms in an organized militia." The second amendment is not there to protect your "right" to owning and operating an M-60 or a sniper rifle, it's there so that a community within the United States will always be able to protect itself.

Of course, the NRA doesn't want you to know about that.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 17:56:20 GMT

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

Quote:But anyways, the second amendment doesn't just say "The right to bear arms." It says "The right to bear arms in an organized militia."

Careful there, bud. That's not how the second amendment is worded- you are twisting the meaning by re-arranging sentences.

It says:

THE SECOND AMENDMENT A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

BIG difference. You would have people believe that one must be a part of a militia in order to own a firearm. The second amendment states that citizens may own weapons and IF NECESSARY use them in a militia. You either have a shaky grasp of how the English language works, or you are hoping that others do- either way, you are trying to pervert the words of an amendment to this nation's most sacred document.

A militia is defined as:

1. An army composed of ordinary citizens rather than professional soldiers.
2. A military force that is not part of a regular army and is subject to call for service in an emergency.
3. The whole body of physically fit civilians eligible by law for military service.

Paraphrasing that- A militia is a force of ordinary citizens who are fit for military service and may be called upon to serve in an emergency. If you are of draft age and not yet in the military, you may become part of the militia in an emergency. Contrary to popular belief, the National Guard is NOT the militia, as the National Guard is a trained military force under the control of the government.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:11:55 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngil declare this to be the Ignorant Thread.

Quote:Of course, the NRA doesn't want you to know about that.

You call this thread ignorant, then you make a statement like that? I declare YOU ignorant follower of Democratic propaganda.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:17:07 GMT

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

Guns suck, that's why there are no guns in Canada, or CRIME for that matter.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:18:48 GMT

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

There's no crime here? That's news to me.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:18:51 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngil declare this to be the Ignorant Thread.

But anyways, the second amendment doesn't just say "The right to bear arms." It says "The right to bear arms in an organized militia." The second amendment is not there to protect your "right" to owning and operating an M-60 or a sniper rifle, it's there so that a community within the United States will always be able to protect itself.

Of course, the NRA doesn't want you to know about that.

14 year olds shouldn't blindly read Liberal blabber. The U.N. and John Kerry what to remove our rights to hunting rifles, handguns, and of course you know anything that can be described as an "Assault Weapon." The assault weapon ban was passed to get the Liberals to shut the fuck up. I enjoy going to the shooting range with my dad and shooting targets for sport. I also like to know I have a gun in my house for protection. My dad is a reserve officer for the local police and he has gotten many death threats, and what are we going to do if we don't have a gun in the house and someone breaks in, in order to kill us all. The NRA was established in order to protect our right to bear arms.

glyde51Guns suck, that's why there are no guns in Canada, or CRIME for that matter.

As for that...

Crime has risen since Canda passed its small arms ban. I think Aprime can even agree with me on the fact that Criminals get their guns however they can.

* Canada: After enacting stringent gun control laws in 1991 and 1995, Canada has not made its citizens any safer. "The contrast between the criminal violence rates in the United States and in Canada is dramatic," says Canadian criminologist Gary Mauser in 2003. "Over the past decade, the rate of violent crime in Canada has increased while in the United States the violent crime rate has plummeted."

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,120638,00.html>

Fox News— Australia has also seen its violent crime rates soar after its Port Arthur gun control measures (search) in late 1996. Violent crime rates averaged 32 per cent higher in the six years after the law was passed (from 1997 to 2002) than they did the year before the law in 1996. The same comparisons for armed robbery rates showed increases of 45 percent.

— The 2000 International Crime Victimization Survey, the most recent survey done, shows that the violent crime rate in England and Australia was twice the rate in the US.

— Canada has not gone anywhere near as far as the United Kingdom or Australia. Nevertheless, their gun registration system is costing roughly a thousand times more than promised and has grown to be extremely unpopular, with only 17 percent of Canadians in a poll release this week supporting the system. Nor does the system seem to be providing any protection. The Canadian government recently admitted that they could not identify even a single violent crime that had been solved by registration.

Everyone wants to take guns away from criminals. The problem is that if the law-abiding citizens obey the laws and the criminals don't, the rules create sitting ducks who cannot defend themselves. While the debate is hardly over, gun control is just another example of government planning that hasn't lived up to its billing. And like other types of government planning, eventually its failures become too overwhelming to ignore.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:33:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can't agree with you, maybe if we were in the 90s I would, but now, everything has changed, trust me.

It isn't really a trend anymore in our criminal world, ever since we've got rid of the "motorized gangs".

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 19:35:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra1945

warrantoOH NO! NO MORE GUNS! Whatever shall people do!
You should make that a more accurate statement by saying "Oh no, no more guns for law-abiding citizens! Whatever shall people do??"

Nope, I had it right. The only reason to own a gun is to kill, or threaten to kill someone. Regardless of it being in the name of self defense or not. Besides, people who have committed crimes have the ability to own firearms as well, they are just more closely scrutinized.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 19:51:58 GMT

warrantohydra1945

warrantoOH NO! NO MORE GUNS! Whatever shall people do!

You should make that a more accurate statement by saying "Oh no, no more guns for law-abiding citizens! Whatever shall people do???"

Nope, I had it right. The only reason to own a gun is to kill, or threaten to kill someone. Regardless of it being in the name of self defense or not. Besides, people who have committed crimes have the ability to own firearms as well, they are just more closely scrutinized.

So should we ban the ownership of knives, or the ownership of any objects that have the ability to kill but are used for hobbies. Going to the shooting range is a family thing. It is my hobby to go out and shoot at targets. People collect guns because they are pieces of art. So before you start speaking out your ass again, think before you type.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 20:12:59 GMT

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

Types that are fine:

Culinary Knives: Primary use is for culinary-based actions.

Types that aren't:

All other knives: Primary use is for killing

Guns: Primary use is for killing.

Comparing apples and oranges won't get you anywhere. So before you resort to insulting, stop arguing incompatible points.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 20:31:59 GMT

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

I am trying to make the point that guns are just for killing. There are sporting rifles for shooting clay pigeons. Competition Hanguns for special competitions showing skills in shooting. You don't understand that you can't just label something like that. Rifles were originally made for hunting. Anything that has ever been developed for hunting has also been used to kill others. You won't fix the world by banning guns. Criminals will always get the guns no matter what.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 21:12:10 GMT

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

heh, where did I say they should all be banned? Nowhere.

I was just making fun of how Americans cannot be seperated from their precious. (And yes that is a Lord of the Rings referance)

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 22:00:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AprimeThere's no crime here? That's news to me.

That's because there's nobody there. If you try to commit a crime in Canada, they will be so happy for human contact that they will give you a traditional dinner.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 22:16:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think the UK should reintroduce guns for personal protection, gun crime in the UK has risen by over 35% in recent years, though many of the guns used in the UK are replica while the majority used in the US are real.

Guns for sports are already legal in the UK (I'd beat anyone in a Clay Pigeon shooting competition:P)

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 22:57:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have the right do bear arms. I am going to do so. I also find it funny that Kerry says he cares about his country and yet he tries to change the thread that the country is based on. Same goes for most liberals. The Bill of Rights was added as Ammendments so that they WOULD NEVER be altered... Why can't others get that into their heads? The stupidest argument I've heard is "times are different." You seriously don't think that our founding fathers thought of that? I'm sure it'd be ridiculous to imagine that the founding fathers knew that and decided to put it in the ammendments. :rolleyes:

Kerry doesn't love America, he loves Ketchup and money.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 23:08:32 GMT

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

Removing our guns is like de-clawing a cat. It shouldn't be done. The second amendment was devised on the premise that we should be able to defend ourselves from the government. Real suspicious that some of them want to take them away, isn't it?

Just as there are checks and balances in government, our guns are the checks and balances against the government.

Subject: Kerry is anti-gun.

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 01:41:38 GMT

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

I don't believe in conspiracy theories very easily, so I do not believe that either liberals or conservatives are out to ruin the country...

...however, I do believe that, in this case, one of the most fundamental rights in this country is being exploited and shat upon by politicians who would fuck anyone for a vote. They know they can get lots of votes by bashing guns and gun owners because most of the country refuses to develop their skills of logic and reasoning. They'll burn anyone and anything to get into office- if it weren't guns, it would be free speech (oh...wait a minute, politicians are already ripping on that! Silly me!), or right to privacy (oh, they do that too?), or cruel and unusual punishment (is there anything the fools don't get into?)...you get the picture.

It's not a conspiracy; it's a bunch of individual power grabs that just happen to be riding on the same bandwagon. They (members of the same party) would torpedo each other if they thought they could advance themselves by doing so.
