
Subject: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 15:48:52 GMT

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

A man bought some ammo for his shotgun at his local walmart in San Diego, walmart's gun/ammo policy says that all guns and ammo cannot be returned once bought, the man wanted to return his shotgun ammo but couldnt, he told employees in the sporting area that he would be back to kill them, he then later loaded his shotgun and "returned" his ammo by shooting it all at walmart in their parking lot, no one kileld, no one harmed. later a swat team of police came to the man's house after several people complained and had given police the man's licence plate, the police then arrested him after 8 hour stand off at his house.

<http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/metro/20070909-1009-swat.html>

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 16:06:06 GMT

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

What an idiot.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 16:09:37 GMT

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

I just bought my first shotgun from walmart a month ago, I was astonished that they let me buy buckshot with the shotgun! Thats just asking for a turn around robbery.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [_SSnipe_](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 18:53:05 GMT

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

RPG ftw ;P

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 19:38:54 GMT

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

Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 19:45:54 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 14:38 Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Maybe for defending yourself... But I do semi-support that. A tazer or something could do better if you find a robber or something at your house.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 19:50:52 GMT

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

No, not even for defending yourself. Thats not a reason in my book to have a gun. Something that will cause harm but wont kill is the right way to go, something like a tazer/stun gun.

Whats to stop someone from going to a shop, purchasing a gun and then to turn around and hold them up? Makes no sense.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 19:51:23 GMT

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

I support having guns, I mean not really for using them or having them in your house, unless you go hunting, then you NEED a gun, some people say well ban guns, allow bow n arrows.....soon you'll start seeing people being killed with an arrow xD

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 19:55:42 GMT

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

As a born Texan I would of course lean towards freedom of guns. I do however think that you need to complete several courses and pass a mental competency test before you are allowed to own a gun.

As is it right now I can just walk in to any store in America and buy just about anything above a handgun and walk out in the street within 15 minutes of purchase.

This is bullshit, I hate it but the obliv has to have his guns and would be perfectly willing to earn them.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 20:02:54 GMT

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

I agree with Oblivion. Freedom of guns should not be restricted but strict courses must be taken by a prospective buyer before the purchase.

There are SO MANY rules and regulations and practices that go along with having a gun. A person must be exposed to all of those before being allowed to own a firearm.

IMO, buying guns should be treated like how driver licenses are issued. People can't protest about that...they must take the test to earn the license. Likewise, prospective gun buyers must take long strict courses and pass a mental/social test.

To walk into a store and buy a gun and walk out in 15-60 minutes is just bullshit.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Viking](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 20:10:49 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 14:38 Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Yeah, I will enjoy to hear you say that when the zombies start eating you.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [scarabguy](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 21:33:56 GMT

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

i agree with defence, but something like an ak-47 is NOT DEFENCE!
maybe a handgun, but no machine guns! but i think you dont need a GUN for defence, go learn some martial arts or something, they work better.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 22:44:04 GMT

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

This reminds me of ninja vs gun, ninja did all this kung fu and beat the guy up, then when the guy had the chance, he shot the ninja and won.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 22:53:38 GMT

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

scarabguy wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 16:33i agree with defence, but something like an ak-47 is NOT DEFENCE!

mabye a handgun, but no machine guns! but i think you dont need a GUN for defence, go learn some martial arts or something, they work better.

Martial Arts isn't much for long range. If a robber comes in your house, and he's the other side of the room or the end of the hallway, it'd be a bit hard to kick or hit him from where you are standing.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 22:59:37 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:38Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

That is such a stupid thing to say. If regular people aren't allowed to have guns, then only the people that shouldn't have guns will have them. You react so quickly to an isolated incident that common sense is impeded.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:09:09 GMT

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

Viking wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:10Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 14:38Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Yeah, I will enjoy to hear you say that when the zombies stat eating you.

So funny it went in my siggy!

BlueThen wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 17:53scarabguy wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 16:33i agree with defence, but something like an ak-47 is NOT DEFENCE!

mabye a handgun, but no machine guns! but i think you dont need a GUN for defence, go learn some martial arts or something, they work better.

Martial Arts isn't much for long range. If a robber comes in your house, and he's the other side of the room or the end of the hallway, it'd be a bit hard to kick or hit him from where you are standing.

Well, scarab is definitely right about the AK-47 and high-powered assault weapons. You don't need those for defense...should be only for avid gun collectors and the military.

But martial arts? WTF? Most citizens don't exercise!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:26:47 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:02

To walk into a store and buy a gun and walk out in 15-60 minutes is just bullshit.

Er, isn't there a 3-day wait of some sort?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:28:06 GMT

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

nope.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:30:16 GMT

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

Well, when did they change that?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:33:40 GMT

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

cmatt42 wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 18:30Well, when did they change that?

I am not sure...the 3 day-waiting period was initially proposed by someone in Congress...it never went through. I may be wrong.

Eitherway, in my state (PA), there is no waiting period.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:38:18 GMT

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

Jecht wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 23:59Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007

15:38Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

That is such a stupid thing to say. If regular people aren't allowed to have guns, then only the people that shouldn't have guns will have them. You react so quickly to an isolated incident that common sense is impeded.

I mean guns shouldn't be allowed full stop. Allowing some random person to own a gun is just asking for trouble.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 23:38:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No waiting in NC SC or Texas, the waiting period is for handguns only as far as I know.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cncnick13](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 00:14:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wow what a waist of ammo!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 00:17:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cncnick13 wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 19:14hi i idiot are back

Well this is why you shouldn't have GUNS.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cncnick13](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 00:19:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well im just saying!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 01:11:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The single best deterrent to crime is an armed and trained general populace. Nothing stops aspiring felons quite like the knowledge that they'll more than likely end up dead if they act on their impulses- nothing. Guns are the proverbial genie in the bottle- there's no way to rid society of them, and if you enact legislation to prohibit gun ownership then the only people who will be unable to acquire them are people who obey the laws in the first place. The bottom line is that a person hell-bent on crime will find the means to commit that crime regardless of what the law says, and the police are by and large a reactive force (they act after a crime has already been

committed)- without a reliable protective force in place (and many, myself included, would be somewhat put off by any authority with that much power), the next best thing is a gun. There doesn't exist a single non-lethal or less-than-lethal defensive weapon or technique which has yet been able to rival a gun for the fast, decisive, and utterly final elimination of a threat. People have been known in extreme situations to shrug off pepper spray, tazers, and just about any hand-to-hand defensive move, but a bullet in the head stops anything- period.

Yes, there are and always will be morons who slip through the cracks and use guns to do harm to the innocent- however, it is important to note that violent crime rates are lower overall (not just for gun crimes, but all violent crimes) in areas which have enacted right-to-carry legislation- whereas other areas which have enacted handgun bans or all-inclusive gun bans have some of the highest crime rates on record- places like Washington D.C. and New York, for example. Ever wonder why Sweden, a country where nearly every adult is armed and trained, has the lowest crime rate of any country in the world? There is no better deterrent to crime than death, as cold as that fact may be. Criminals are by and large selfish creatures by nature, and they stand to gain very little from a populace armed, willing, and able to defend against their actions.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 01:32:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I believe all guns should be pink, and restricted only to women.

Not only are chicks with guns a turn on for some men, but seeing as women are the 'fairer' sex, they should be the ones who are heated.

Plus, women tend rationalize their actions better than men (still scientifically debatable). If this guy were a lady, and wasn't a former NASA astronaut, I doubt he/she'd have done this.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 01:37:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow this was meant to be a lol thread where we all make fun of this stupid guy, and it becomes a debate, move it to heated topics and debates then lol.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 03:09:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I guess because guns are a serious and a sensitive subject...that's why people became all serious. Surely, this retard must be punished for what he did.

Anyway, LOL.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 07:20:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Remember that 11 year old that got killed last week?

A gun did that.

Still support selling guns without a license now?

That's what I thought.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Memphis](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 08:24:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oblivion165 wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 12:09I just bought my first shotgun from walmart a month ago, I was astonished that they let me buy buckshot with the shotgun! Thats just asking for a turn around robbery.

Shotgun at Wallmart....

I was a little surprised at some banks offering you a gun when you choose one of their products but selling guns at Supermarkets is lunacy. I could perhaps understand it in some areas where people hunt but in other areas I just don't see the logic. I also sigh when people say 'I have a gun since it protects me from other people with guns' as I simply don't think that is a valid reason at all. Guns are all over the place yet you don't find everyone else with this same mindset. I'm not anti-guns since they have a use in sport and hunting but for protection I just don't think that is so.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 10:50:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 03:11The single best deterrent to crime is an armed and trained general populace. Nothing stops aspiring felons quite like the knowledge that they'll more than likely end up dead if they act on their impulses- nothing. Guns are the proverbial genie in the bottle- there's no way to rid society of them, and if you enact legislation to prohibit gun ownership then the only people who will be unable to acquire them are people who obey the laws in the first place. The bottom line is that a person hell-bent on crime will find the means to commit that crime regardless of what the law says, and the police are by and large a reactive force (they act after a crime has already been committed)- without a reliable protective force in place (and many, myself included, would be somewhat put off by any authority with that much power), the next best thing is a gun. There doesn't exist a single non-lethal or less-than-lethal defensive weapon or technique which has yet been able to rival a gun for the fast, decisive, and utterly final elimination of a threat. People have been known in extreme situations to shrug off pepper spray,

tazers, and just about any hand-to-hand defensive move, but a bullet in the head stops anything-period.

Yes, there are and always will be morons who slip through the cracks and use guns to do harm to the innocent- however, it is important to note that violent crime rates are lower overall (not just for gun crimes, but all violent crimes) in areas which have enacted right-to-carry legislation- whereas other areas which have enacted handgun bans or all-inclusive gun bans have some of the highest crime rates on record- places like Washington D.C. and New York, for example. Ever wonder why Sweden, a country where nearly every adult is armed and trained, has the lowest crime rate of any country in the world? There is no better deterrent to crime than death, as cold as that fact may be. Criminals are by and large selfish creatures by nature, and they stand to gain very little from a populace armed, willing, and able to defend against their actions.

Now, please tell me, that in my country, the Netherlands, you are safe? Unless you got a special license you can't get a gun, and that license only allows you to carry it in a special locked case between your home and the shooting club. Also, before you can get one they'll look into your (criminal) records etc, additionally, you can't get the gun until you have proven capable to use it properly, at the shooting range.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:10:04 GMT

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

Actually with a test or licensce you can still kill people, just because you pass those requirments it doesnt mean your going to be a good person and not use them to kill others, in the USA they do a background check in gun shops and check your social security, you could come with a fake SS number and they will approve you.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:18:26 GMT

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

AoBfrost wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 09:10Actually with a test or licensce you can still kill people, just because you pass those requirments it doesnt mean your going to be a good person and not use them to kill others, in the USA they do a background check in gun shops and check your social security, you could come with a fake SS number and they will approve you.

Err no.

When the clerk of court or a license gun dealer does a background check the name given is always checked against their database. You wont just be able to put in another number because the computer will instantly flag it.

Also the background check is done off of your drivers license, not your social security card.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:21:11 GMT

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

RyuRemember that 11 year old that got killed last week?

A gun did that.

Still support selling guns without a license now?

Yup. My rights are inalienable, in my opinion. Isolated incidents are going to happen. Accidents happen.

Should we rid of automobiles? They kill more innocent people per year than guns do. Still support manufacture of automobiles?

Yes? That's what I thought.

Edit: I would support having to own a gun license in order to purchase a weapon, but the license should be the equivalent of a driver's license. You have to know how to operate the gun, and know the laws regarding operation, but no background checks or anything more in-depth.

RyuThat's what I thought.

No, it's not.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:39:08 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 14:21RyuRemember that 11 year old that got killed last week?

A gun did that.

Still support selling guns without a license now?

Yup. My rights are inalienable, in my opinion. Isolated incidents are going to happen. Accidents happen.

Should we rid of automobiles? They kill more innocent people per year than guns do. Still support manufacture of automobiles?

Yes? That's what I thought.

Edit: I would support having to own a gun license in order to purchase a weapon, but the license should be the equivalent of a driver's license. You have to know how to operate the gun, and know the laws regarding operation, but no background checks or anything more in-depth.

RyuThat's what I thought.

No, it's not.

However, this WASN'T an accident. How many people get killed by a car by purpose and how many get killed by a gun by purpose.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:47:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Caveman wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 09:39cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 14:21RyuRemember that 11 year old that got killed last week?

A gun did that.

Still support selling guns without a license now?

Yup. My rights are inalienable, in my opinion. Isolated incidents are going to happen. Accidents happen.

Should we rid of automobiles? They kill more innocent people per year than guns do. Still support manufacture of automobiles?

Yes? That's what I thought.

Edit: I would support having to own a gun license in order to purchase a weapon, but the license should be the equivalent of a driver's license. You have to know how to operate the gun, and know the laws regarding operation, but no background checks or anything more in-depth.

RyuThat's what I thought.

No, it's not.

However, this WASN'T an accident. How many people get killed by a car by purpose and how many get killed by a gun by purpose.

That's irrelevant. It's obvious that there are more murders by gun than automobile. That's not the issue, as Nukelt pointed out. Those who are doing the shooting are, generally, criminals. Those criminals don't purchase their guns legally. Eliminating the ability for a law-abiding citizen to own a gun doesn't stop the criminal from owning a gun.

If we're talking about murders committed by people properly licensed for automobile and guns, I'd say the amount is about equal. People do maliciously run each other over in a fit of rage.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:50:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well said, cheesesoda.

I find it disgusting that people say guns should be removed because IT is causing problems. The gun did not commit the crime but the irresponsible idiots wielding it.

No one seems to understand what individual responsibility is. Those who want guns removed because it kills people are simply ignoring the facts. Oh yeah...let's put the multi-billion dollar industry out of business because it automatically solves everyone's problems.

How many kids end up dead after playing with guns? Whose fault is that? The gun manufacturers? BS...it is the fault of the idiot parents/guardians for not keeping their guns locked away out of sight and reach.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 13:54:27 GMT

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

My liberal buddy understands that concept. :\

Micheal: If you outlaw guns then only outlaws will have guns.

Me: exactly

Me: why don't more liberals understand that?

Micheal: dunno

Me: covering your eyes and ears does not make gun violence disappear

Micheal: nope

Me: "IF WE PRETEND THAT YOU CAN'T BUY A GUN, THEN GUN VIOLENCE DOES NOT EXIST"

Micheal: Security through obscurity

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 14:17:56 GMT

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

I hate it when people quote other famous quotes without even an attempt at citation.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Caveman](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 14:32:33 GMT

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

Yes I agree that its down to the person who has the fucking gun in his hand. The gun didn't pull its own trigger, however, to go into a shop and walk out 15 mins later with a pistol is STUPID. You sure as hell can't do that over here.

From my understand I am a sane person. So if I lived in the US I could probably goto the shop and purchase a gun? Now I know im not going to walk out of the shop and hold some old granny for her purse that probably has like \$10 in it. But if I was at home and lets say my best friend has been sleeping with my girl. I am fairly certain that the thought of shooting him would go through my mind a good few times, which could lead into something that I would later regret. If I didn't have the gun in the first place then the thought wouldn't have had been there.

That is what im trying to say. Most of us here are sane normal people but if someone pushes the right buttons, god knows what will come over you.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 14:45:32 GMT

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

5 year old boy can't sleep, goes down the stairs and grabs something to drink. Father hears something and thinks it's a burglar.

Father A has a cell phone next to his bed

Father B has a shotgun next to his bed

Guess who has most risk of killing his own son, cheesosoda? And don't say this never happened before... oops: accident?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesosoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 14:49:32 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 10:32But if I was at home and lets say my best friend has been sleeping with my girl. I am fairly certain that the thought of shooting him would go through my mind a good few times, which could lead into something that I would later regret. If I didn't have the gun in the first place then the thought wouldn't have had been there.

Wait, so it's the gun's fault that you can't deal with your anger? Yes, let's blame the gun for that! This goes right back to my automobile argument. You could murder your friend with your car. By that argument, automobiles should be illegal.

It's called PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY. Just because you CAN do something doesn't mean that you should. Just because I have a tongue doesn't mean I should go around licking people. Just because I have hair doesn't mean I should rip it out in a fit of rage. Let's shave everybody's heads and cut off their tongues!

Yes, a gun would make it EASIER to kill your best friend, but if you want to kill him, you're going to do it regardless of what you have to use. Whether it be a car, bat, knife, your fists, or the HORRIBLE gun.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 14:50:54 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 10:455 year old boy can't sleep, goes down the stairs and grabs something to drink. Father hears something and thinks it's a burglar.

Father A has a cell phone next to his bed

Father B has a shotgun next to his bed

Guess who has most risk of killing his own son, cheesesoda? And don't say this never happened before... oops: accident?

Personal responsibility. One would think you would say, "I HAVE A GUN" to any intruder, not just fire blindly into the dark at some shadowy figure, especially if that shadowy figure is 4' tall.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 14:56:43 GMT

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

You don't seem to understand, theres a point where personal responsablity isn't a factor anymore because you're so enraged. You don't think. (Yes this is your fault) but once you reach this point its kinda hard to stop and think.

What im trying to say is, Guns are designed to kill people, cars aren't. I'd rather have someone beat the shit out of me because I pissed them off to the level of no return than to get shot by him because he has a gun that he just bought 15mins ago for a store.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 15:01:51 GMT

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

If the guy is so mad he's not thinking, he won't just "beat the shit out of you." He will beat you to death. Or suffocate you. Or kill you in many other ways that don't involve a gun.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 15:03:16 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 10:56You don't seem to understand, theres a point where personal responsablity isn't a factor anymore because you're so enraged. You don't think. (Yes this is your fault) but once you reach this point its kinda hard to stop and think.

What im trying to say is, Guns are designed to kill people, cars aren't. I'd rather have someone beat the shit out of me because I pissed them off to the level of no return than to get shot by him

because he has a gun that he just bought 15mins ago for a store.

No, you don't understand the concept of personal responsibility, then. Your actions are your own REGARDLESS OF YOUR MENTAL STATE. Sure, it's more understandable why you would react a certain way in a situation, but it still doesn't change the fact that YOU did the act.

Again, if we use your logic, automobiles could be used in the same fashion. What makes that any better? Because automobiles serves an alternate purpose? Guns server an alternate purpose than to murder people. They serve to protect others, and they're also great for recreation.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 15:13:27 GMT

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

I have pistol that I carry in my pocket (recent mugging just one building over) that I've had since I was 13 and I haven't shot one round out of it in those 7 years.

This is a very nice apartment complex and even it has the occasional crime. Some people walk around with guns like a kid with a walkie talkie. They think they have some power or authority and want to show it so they take any chance they can to use it.

Any and all decent gun safety course cover those types of situations. They teach you how to keep your cool and use a gun safely.

Now keep in mine that my handgun is very illegal in 3 ways, so that does make me hide the fact of ownership a lot more but never once shooting it in 7 years shows that I can handle myself and use a gun wisely.

Big Note: Yes I have shot many, many other guns in my life. Growing up in Texas requires you to have a gun. When I was a kid the sheriffs office would even train kids on gun safety to ensure that the kids would be safe and that the parents would trust their kids with a weapon.

Texas summers are like so: (Lake dallas Texas, just north of Dallas.)

113 degree summers and animals in order of quantity: Snakes, Scorpions and Tarantulas. You had to be on your toes and know how to use a gun incase you got in a situation that required one.

The rules as I remember them:

Ages 8 and under - No guns at all and adult required supervision just to play in the woods.

Ages 9 - 11 BB Guns with a certain amount of power

Ages 12 - 15 Pellet Guns

Ages 16 and up - .22 Caliber Rifles, CB caps only.

As long as your gun and age fit then you had no trouble from johnny law carrying them around your neighborhood or around the woods where us kids played. It was just the way of life.

I don't know how many snakes I've killed as a kid but I never once shot one just to shoot, the high

temperatures made them pissed off and they didn't mind chasing you to show you just how mad they really were.

The other two seemed to always corner you in your own home. Scorpions are the worst, they are not afraid of you at all and they ALWAYS trap you somehow.

EDIT: Oh and I forgot to mention that never once did I hear of a kid shooting another kid in our neighborhood. Snake bites and Scorpion stings out the ass but even as kids we all knew it was not a toy.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 16:09:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 08:21
Isolated incidents are going to happen. Accidents happen.

Who the fuck kills a 11 year old by accident and doesn't admit to it?

It's obvious he was murdered.

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 08:21
Should we rid of automobiles? They kill more innocent people per year than guns do. Still support manufacture of automobiles?

Obviously, Now, If people weren't retarded to drink alcohol and drive at the same time, them figures would be reduced alot.

Also, Looking both ways and using traffic lights to cross the road helps alot, Unless you're an idiot and have a death wish.

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 08:21
Edit: I would support having to own a gun license in order to purchase a weapon, but the license should be the equivalent of a driver's license. You have to know how to operate the gun, and know the laws regarding operation, but no background checks or anything more in-depth.

Okay, So a nursery shouldn't be allowed to do background checks on someone they're about to employ? no?

The police shouldn't do background checks on people they're about to employ?

You don't know who you're selling the gun to, Back ground checks can tell you a little about what the person could do with the weapon.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 16:12:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 15:50Well said, cheesesda.

I find it disgusting that people say guns should be removed because IT is causing problems. The gun did not commit the crime but the irresponsible idiots wielding it.

No one seems to understand what individual responsibility is. Those who want guns removed because it kills people are simply ignoring the facts. Oh yeah...let's put the multi-billion dollar industry out of business because it automatically solves everyone's problems.

How many kids end up dead after playing with guns? Whose fault is that? The gun manufacturers? BS...it is the fault of the idiot parents/guardians for not keeping their guns locked away out of sight and reach.

All I'm saying is this: in the USA, where every dumb fuck can get a gun, you have loads of accidents with guns. As if that's not bad enough, how often can you actually use a gun to protect yourself? I'm not talking about your home because, wtf do I care about some idiot that wants to steal my stuff? I surely wouldn't want to kill him. Of course, it might differ a bit on what he's taking, but as long as it isn't personal stuff, the insurance will pay. For me that's not worth the risk anyway. Besides, because everyone can get a gun, what makes you think the criminal doesn't have one? He has nothing to lose, as you might kill him. He'll now probably kill you first. On a side note: how often you get robbed when you're home?

In the Netherlands you do have burglary of course, just like anywhere else. But not more then in other countries where you can easily legally get a gun. Also, you're saying that criminals can always get a gun. Perhaps this is true, but here you know that if someone is found to have a gun, he is a criminal and will get arrested. Also, in the USA there will be many many more guns, simply because everyone has one. Thus, the burglar we just mentioned can steal your gun, and there you go, another gun in criminal hands.

on your last point: if you keep your gun safely locked away, how can you (quickly) use it when there is a situation you can solve with a gun? So one way or another, that doesn't work. Now if you want to kill innocent children, be my guest, as long as I don't have to be a part of it.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 16:43:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryu wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 12:09cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 08:21

Isolated incidents are going to happen. Accidents happen.

Who the fuck kills a 11 year old by accident and doesn't admit to it?

It's obvious he was murdered.

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 08:21

Should we rid of automobiles? They kill more innocent people per year than guns do. Still support manufacture of automobiles?

Obviously, Now, If people weren't retarded to drink alcohol and drive at the same time, them figures would be reduced alot.

Also, Looking both ways and using traffic lights to cross the road helps alot, Unless you're an idiot and have a death wish.

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 08:21

Edit: I would support having to own a gun license in order to purchase a weapon, but the license should be the equivalent of a driver's license. You have to know how to operate the gun, and know the laws regarding operation, but no background checks or anything more in-depth.

Okay, So a nursery shouldn't be allowed to do background checks on someone they're about to employ? no?

The police shouldn't do background checks on people they're about to employ?

You don't know who you're selling the gun to, Back ground checks can tell you a little about what the person could do with the weapon.

You people suck. Let's take away all of my liberties because someone else might get hurt, and some people might do that purposely. Oh-fucking-well. It's life. Shit happens. Get the fuck over it and move on. Just because the government makes it law doesn't mean it changes anything, and it doesn't. Not by much, anyways.

Business employing people is different than a business selling a product or service to consumers.

If the business wants to ensure that their customers have a squeaky clean record, they should be able to do so. However, it's not the government's job to decide for the business.

Again, the more people that own guns, the less violence is going to happen. If you have a 1 in 2 chance that you're going to encounter someone with a gun, are you going to be entirely confident in attacking that person, especially with bystanders with the same chance of owning a gun? I don't think so. As Nukelt said, criminals are selfish. They only care about themselves, so they're not going to do anything to put themselves in harms way.

Sure, there's always going to be exceptions to the world, but wrapping the world up in bubble wrap isn't going to make the world any better. It's going to suffocate people, and it makes for a dull existence. If you want to live in a bubble wrap world, then do that to yourself, don't make my government do that to me when I can handle myself. I don't care if people can't handle themselves in the same manner I can. If they want to fuck with me, then I can deal with them.

LEAVE MY LIBERTIES ALONE.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:09:11 GMT

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

I won't even bother.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:10:53 GMT

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

Ryu wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:09I won't even bother.

I wouldn't, either. Socialism cannot be logically promoted in real-world situations.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:13:28 GMT

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

Well, The idea of one gun to every family sounds a tad bit too extreme to me.

And I don't want to waste my time.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Caveman](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:22:01 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 17:12Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 15:50Well said, cheesesoda.

I find it disgusting that people say guns should be removed because IT is causing problems. The gun did not commit the crime but the irresponsible idiots wielding it.

No one seems to understand what individual responsibility is. Those who want guns removed because it kills people are simply ignoring the facts. Oh yeah...let's put the multi-billion dollar industry out of business because it automatically solves everyone's problems.

How many kids end up dead after playing with guns? Whose fault is that? The gun manufacturers? BS...it is the fault of the idiot parents/guardians for not keeping their guns locked away out of sight and reach.

All I'm saying is this: in the USA, where every dumb fuck can get a gun, you have loads of accidents with guns. As if that's not bad enough, how often can you actually use a gun to protect

yourself? I'm not talking about your home because, wtf do I care about some idiot that wants to steal my stuff? I surely wouldn't want to kill him. Of course, it might differ a bit on what he's taking, but as long as it isn't personal stuff, the insurance will pay. For me that's not worth the risk anyway. Besides, because everyone can get a gun, what makes you think the criminal doesn't have one? He has nothing to lose, as you might kill him. He'll now probably kill you first. On a side note: how often you get robbed when you're home?

In the Netherlands you do have burglary of course, just like anywhere else. But not more then in other countries where you can easily legally get a gun. Also, you're saying that criminals can always get a gun. Perhaps this is true, but here you know that if someone is found to have a gun, he is a criminal and will get arrested. Also, in the USA there will be many many more guns, simply because everyone has one. Thus, the burglar we just mentioned can steal your gun, and there you go, another gun in criminal hands.

on your last point: if you keep your gun safely locked away, how can you (quickly) use it when there is a situation you can solve with a gun? So one way or another, that doesn't work. Now if you want to kill innocent children, be my guest, as long as I don't have to be a part of it.

Well said.

Cheesesoda, you're jumping the gun here (No pun intended). If you're trained in firearms and safety of a firearm then sure why not have a gun? But to be able to walk into a shop and say Hey man i'll have that pretty little number over there and then walk out the shop with it within 15mins is IDIOTIC. There should be like a 2 week waiting period so the store keeper can do whatever checks he needs to do, so he doesn't sell a gun to some fucked up prick that thinks its cool to shoot down a 11year old boy for no apparent reason.

You don't like my opinion then screw you.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:24:24 GMT

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

Ryu wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:13Well, The idea of one gun to every family sounds a tad bit too extreme to me.

And I don't want to waste my time.

Every family being gun-toting rednecks is a tad extreme. Protecting yourself, by any means necessary, isn't.

Would you consider every family having an alarm in their home to be extreme? Do you consider people carrying mace with them to be extreme? Protecting yourself and your property is not "extreme", it's logical. Owning a gun isn't any more extreme than that. It's just that people get these stupid, knee-jerk reactions to it.

I'm completely sympathetic to these horrible stories of these accidents and horrible, conscious acts committed by people. I don't just turn the other way and pretend that doesn't exist, either.

However, I'm not going to pretend that all can be fixed by taking liberties from others. Don't suffocate my life because of a few bad people and a few careless people.

Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts. There are some really ruthless people out there, but they're criminals regardless of the law. If they want to harm you, they will. If they want a gun to do it, they will find a way to get a gun, and getting a gun illegally is a bit easier than getting one legally, whether or not you're law-abiding.

Taking away my freedom from protecting myself with lethal force only helps out the criminals succeed. A gun is a great equalizer. A 4'6", 85lb woman toting a gun can effectively defend herself against a 6'5", 250lb attacker.

If you don't like guns, don't buy one. If you're afraid of your children and friends of your children getting a hold of your gun, don't buy one. If you're afraid of accidentally discharging it against a friend, rather than a foe, (I bet you can guess what I'm about to say, can't you?...) don't buy one. I, however, want a gun, and I am fully prepared to take responsibility for anything that happens directly relating to my gun.

A gun isn't necessarily for everyone. I don't expect everybody to like guns. However, I expect everybody to respect mine and others' decisions to live our lives by our own accord.

Edit: Caveman, why should I have to wait? I could just as easily walk up to someone's house, buy their shitty car for \$200, and then proceed to run over innocent pedestrians walking on the downtown sidewalks. I could go buy a PC from a local store, connect it to my internet connection, and proceed to use it maliciously against others. I could go buy a set of kitchen knives and go stab my ex-girlfriend because I happened to think of what she did to me x amount of years ago for x reason. I could go buy a baseball bat at my local store and proceed to smash car windshields because I'm pissed off at the world. I could go on, but I feel you get my point.

Yes, a gun is traditionally more violent than any of what I just listed above. I won't deny that, but maybe it's not me who needs to have a different view of guns. Maybe it's everybody else who needs to realize that guns aren't causing crime. Yes, they're also more lethal than what I listed above, but a crime is a crime. If you want to maliciously attack someone or something, you're going to do it regardless of whether or not you have a gun. You have so many things to choose from to perform your criminal acts. Don't criminalize me because someone else is irresponsible, just as I'm not criminalizing you.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:39:00 GMT

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

Quote:Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:41:21 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:39Quote:Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Recreation? It's fun to shoot stuff. Just like it's fun to set stuff on fire. I hardly think that shooting at clay targets would be considered to be a horrible act. Plus, guns are sexy in their own right, so they're nice showpieces.

Edit: Starbuzz added hunting that I forgot.

Also, don't forget that sometimes horrible acts are necessary in life. Just because it's not "nice" doesn't mean that it isn't needed. When I said "HORRIBLE acts", I meant unnecessary and evil actions. Protecting yourself is hardly unnecessary and evil.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:43:52 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 12:39Quote:Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Well, we have no choice in this world. Out there, whoever we maybe and whatever religion, race, or nationality, we will always have an enemy who would want to do harm.

Someone out there is our enemy and we ourselves are someone's enemy...that's the world.

waits for aliens to come and disarm the militaries thorough diplomacy

EDIT:

And one must realize how nice it is to hunt, prepare, cook and eat your own food out in the wilderness. Nothing wrong with that. Don't complain unless you have experienced it!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 17:57:40 GMT

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

Quote:You people suck. you too.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 18:27:19 GMT

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

Surth wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:57Quote:You people suck. you too.
At least, I know how to respect your liberties. Something very few others respect. :\

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 18:28:29 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:39Quote:Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Target Practice

Signaling for help

Nail Driving

Archeology

Survival

Flares

You can even get your High School Diploma!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 18:51:41 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:39Quote:Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Well a gun could be used to say, stop a guy from running, I have seen police shows where if orders will will try to shoot the criminals angle or foot to make him fall, it doesnt kill him, but it can be used to just injure him enough to where he can be caught.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 19:40:34 GMT

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

On a practical basis, killing criminals prevents re-offending (in the most sure way possible) and helps to solve the impending over-population crisis.

Sadly, humans insist on being impractical with life and emotions.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 20:10:41 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:38 Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Go fuck yourself.

nuff said.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 20:33:32 GMT

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

Oblivion165 wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 20:28 Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:39 Quote: Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Target Practice

Signaling for help

Nail Driving

Archeology

Survival

Flares

You can even get your High School Diploma!

Right, but that's where gun licenses are for. That doesn't explain why everyone should be able to get one.

When I read these replies, I'm starting to find it bizar that I, not having a gun, am still in perfect health :-S.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 21:06:45 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 16:33 Oblivion165 wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 20:28 Goztow wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 13:39 Quote: Yes, guns can be used for HORRIBLE acts.

Plz explain me what else they can be used for? Killing a criminal is also a horrible act, no matter how much he may have deserved it.

Target Practice
Signaling for help
Nail Driving
Archeology
Survival
Flares

You can even get your High School Diploma!

Right, but that's where gun licenses are for. That doesn't explain why everyone should be able to get one.

When I read these replies, I'm starting to find it bizar that I, not having a gun, am still in perfect health :-S.

I don't own a gun (yet), and I'm in perfect health. However, that has NOTHING to do with this argument. Quit trying to correlate stupid shit that doesn't matter.

The fact is, just as anybody should be able to buy kitchen knives, cars, and tissues, people should be able to buy guns. There's no real logical argument against it, besides your knee-jerk, "OMG WUT IF DETH HAPENZ". Oh well. Shit happens.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 21:09:30 GMT

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

Need dart guns instead, so you could paralyze people who attack you instead of kill. Just enough for you to get the police.

It doesn't matter if it causes less deaths than car accidents or whatever, IT STILL CAUSES DEATHS!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Caveman](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 21:24:54 GMT

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

DarkDemin wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 21:10Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:38Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Go fuck yourself.

nuff said.

Yeah you really have a good arguement there.

Cheesesoda, from my understanding, you think that people shouldn't have to be put on a waiting list (Checkup list) to purchase a gun?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 22:16:34 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 17:24DarkDemin wrote on Tue, 11 September 2007 21:10Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:38Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

Go fuck yourself.

nuff said.

Yeah you really have a good arguement there.

Cheesesoda, from my understanding, you think that people shouldn't have to be put on a waiting list (Checkup list) to purchase a gun?

Correct.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [scarabguy](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 02:30:52 GMT

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

wow, i like this arguement....

enough bs. the world is an unsafe place. people are gonna have guns, people are gonna die, and theres nothing we can do about it! but i do think that one thing we CAN control is who we let have guns, and im not talking bout just average joe out there, im talking bout machine guns to anyone, and handguns to people who have already committed felonies, or are mentally unstable! and i am totally for my and your rights, but we gotta get some kind of control!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 03:19:05 GMT

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

Mentally stable I can see restricting access to, but you don't give mentally unstable people operator (driver's) licenses, either.

My past behavior, while is somewhat of an indication of my future behavior, does not define my future behavior. If I've done my time and am now given the chance to be a law-abiding citizen, I don't feel that I should be prevented from buying weapons.

To some extent, I do believe in preventing felons from purchasing guns. As long as the crime is severe enough to warrant such a thing.

Regardless, this doesn't require a background check. If the person has his or her weapon license revoked, they wouldn't be able to purchase a weapon. Just as someone without their ID would be unable to purchase tobacco, alcohol, lottery tickets, pornography, etc...

No privacy is invaded. No waiting period. Some comfort knowing a serial killer won't have legal access (but again, will still have illegal access) to weapons.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 14:18:42 GMT

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

I know this has been responded to already, but it was just so inanely stupid that I couldn't resist. Sorry if I drag things backwards a bit.

Quote:All I'm saying is this: in the USA, where every dumb fuck can get a gun,

Firstly, not "every dumb fuck" can buy a gun (legally). No matter where you go in the US, no matter what sort of gun you aim to buy (excepting fully automatic, which requires a special federal permit), when you select your purchase and fill out the on-site paperwork, the dealer picks up their phone. In every state but one, so far as I know, they call a toll-free number to an FBI hotline, and the FBI performs a background check against a national database of felons, loonies, and anyone else who ought not have that gun. This background check is, as one would expect in the twenty-first fucking century, a very quick procedure. It doesn't require the three-day wait periods some states have in place, and it certainly doesn't require weeks. Thusly, by the time the dealer hangs up the phone, they know whether or not you are legally permitted to own a gun. They then look at the paperwork to make sure you haven't omitted anything they may have been informed of during said phone call. In the one state where the dealer does not call the FBI directly (New Jersey), the dealer instead calls the State Police, who then call the FBI- this is done so that the state government can grub \$15 from every gun purchase, not for any security reason. Still think every dumb fuck can get a gun (legally)?

Quote:you have loads of accidents with guns. As if that's not bad enough, how often can you actually use a gun to protect yourself? I'm not talking about your home because, wtf do I care about some idiot that wants to steal my stuff? I surely wouldn't want to kill him. Of course, it might differ a bit on what he's taking, but as long as it isn't personal stuff, the insurance will pay. For me that's not worth the risk anyway. Besides, because everyone can get a gun, what makes you think the criminal doesn't have one? He has nothing to lose, as you might kill him. He'll now probably kill you first. On a side note: how often you get robbed when you're home?

Here's the rub, skippy: if there's a criminal in your home, they are a threat to anyone in the house. Sure, you can say "well, they'll go after my stuff first," but you're not a psychic and neither am I- there is no way of knowing what that asshole means to do when they break and enter. While there are a great many people over here who would sadly agree with you, many more are of the opinion that once a criminal violates your home, they are already a threat and their life is forfeit.

Additionally, robberies that happen when you aren't home aren't the fucking point. The issue here is what you choose to do when there is a confrontation. And if that criminal is armed, they might get off the first shot if you are also armed. However, they will get off the first shot if you aren't. I'd rather not die because some tool like you decided that I didn't have a right to defend myself and my loved ones by any means necessary- and that makes me damned glad you aren't writing the laws over here.

Quote:In the Netherlands you do have burglary of course, just like anywhere else. But not more than in other countries where you can easily legally get a gun.

I really have neither the time nor the patience to sift through crime statistics now, so I'll just leave that be. I'll come back to this one if I feel up to it later.

Quote:Also, you're saying that criminals can always get a gun. Perhaps this is true, but here you know that if someone is found to have a gun, he is a criminal and will get arrested.

This is a fallacious argument. The analog here would be to say that you know a person is a criminal because they were found carrying marijuana- no shit, Sherlock! They're committing a crime because they're carrying something that is illegal. The problem is that you can't prove that they intended to do anything else illegal using said prohibited thing. That's why if you get caught with weed here you only get charged with possession, and if you get caught with an illegal gun you get charged only with possession and not with "intended homicide." Also, in order to arrest a criminal you have to catch them first. Guns are, as you may or may not have heard, somewhat easily concealed. And, as you may or may not have figured out by now, it is rather more difficult to impose your will on somebody who is armed. Would a desperate criminal (hypothetically, of course) always just give up with an "oop, you caught me- good show!" when they have the means to violently resist? You're assuming an awful lot here, and assumptions evidence do not make. At any rate, the fact remains that said hypothetical criminal does have a gun, and they have ample opportunity to squeeze off a few at somebody before the police- hypothetically- take them down (I don't know how well armed your boys in blue are), and if nobody else is armed then he can do so with impunity.

Quote:Also, in the USA there will be many many more guns, simply because everyone has one. Thus, the burglar we just mentioned can steal your gun, and there you go, another gun in criminal hands.

Another stupid, stupid, uninformed, and stupid statement. No, everyone in the US does not have a gun. Some of my best friends are anti-gun, and even among those of my friends who support gun rights only a handful actually own one. Hell, my mother doesn't own a gun, even though my father and my sister and I all do (and more than one each at that). That alone tells me that you've never even bothered to glance at anything that backs up your conclusions; how the hell can you pretend

to 'know' what the situation is over here when you can't be arsed to look up even the basic facts? No, I can't remember the exact numbers offhand- but the number of gun owners in this country adds up to ~1/3 of our total population, IIRC. The number of guns owned is much higher, because many people who own guns own more than one.

Secondly, you make the assumption that the criminal will get their hands on your weapon before you can use it. How so, exactly? When using a weapon for home defense, it is common practice to keep that weapon in a small combination-locked strongbox beside your bed. To make an assumption of my own (a necessary one, if we are to presume that there will be a confrontation at all), you will wake up when you hear the criminal enter your home. Are you willing to argue that the criminal can reach your room, guess at your combo, and extract your gun before you can do the same? Bullshit. In the real world, it happens this way- you wake up to the sound of somebody breaking in. You punch/dial in the code and pick up your gun and ammo, and load it. This takes no more than a few seconds' time, if you've had the good sense to practice. This is possible in all situations unless the criminal entered your room directly from the outside, in which case it is usually more advisable to use a melee weapon such as a baseball bat which is quicker to pick up and easier to use at point-blank range. Or did you, perhaps, think that the gun would be the only means a well-prepared homeowner would have available to defend their home with?

Quote: on your last point: if you keep your gun safely locked away, how can you (quickly) use it when there is a situation you can solve with a gun?

See above. Also, acquire a carry permit in order to deal with situations outside the home (in those states which require it).

Quote: So one way or another, that doesn't work. Now if you want to kill innocent children, be my guest, as long as I don't have to be a part of it.

That, my uninformed friend, is a statement which provides nothing but a quick emotional jab to your arguments. Not only is it assuming quite a bit. For starters, that you would keep a loaded weapon where a child could easily get at it, that you wouldn't make any attempt to educate said child so that they know not to point the bloody thing at their own self, or that you would be so stupid as to neglect everything you've ever learned about gun safety and point it anywhere but up, down, or at your intended target- even when unloaded- to say nothing of the implicit assumption that every person who owns a gun will go around intentionally shooting children.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:16:20 GMT

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

Quote:

The fact is, just as anybody should be able to buy kitchen knives, cars, and tissues, people should be able to buy guns. There's no real logical argument against it, besides your knee-jerk, "OMG WUT IF DETH HAPENZ". Oh well. Shit happens. Kitchen Knives and Cars have a real use (cut bread/drive to grandma who lives 100 miles away) - A gun hasnt. I dont think the Guns you buy in a Supermarket or something are used to go hunting.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:19:44 GMT

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

Surth wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:16Quote:

The fact is, just as anybody should be able to buy kitchen knives, cars, and tissues, people should be able to buy guns. There's no real logical argument against it, besides your knee-jerk, "OMG WUT IF DETH HAPENZ". Oh well. Shit happens. Kitchen Knives and Cars have a real use (cut bread/drive to grandma who lives 100 miles away) - A gun hasnt. I dont think the Guns you buy in a Supermarket or something are used to go hunting.

No, you're right. The guns in the SPORTING GOODS sections and next to the HUNTING gear are obviously NOT used for hunting. No fucking way in Hell...

Edit: Nukelt, let me add onto what you said about the whole "it's just stuff" argument that was so blatantly stupid.

I don't give a flying fuck if someone just wants my stuff. That's MY stuff. That's stuff I earned. If I can defend said property, why wouldn't I? Sure, I could leave it to the insurance companies to replace the items, but then that just makes everybody else's interest rates go up, and I'm not that selfish. In fact, I bet if everybody owned a gun, insurance rates would go down, most likely. So owning a gun not only protects me, my family, my possessions, but also has the potential save me and others money in the long run.

Another reason why that's stupid. Just because MOST home invasions are robberies doesn't mean that ALL are. What if someone intends to hurt you? Then what? You can't tell the would-be attacker, "I DIDN'T EXPECT TO BE HARMED, SO I DIDN'T HAVE A GUN" and expect him to turn around and leave your house.

Speaking of that, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aeo05uPMmn4>

I love that video.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:23:16 GMT

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

Cheesesoda, your reasoning starts from the POV that the majority of people know what they're doing most of the time. Unfortunately, this just isn't true.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:26:58 GMT

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

In some circumstances it's as easy, or even easier to kill someone with a kitchen knife, yet they aren't banned. So if you support banning guns, you might as well (by extension) kill anything that could injure someone.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:43:14 GMT

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

CarrierII wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:26In some circumstances it's as easy, or even easier to kill someone with a kitchen knife, yet they aren't banned. So if you support banning guns, you might as well (by extension) kill anything that could injure someone.

Tell me, what other use have guns then kill/harm people/animals or target practise? (Target practise, hmm for what, doesn't have any use unless you are planning to fire at someone/some animal)

Now, tell me what uses kitchen knives have? Not just killing/injuring someone, that's for sure.

Also, about guns being in the sports department, that's not weird, they can't put it in the mutilation/killing department.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:51:22 GMT

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

There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, theres more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I dont know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesnt mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they dont abuse it, but heck, you cant read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becomming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then bann kitchens knives to, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they wont use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point if, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:53:11 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:43CarrierII wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:26In some circumstances it's as easy, or even easier to kill someone with a kitchen knife, yet they aren't banned. So if you support banning guns, you might as well (by extension) kill anything that could injure someone.

Tell me, what other use have guns then kill/harm people/animals or target practise? (Target practise, hmm for what, doesn't have any use unless you are planning to fire at someone/some

animal)

Now, tell me what uses kitchen knives have? Not just killing/injuring someone, that's for sure.

Also, about guns being in the sports department, that's not weird, they can't put it in the mutilation/killing department.

Why can't firing guns be for sport? I never once shot a BB gun thinking, "WOW, I COULD USE THIS SKILL TO SHOOT PEOPLE!" Shooting guns is purely for entertainment. Just like pyrotechnics. They serve no purpose other than "ooooo ahhhhhhhhh". LET'S BAN EVERYTHING YOU DEEM TO BE POINTLESS. THAT MAKES SENSE! Are you trying to pull shit out of your ass? If so, it's working quite wonderfully.

The point in me saying that was he claimed that the guns in the supermarkets aren't used for hunting. He obviously ignores logic slapping him in the face.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:54:20 GMT

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

AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:51 There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, theres more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I dont know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesnt mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they dont abuse it, but heck, you cant read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becomming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then bann kitchens knives to, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they wont use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point if, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

I stopped reading after "There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that,".

I had hoped you had a little more intelligence. Now I do see why you are pro-guns. It's a bit of a primitive thing, where you will probably feel right at home.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:55:41 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:53 EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:43 CarrierI wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:26 In some circumstances it's as easy, or even easier to kill someone with a kitchen knife, yet they aren't banned. So if you

support banning guns, you might as well (by extension) kill anything that could injure someone.

Tell me, what other use have guns then kill/harm people/animals or target practise? (Target practise, hmm for what, doesn't have any use unless you are planning to fire at someone/some animal)

Now, tell me what uses kitchen knives have? Not just killing/injuring someone, that's for sure.

Also, about guns being in the sports department, that's not weird, they can't put it in the mutilation/killing department.

Why can't firing guns be for sport? I never once shot a BB gun thinking, "WOW, I COULD USE THIS SKILL TO SHOOT PEOPLE!" Shooting guns is purely for entertainment. Just like pyrotechnics. They serve no purpose other than "ooooo ahhhhhhhhh". LET'S BAN EVERYTHING YOU DEEM TO BE POINTLESS. THAT MAKES SENSE! Are you trying to pull shit out of your ass? If so, it's working quite wonderfully.

The point in me saying that was he claimed that the guns in the supermarkets aren't used for hunting. He obviously ignores logic slapping him in the face.

Well, if guns are purely for entertainment, why not get rid of the guns and just sell bbguns/paintball guns. Same fun, less deaths.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:55:42 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:54AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:51There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, theres more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I dont know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesnt mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they dont abuse it, but heck, you cant read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becomming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then bann kitchens knives to, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they wont use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point if, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

I stopped reading after "There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that,".

I had hoped you had a little more intelligence. Now I do see why you are pro-guns. It's a bit of a primitive thing, where you will probably feel right at home.

Wow, you're quite the arrogant son of a bitch, aren't you? Ever stop to think that just because you deem something pointless doesn't make it pointless to everybody else? I feel that your opinion is pointless, but I can't help but to think you feel otherwise.

Edit: Because they're not the same. BB guns are boring. I want something with more power. Why light a match when you can light a roman candle?

Edit2: Also, BB guns fail at home security. Shooting someone with small, copper BBs isn't going to stop an attacker, especially someone hellbent on harming you. So not only do guns serve the purpose for entertainment and show, but also for protection as we've been trying to beat into your empty heads.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 15:56:02 GMT

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

Some people use guns for target practice but not for killing, they use it for pleasure and personal entertainment, they don't have the intent to kill someone, maybe hunting animals, but they don't have intent to kill usually, just the feeling of owning a gun and firing it at something gives them a spark of enjoyment, though dangerous, next i'd like to see knives be banned, some people like collecting them for fun, though dangerous, just like guns, they don't have the intent to kill (usually, unless you plan too and are crazy)

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 16:44:53 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:55 EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:54 AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:51 There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, there's more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I don't know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesn't mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they don't abuse it, but heck, you can't read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becoming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then ban kitchen knives too, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they won't use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point is, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

I stopped reading after "There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that,".

I had hoped you had a little more intelligence. Now I do see why you are pro-guns. It's a bit of a primitive thing, where you will probably feel right at home.

Wow, you're quite the arrogant son of a bitch, aren't you? Ever stop to think that just because you deem something pointless doesn't make it pointless to everybody else? I feel that your opinion is

pointless, but I can't help but to think you feel otherwise.

Edit: Because they're not the same. BB guns are boring. I want something with more power. Why light a match when you can light a roman candle?

Edit2: Also, BB guns fail at home security. Shooting someone with small, copper BBs isn't going to stop an attacker, especially someone hellbent on harming you. So not only do guns serve the purpose for entertainment and show, but also for protection as we've been trying to beat into your empty heads.

Tell me why would a criminal harm you? Yes he does want to stel your stuff and yes I know that sucks, but unless you go waiving with a gun, there is no reason for the criminal to actually harm you. He might run and get away, resuming you caught him in the act.

Also, how often have you been robbed in your own home?

I have been robbed once, while we where on vacation, so no gun could've stopped the criminal. How many times have you been robbed and got the chance to respond on it (with or without gun, that doesn't matter now)?

You say you like real guns more then BBguns/ paintball guns because they have more power, well ok, but what can you do with that power? With the proposed bb/paintball gun you can actually fire on your mates and have a good time together. Something tells me that though you can point a real gun at your mates, you won't have a good time then.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 16:48:48 GMT

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

AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:56 Some people use guns for target practice but nor for killing, they use it for pleasure and personal entertainment, they dont have the intent to kill someone, maybe hunting animals, but they dont have intent to kill usually, just the feeling of owning a gun and firing it at something gives them a spark of enjoyment, though dangerous, next i'd like to see knives be banned, some people like collecting them for fun, though dangerous, just like guns, they dont have the intent to kill (usually, unless you plan too and are crazy)

I'm not saying noone is allowed to have a gun, I'm just saying that it shouldn't be sold so easily. I mean, for a hunter it's pretty logical to have a gun, but let the hunter be registered, and check him etc, before selling him a gun. With checking him I also mean, give him a course on how to handle the weapon, how to store it, and let him do this for a month or so. Perhaps make him do a psychological test before he actually gets the gun.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 17:09:14 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 12:44
cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:55
EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:54
AoBfrost wrote

on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:51 There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, theres more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I dont know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesnt mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they dont abuse it, but heck, you cant read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becomming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then bann kitchens knives to, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they wont use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point if, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

I stopped reading after "There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that,".

I had hoped you had a little more intelligence. Now I do see why you are pro-guns. It's a bit of a primitive thing, where you will probably feel right at home.

Wow, you're quite the arrogant son of a bitch, aren't you? Ever stop to think that just because you deem something pointless doesn't make it pointless to everybody else? I feel that your opinion is pointless, but I can't help but to think you feel otherwise.

Edit: Because they're not the same. BB guns are boring. I want something with more power. Why light a match when you can light a roman candle?

Edit2: Also, BB guns fail at home security. Shooting someone with small, copper BBs isn't going to stop an attacker, especially someone hellbent on harming you. So not only do guns serve the purpose for entertainment and show, but also for protection as we've been trying to beat into your empty heads.

Tell me why would a criminal harm you? Yes he does want to stel your stuff and yes I know that sucks, but unless you go waiving with a gun, there is no reason for the criminal to actually harm you. He might run and get away, resuming you caught him in the act.

Also, how often have you been robbed in your own home?

I have been robbed once, while we where on vacation, so no gun could've stopped the criminal. How many times have you been robbed and got the chance to respond on it (with or without gun, that doesn't matter now)?

You say you like real guns more then BBguns/ paintball guns because they have more power, well ok, but what can you do with that power? With the proposed bb/paintball gun you can actually fire on your mates and have a good time together. Something tells me that though you can point a real gun at your mates, you won't have a good time then.

Up until 2005, I could have said, "I never have been in a car accident, so why would I need car insurance". Well, August 2005 explains why...

Just because it hasn't happened yet doesn't mean that it won't.

Why do I have to fire a gun at someone to have fun? It's fun shooting at targets. Sure, paintball

guns are fun, too, but it's quite a bit different.

As far as the whole psychological thing goes... at the very most someone needs to read up on gun handling, take a test, and be issued a license for it. I don't feel background checks are necessary.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 17:31:58 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:54AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:51There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, theres more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I dont know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesnt mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they dont abuse it, but heck, you cant read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becomming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then bann kitchens knives to, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they wont use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point if, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

I stopped reading after "There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that,".

I had hoped you had a little more intelligence. Now I do see why you are pro-guns. It's a bit of a primitive thing, where you will probably feel right at home.

Wow, it seems those who don't like something want to force it onto everyone else, how smart and fair that is, yes I may seem to have sounded retarded in that area, but still I proved a point and a point is still a point, you challenged us to come up with more uses and I did, and for lashing at me like that for answering your question, it shows how patience and intelligent you really are. Plus there was some useful arguments after I said "horse/dog" thing, but like a lot of people I guess, their too arrogant to read 3 more sentences just because they cant agree with someone else's view.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 18:28:44 GMT

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

Quote:Tell me why would a criminal harm you? Yes he does want to stel your stuff and yes I know that sucks, but unless you go waiving with a gun, there is no reason for the criminal to actually harm you. He might run and get away, resumng you caught him in the act.

Sweet merciful stars- I can understand most of the reasons why so many people want to outlaw guns- just because they're wrong doesn't mean that every reason given in support of that position is automatically bad. However, this just has to take the cake as the single dumbest thing I've seen today.

Do you honestly believe that violent crime doesn't happen in the absence of guns? Right, because a criminal will just leave you alone whilst robbing you blind, as long as you aren't armed? Wake the hell up! Do you know what you are when you are in the house while it is being robbed? A witness, that's what. Criminals don't like witnesses. Criminals like to get away clean. If you confront a criminal in your home without a weapon, you run the very real risk of being killed just because you were there.

Allow me to clear a few things up-

First off, you don't "wave a gun around." That defeats the purpose of the tool. If you draw your weapon, you fire it- period, end of discussion. If you don't have a reason to fire it, you don't pull it out in the first place.

A person whipping out their handgun and pointing it at a burglar while dialing 911 with the other hand? That happens almost never in the real world. Getting caught in the act of committing a felony is more often than not plenty to push someone over the edge to a violent reaction, and they're not going to just sit down and wait for the cops. Every second you have that weapon out and don't fire it is another second in which the other guy could make an attempt at either grabbing it or pulling a weapon of his own- and it only takes a moment's lapse in attention for him to gain that opportunity. Even if you manage to sneak up behind that burglar- the sudden sound of your voice is even more likely to cause him to whip around with a weapon of his own. If someone has taken it upon themselves to invade your home, you assume the worst and react accordingly. If they happen to survive, that's great- but anything less than a decisive, violent reaction on the part of the homeowner puts everyone in danger. You put the bastard on the floor, then you make sure they are unable to respond in kind, then you call the cops. Whether you do that with a bat, or a knife, or a gun, you just do it. None of this "stop, thief!" shit- that only works in movies.

Second, at the risk of sounding like a broken record, you cannot assume that any given criminal- be they a burglar or some twer trying to mug you in an alley- is going to leave you alone after taking your stuff. Hell, you can't even assume that they're after your stuff in the first place. That attitude will get you killed in those situations.

Now, however revolting the thought of taking another person's life may be- and I can't say it's something I ever want to think about- it comes down to a simple choice- their life, or yours. Seriously now, do you hold a criminal's life above your own, above the lives of the people you care about? If you had no way out, would you sit by and let that criminal do you and your loved ones harm because you didn't want to have blood on your hands? Yes, it's a shitty choice, but as far as I- and a great many others, though sadly not everyone- am concerned, one person's rights stop dead where another's begin. Once you do harm to others by intent, you sacrifice your rights. That's the logic behind the criminal justice system, anyway, and it ought to apply all the time- to everyone. If you threaten another person's life- and please bear in mind that a victim has no way of knowing what their assailant intends to do until after the criminal has done the deed- you lose the right to your own. If you were to threaten any one of my friends, or my family, or if you broke

into my home, I would kill you to defend them and myself because you had no right to act against me and mine. I would hate myself for it every day for the rest of my life, but I would do it, and I would do it a second time to a second person if the need arose.

I believe, with utter conviction, that it is not the availability of weapons which leads people to be violent. It is not the prevalence of violence in the media, or any other factor than this: society as a whole, across most of the world, consists of people who are unwilling to take action to protect anyone's interests but their own. That allows a few predatory individuals to take advantage of anyone they perceive as weak, because they know most of humanity has neither the will nor the ability to do anything about it. I guarantee that crime would all but vanish if we could just persuade the mass to enact laws enabling people to act in each others' defense- but that will never happen. It will never happen because the majority of humanity would rather pretend that they are above violence of any sort, that they would not resort to such measures and therefore that others would not act violently towards them. Bullshit.

The only way to defend against violence is to be willing and able to be violent if the need arises. Violence is the only argument some folks will listen to- and that's just the plain truth. Hate guns all you want, but that won't change the simple fact that when you are faced with an immediate danger- any immediate danger into which you are placed by another being, human or otherwise, be it a home invasion or a mugging or a hold-up or whatever else your mind can conceive- the best possible defense is a gun and the training to use it properly.

No one is arguing that we issue guns to every single person on the planet- but there are some important things to keep in mind:

- In the US at least, a person is innocent until proven guilty. Therefore, unless you are proven to have committed a crime or have a serious mental defect, you are competent in the eyes of the law and therefore have the right to own a gun. That is law, as laid down hundreds of years ago and thankfully held more or less intact since.
- Guns are a weapon, but ultimately there is a person behind that weapon. The weapon does not think or act for itself. There is no way for a gun to 'just go off' without some human tampering on some level or another. By all means, enact legislation that ensures people are safely able to handle that weapon, but do not make people pay out the ass for that training (as is presently required) and do not ever call the weapon 'dangerous.' There is no such thing as a dangerous weapon, only dangerous people (by incompetence or intent).
- Technology, as a rule, does not regress, barring a massive societal collapse (i.e. the Roman Empire). For that reason, guns will not go away.
- Prohibitions don't work. A determined person can make a gun out of materials that can be bought in a hardware store, crude as that gun may turn out- but more likely they will track down a black market dealer and buy one. As long as there is a use for a weapon, it will be provided somehow, by legal or illegal means. This is a fact, the simple law of supply and demand.
- The advantage always goes to whomever has the more effective weapon. Always. A person with a gun will always be at an advantage over a person without. Thus, the only way to place yourself on an equal footing with all potential threats (short of someone setting off a bomb) is to have a

gun of your own- and more than that, to carry it responsibly.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 18:57:33 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 14:28 I believe, with utter conviction, that it is not the availability of weapons which leads people to be violent. It is not the prevalence of violence in the media, or any other factor than this: society as a whole, across most of the world, consists of people who are unwilling to take action to protect anyone's interests but their own. That allows a few predatory individuals to take advantage of anyone they perceive as weak, because they know most of humanity has neither the will nor the ability to do anything about it. I guarantee that crime would all but vanish if we could just persuade the mass to enact laws enabling people to act in each others' defense- but that will never happen. It will never happen because the majority of humanity would rather pretend that they are above violence of any sort, that they would not resort to such measures and therefore that others would not act violently towards them. Bullshit. I completely agree. Even in the animal kingdom, animals seek to do harm against others. Mostly it's territorial or for protection, but it still happens. Violence is inevitable. The only way to combat violence is for there to be a threat of violence.

Quite frankly, just about anything can be used for violence. Rocks, glass, baseball bats, guns, knives, cars, razors, scissors, lamps, plates, water, arms, legs, hands, feet, teeth, and pillows are all things that have been used to harm people. It's just impossible to remove any threat of violence. Sure, you can say that banning guns would make it one less thing available, but if you're going to kill someone, you'll do it with or without guns. Plus, as we've argued and shown SEVERAL times in this thread, guns are great for protection.

Why did the Cold War not progress further than it did? While some may consider this ideology to be absurd, I fully believe that M.A.D. is the reasoning why things didn't progress. The threat of destruction was enough to keep destruction from happening.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [reborn](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 20:42:46 GMT

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

So what's the deal in America?
If I become a US citizen could I buy a handgun and walk about with it? If I had a holster and not just in the back of my jeans like some "home-boy".
Can I walk into a shop wearing my gun in the holster and do my shopping, or is that store policy?
Do I have to have it locked in a room and can only use it if some turd walks in?
How many can I have, and how many can I have on my persons at any one time?
I'm guessing it's different for every state, so what's the deal in the most g"gun friendly" state.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 22:40:24 GMT

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

In virginia they are the most gun friendly, their proud of their guns, tons of hunters, or enthusiast travel there just to buy guns because of low prices, and well...it's just a popular spot, plus the craze there, it's easier to buy a gun.....why do you want all this info though? thinking of going on a rampage?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 22:49:34 GMT

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

He's just curious about the law.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 08:43:42 GMT

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

AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 18:40In virginia they are the most gun friendly, their proud of their guns, tons of hunters, or enthusiast travel there just to buy guns because of low prices, and well...it's just a popular spot, plus the craze there, it's easier to buy a gun.....why do you want all this info though? thinking of going on a rampage?

I can't let some gook have a higher body count than a white man... I wonder if I can get a 100:1 k/d ratio.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 09:06:35 GMT

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

This thread reeks of ignorance. At least a few individuals understand what they're talking about.

Why is personal responsibility such a difficult thing for some people to understand? Your actions are your own, period. If you shoot someone, it's not the firearm's fault, it's yours. My mother has a concealed weapons permit and has had it for almost a year and a half now. She had to go through quite a few classes to get it as well. Now, guess how many people she has shot so far? I'll give you a hint, it starts with the letter "Z", and ends with "ero".

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 09:58:45 GMT

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

Thirty?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [scarabguy](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 10:52:42 GMT

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

CarrierII wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 04:58Thirty?

rofl

ididot

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 11:18:23 GMT

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

scarabguy wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 11:52CarrierII wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 04:58Thirty?

rofl

ididot

No, you're the idiot in this case.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Memphis](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 11:38:48 GMT

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

What would you happen if you shoot a a thief in the face while he is going about his business? You don't know if this person is armed or not they could well have nothing on them at all and I would have thought murder is a worse crime than stealing a DVD player to buy some crack. I think the idea of using a gun for protection is completely flawed. On the other hand I'm not expecting you to sit him down and bake him some muffins. If someone comes in your house they are a threat therefore you would do anything you can to get them out of your property. I personally think that if someone came into my house I WOULD use a weapon (such as a Cricket or Baseball bat) not because I need it but because it is there. If I had a gun I feel is it likely that I would turn the gun on them without a moments hesitation. I wouldn't do it because I want to but because I could.

You would be thinking with adrenalin and not your brain. Before anyone says that I have no idea what a gun is I have done quite a bit of target shooting and was considering getting a rifle myself but decided not to. With that in mind evidently I think firearms in sport and hunting are completely acceptable but only if they have sufficient regulation.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 12:06:36 GMT

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

Your use of common sense is as lacking as your use of the comma. If someone is threatening your family, you blast them with a Sig 40 cal.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 12:37:58 GMT

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

Memphis wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 07:38 What would you happen if you shoot a a thief in the face while he is going about his business? You don't know if this person is armed or not they could well have nothing on them at all and I would have thought murder is a worse crime than stealing a DVD player to buy some crack. I think the idea of using a gun for protection is completely flawed. On the other hand I'm not expecting you to sit him down and bake him some muffins. If someone comes in your house they are a threat therefore you would do anything you can to get them out of your property. I personally think that if someone came into my house I WOULD use a weapon (such as a Cricket or Baseball bat) not because I need it but because it is there. If I had a gun I feel is it likely that I would turn the gun on them without a moments hesitation. I wouldn't do it because I want to but because I could. You would be thinking with adrenalin and not your brain. Before anyone says that I have no idea what a gun is I have done quite a bit of target shooting and was considering getting a rifle myself but decided not to. With that in mind evidently I think firearms in sport and hunting are completely acceptable but only if they have sufficient regulation.

As long as you're not trying to take the guns out of my hands as personal protection, then I don't care if you don't feel comfortable wielding a gun. That's not my issue to worry about, and that's your problem when someone attacks you and you're left with "oh shit, NOW I see how a gun would have come in handy."

How the fuck is it flawed? If I'm being robbed at home or on the streets, I need to protect myself. I don't care if I would react without thinking and shoot someone. They're invading MY space with intent to HARM me, my friends, or my family, whether it be physically or financially. Why should I care about THEIR well-being when I AM the VICTIM? Whatever happens to them happens. If you're worried about that happening, you might as well throw all of your belongings out into your yard and let people take what they wish. You obviously don't seem to care.

I don't understand how people can just think that if you are unarmed that somehow you come out better in the situation. If you want to live in this fairy tale world where criminals actually respect law-abiding citizens, then be my guest, but that's far from the real world. If they respected you AT

ALL, they wouldn't be robbing you, would they?

How many times must I and others say this? IF YOU REGULATE THE PURCHASING OF GUNS, YOU HARM THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN'S ABILITY TO PURCHASE A GUN. CRIMINALS AREN'T AFFECTED. IF CRIMINALS ARE WILLING TO MURDER AND COMMIT OTHER CRIMES, WHAT MAKES YOU THINK THEY'D OBEY A GUN LAW?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 13:08:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Welcome to the far west!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 13:16:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now I know you people are idiots. Even Jackie Mason thinks you're all "fuckin' morons". I'm quite inclined to agree.

It boggles the mind to think that people would care more about their attackers than themselves. I don't care much for possessions, but I'm not about to give up what I have to some criminal. If I can defend myself, I will, and if it's lethal force, so be it. A dead man can't rob me or anybody else, can he?

Even if you don't care about yourself, think about what happens if you let that person go? If they rob someone once, they're bound to do it again to someone else. What if, that time, the criminal decides to HARM that other victim? It's certainly happened. Criminals generally aren't one-time criminals.

If you don't want to have a gun for fear of someone you love being hurt, then don't own one. However, don't prevent me from owning one even by regulating it. If my child or friend gets killed by my gun, then let that blood be on MY hands. Allow me to take responsibility for MY actions. I don't want your "protection" from myself.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 13:22:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 09:16: Now I know you people are idiots. Even Jackie Mason thinks you're all "fuckin' morons". I'm quite inclined to agree.

It boggles the mind to think that people would care more about their attackers than themselves. I

don't care much for possessions, but I'm not about to give up what I have to some criminal. If I can defend myself, I will, and if it's lethal force, so be it. A dead man can't rob me or anybody else, can he?

Even if you don't care about yourself, think about what happens if you let that person go? If they rob someone once, they're bound to do it again to someone else. What if, that time, the criminal decides to HARM that other victim? It's certainly happened. Criminals generally aren't one-time criminals.

If you don't want to have a gun for fear of someone you love being hurt, then don't own one. However, don't prevent me from owning one even by regulating it. If my child or friend gets killed by my gun, then let that blood be on MY hands. Allow me to take responsibility for MY actions. I don't want your "protection" from myself.

Yes, Cheese is right, if they do it once, why not say they will do it again? what will stop them? no one, they will rob and hurt others as long as they can get what they want, that's why it should be that if you can defend yourself, then do so, call 911 if you don't wanna "fight" the guy, the just do it so cops will come atleast.....

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 13:32:38 GMT

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

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jn9cX5BaqYc>

I actually agree with Jackie Mason.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qyoLuTjguJA>

If I were gay, I would want John Stossel's babies. He is one of my favorite guys to quote and link to. He's fucking brilliant.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Memphis](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 13:42:30 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 08:37

I don't understand how people can just think that if you are unarmed that somehow you come out better in the situation. If you want to live in this fairy tale world where criminals actually respect law-abiding citizens, then be my guest, but that's far from the real world. If they respected you AT ALL, they wouldn't be robbing you, would they?

That is just you being completely paranoid. Yes America can be dangerous as can other places but it is hardly a Johannesburg is it? All of this talk is just scare mongering to me as people will get the impression that at any minute an armed man will jump through your window and threaten to kill everyone if they don't get all of your jewelery and prized possessions.

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 08:37

How many times must I and others say this? IF YOU REGULATE THE PURCHASING OF GUNS, YOU HARM THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN'S ABILITY TO PURCHASE A GUN. CRIMINALS AREN'T AFFECTED. IF CRIMINALS ARE WILLING TO MURDER AND COMMIT OTHER CRIMES, WHAT MAKES YOU THINK THEY'D OBEY A GUN LAW?

As for controlling regulation it should mean you have a better idea of who is getting hold of this hardware and the type of people getting hold of it. This is about lethal weapons that are designed to kill being sold in a supermarket. I would have thought it would be a lot easier for criminals to steal weaponry from a supermarket than a proper armory in a gun shop. If there are less guns in circulation you would have thought it would be easier to track down ones that were not acquired by legal means.

Shootings and violence happens everywhere and it isn't just done by criminals such as in the Hungerford Massacre:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hungerford_massacre

And the Dunblane Massacre:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunblane_massacre

In both of these cases these people could actually legally use the firearms which meant that they must have gone through some kind of process as to what type of person they are. If people don't even have to go through that problems such as these can only get worse.

You should really stop being so pig-headed by the way cheesesoda, calling people idiots and retards is just rude and does nothing in debates such as these. I at least am 'open' to your points even if I don't agree with them whereas you just get angry and defensive.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 14:21:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Memphischeesesodal don't understand how people can just think that if you are unarmed that somehow you come out better in the situation. If you want to live in this fairy tale world where

criminals actually respect law-abiding citizens, then be my guest, but that's far from the real world. If they respected you AT ALL, they wouldn't be robbing you, would they?

That is just you being completely paranoid. Yes America can be dangerous as can other places but it is hardly a Johannesburg is it? All of this talk is just scare mongering to me as people will get the impression that at any minute an armed man will jump through your window and threaten to kill everyone if they don't get all of your jewelery and prized possessions.

No, the paranoia is, "LOL OMG WUT IF KIDZ GET A HOLD OF GUNZ?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!/1?!?!?!?!/!"

My whole argument is that you never know what's going to happen or when it's going to happen. Just because you can't predict it doesn't mean that it couldn't happen. Like I said earlier, I got into a car accident in 2005. Before that, I never had been, so car insurance didn't come into play... until the accident. Just because it hasn't happened doesn't mean that it won't happen.

Memphischeesesoda How many times must I and others say this? IF YOU REGULATE THE PURCHASING OF GUNS, YOU HARM THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN'S ABILITY TO PURCHASE A GUN. CRIMINALS AREN'T AFFECTED. IF CRIMINALS ARE WILLING TO MURDER AND COMMIT OTHER CRIMES, WHAT MAKES YOU THINK THEY'D OBEY A GUN LAW?

As for controlling regulation it should mean you have a better idea of who is getting hold of this hardware and the type of people getting hold of it. This is about lethal weapons that are designed to kill being sold in a supermarket. I would have thought it would be a lot easier for criminals to steal weaponry from a supermarket than a proper armory in a gun shop. If there are less guns in circulation you would have thought it would be easier to track down ones that were not acquired by legal means.

Shootings and violence happens everywhere and it isn't just done by criminals such as in the Hungerford Massacre:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hungerford_massacre

And the Dunblane Massacre:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunblane_massacre

In both of these cases these people could actually legally use the firearms which meant that they must have gone through some kind of process as to what type of person they are. If people don't even have to go through that process such as these can only get worse.

Okay, so it regulates the type of law-abiding citizen purchasing a gun. What does it do for the type of criminal purchasing a gun? If I want a gun that badly, I could go to the black market and purchase a gun fairly easily. THEN it couldn't even be traced back to me if it's a stolen gun. Again, who's at the disadvantage? Me, the law-abiding citizen, or them, the criminal?

If those shootings happened where guns are legal, think about what happens in "Gun Free Zones".

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Columbine_High_School_massacre

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virginia_Tech_massacre

Both of those were in "gun free zones". That didn't help, did it?

How about some proof that guns can stop crime?
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appalachian_School_of_Law_shooting

MemphisYou should really stop being so pig-headed by the way cheesesoda, calling people idiots and retards is just rude and does nothing in debates such as these. I at least am 'open' to your points even if I don't agree with them whereas you just get angry and defensive.

I get angry and defensive because you're taking away MY rights to defend myself, my possessions, and my family. I don't take kindly to those who think they know how I should live my life better than I do. If you don't want to own a gun, that's fine. You'll only have yourself to blame if you find yourself at the business end of a gun and no way to protect yourself other than yelling, "HELP!" Good luck with that.

As for regulating the AMOUNT of guns in circulation: Guns can be created by just about anyone. While they may be crude, they'd still be effective. Even if it DID work (which defies logic), criminals would still have plenty of alternatives to choose from.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 14:28:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cheesesoda, Out of curiosity, Do you support selling guns if you don't own a license?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 14:42:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryu wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 10:28Cheesesoda, Out of curiosity, Do you support selling guns if you don't own a license?
Why wouldn't I? If I support not having regulation on purchasing weapons, why would I support regulation on selling them? It would be ludicrous to say that someone can buy a guy but can't sell one.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 15:06:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Certain guns like BB guns, kids pellet rifles, and small low powered pistols are ok, they rally couldnt kill someone, maybe a small bird or rat, but not someone, I've accidentally shot myself with a pellet and removed it myself, yes it hurt, but life threatening? no.

vertain things like high powered shtoguns, rifles, and semi automatic guns need to require a licence, those are the deadly ones.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 15:19:26 GMT

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

Why should they require a license, though? Who does it stop from getting the guns? I have said it enough that it should be obvious... it stops the law-abiding citizens. The criminals are free to get whatever weapon they want without regulation.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 15:31:36 GMT

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

The real problem is the fact guns aren't controlled.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 15:46:33 GMT

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

Ryu wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 11:31The real problem is the fact guns aren't controlled. How in the fuck do you suppose we "control" them?

Regardless, why should we control them? The people need to control themselves. We can't control the people, and I know everybody arguing for gun control uses this as an argument, but the ideology that since we can't control the people, we must control the weapon is absurd. You're punishing people like me who would control themselves with their weapons. Just because you can't control the people doesn't give you the right to infringe on the rights of the people.

Again, who the fuck are you to tell me that I can't be trusted to be responsible for myself and my actions? Fuck the lot of you.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 15:51:57 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 10:46Ryu wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 11:31The real problem is the fact guns aren't controlled. How in the fuck do you suppose we "control" them?

Regardless, why should we control them? The people need to control themselves. We can't control the people, and I know everybody arguing for gun control uses this as an argument, but the ideology that since we can't control the people, we must control the weapon is absurd. You're punishing people like me who would control themselves with their weapons. Just because you can't control the people doesn't give you the right to infringe on the rights of the people.

Again, who the fuck are you to tell me that I can't be trusted to be responsible for myself and my actions? Fuck the lot of you.

You misunderstood me, Other Governments sell them, Doesn't matter to who, As long as they profit, And they make their way to criminals.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:13:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Fuck the lot of you. Ok.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:30:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryu wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 11:51cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 10:46Ryu wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 11:31The real problem is the fact guns aren't controlled.

How in the fuck do you suppose we "control" them?

Regardless, why should we control them? The people need to control themselves. We can't control the people, and I know everybody arguing for gun control uses this as an argument, but the ideology that since we can't control the people, we must control the weapon is absurd. You're punishing people like me who would control themselves with their weapons. Just because you can't control the people doesn't give you the right to infringe on the rights of the people.

Again, who the fuck are you to tell me that I can't be trusted to be responsible for myself and my actions? Fuck the lot of you.

You misunderstood me, Other Governments sell them, Doesn't matter to who, As long as they profit, And they make their way to criminals.
Yet if every law-abiding citizen (or most) owned guns, that wouldn't matter.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:36:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda at his best; forcing his opinion on everyone

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:38:07 GMT

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

He makes sense.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:43:46 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 12:36cheesesoda at his best; forcing his opinion on everyone

I'm just using logic, and I'm persistent at it. As long as people are trying to take away my liberties, then I'm going to have a problem with it.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:50:26 GMT

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

The fact you're calling people morons suggests so

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:51:52 GMT

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

I like having freedoms. I'm not about to relinquish them because others are too fucking paranoid.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:53:52 GMT

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

So do others, they have the right to an opinion. You should be making your point to the government, not us.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 17:14:38 GMT

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

What good does that do if the majority of people vote in the gun control idiots? Talking to the people helps. Also, a healthy debate is always fun.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Memphis](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 17:32:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cheesesoda, you should start up a vigilante law enforcement team. You could even have a slogan after you shot a thieving drug addict fatally to death. This slogan would be:

"Want cheese with that, asshole"

I'm sure you could get a TV deal out of it too.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 17:43:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Memphis wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 13:32: Cheesesoda, you should start up a vigilante law enforcement team. You could even have a slogan after you shot a thieving drug addict fatally to death. This slogan would be:

"Want cheese with that, asshole"

I'm sure you could get a TV deal out of it too.

And you can start a show where you go around asking people if they've ever been shot and killed by a robber, so you can prove that it never happens.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 19:59:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Argument-free flaming: for when there just aren't any more sensible posts to be made.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 20:13:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Thu, 13 September 2007 15:59: Argument-free flaming: for when there just aren't any more sensible posts to be made.

I'd be more than happy to continue arguing if they kept up with their concocted, nonsensical ideas on why guns should be regulated/banned.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 21:04:58 GMT

I'm going to re-post this link that cheesosoda posted earlier.

people in favor of taking guns away from citizens WATCH THIS:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qyoLuTjguJA>

Incredible insight in common sense right there.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 22:38:03 GMT

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

AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 19:31 EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 11:54 AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 12 September 2007 17:51 There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that, you need guns for surround people when taking them down (if you are a police officer), you need guns to tell the speed of fast cars, theres more uses, but since i'm not into guns, I dont know, but just because the main uses are for the things said previously, it doesnt mean they should be banned, i'm all for people owning guns, as long as they dont abuse it, but heck, you cant read minds so you never know how will crack and use them, if we ban guns, then a knife or cross bow will start becomming common weapon, you want to ban knives? then bann kitchens knives to, screw cooking, maybe we'll eat out everyday at fancy italian places and just let them own knives since we all know for 100% sure they wont use them for injustice.

Ya i went a bit off topic, but the point if, if you ban guns from people, then ban them all, because there have been police cases in the past where police misuse a gun, heck even if you do ban guns, people will still OWN them, the black market, illegal imports, people know where to buy guns.

I stopped reading after "There are many uses, such as starting the horse/dog races, you need a gun for that,".

I had hoped you had a little more intelligence. Now I do see why you are pro-guns. It's a bit of a primitive thing, where you will probably feel right at home.

Wow, it seems those who don't like something want to force it onto everyone else, how smart and fair that is, yes I may seem to have sounded retarded in that area, but still I proved a point and a point is still a point, you challenged us to come up with more uses and I did, and for lashing at me like that for answering your question, it shows how patience and intelligent you really are. Plus there was some useful arguments after I said "horse/dog" thing, but like a lot of people I guess, their too arrogant to read 3 more sentences just because they cant agree with someone else's view.

No, I stopped reading the because it is a totally invalid point, and I had hoped you would notice that yourself too. It is rather easy to make something like a gun to start a race. For that purpose you jsut need sometimg that makes a hell of a lot of noise, not something that fires a piece of lead at or above 300m/s.

@Cheesesoda, you said you like having freedoms, that's nice, but my guess is that you are a

conservative republican voter, right?
That suggest you supports Bush right?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 22:41:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He listed things that guns can be used for. Nobody ever asked for stuff that there was no alternatives for that guns could do.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [scarabguy](#) on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 00:55:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i got an idea: just shut up and stop flaming each other go back to my last post on this subject, the second line of type:
"enough bs"

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 04:55:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How did you make the connection that someone who supports gun rights votes republican? I mean, I can't speak for others, so you may well be right, but I don't support either of the major parties- both of them are interested only in maintaining the status quo, and neither will take this country in a positive direction as far as I'm concerned.

Apologies for cutting in, cheese, but blind political/social assumptions of the "if you believe X, you must be a Y" variety really irritate me on a number of levels.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 12:25:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, it annoys the Hell out of me, too. I say one thing that sounds conservative, and I'm automatically labeled right-wing. Then again, I would have assumed the same, usually before I stopped being a part of either party.

I am certainly not a Republican, nor, obviously, am I a Democrat. I am a Libertarian.

One question: would it kill you to look at my signature? That link that says "Libertarian Party" might have given you a clue.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 13:23:48 GMT

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

It's called liberal stereotyping, it's ok, because if i disagree with someone, they can just back themselves up by saying "oh so you must vote republican, thats why your so ghey"

Really it doesnt matter what side i am if I support guns or not, so saying the above quote to me is starting to show you have no valid point in this argument. (meaning ewd so others dont get confused)

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 23:16:32 GMT

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

I never said you where, it was jsut a guess.

Also, it may seem a bit weird, but for me it's to hear an american that's "right-winged" this because, f you would compare it to the Dutch political climate, every US party would be right-winged. And the democrats beng a bt more left winged then the republicans, but still pretty right winged, if you catch my drift.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 15 Sep 2007 00:43:53 GMT

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

So then your country's full of Socialists? Eww...

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sat, 15 Sep 2007 11:57:32 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 15 September 2007 02:43So then your country's full of Socialists? Eww...

On your definiton, probably yes.

Stll, I must say I enjoy living here, enjoying good health care for everyone, and a lot of other stuff, which would be called socialistic

And as you may or may not know, the Netherlands has a nicely working economy which is rather stable. So apparently socialism can't be all bad

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 15 Sep 2007 23:52:28 GMT

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

Liberty > Equality.

'nuff said.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 16 Sep 2007 00:47:25 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 15 September 2007 18:52Liberty > Equality.

'nuff said.

Agreed.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sun, 16 Sep 2007 01:48:45 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 16 September 2007 01:52Liberty > Equality.

'nuff said.

You know that you can be free and have (partial) equality? I have my doubts. I live in a perfectly free country, and I don't see what your country is different in, in large porportions. Ok, you can have a gun, but as we saw, there is enough reason to debate that. But besides that? This isn't communist Russia.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 16 Sep 2007 04:29:20 GMT

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

You don't get it, though. The government spending your money on other people is an infringement on your rights. From the sound of it, you see this as a good thing and fully support it. However, I don't. I don't like government spending. I don't care if I would benefit from a welfare program or not down the road. I don't want to have other people's money spent on me, and I don't want to have my money spent on others without my direct consent.

That's why I dislike Socialism. Socialism relies on the government to fix problems. I, on the other hand, view that it should be the community's responsibility to do so. If forced, people in a community WILL unite and help each other out. You can see this after natural disasters. If you don't rely on the government, people will rely on each other. Otherwise, people expect everything from the government which is not right. The government gains power over the people when this happens, and the government taxes more and spends more of my money on other people rather than me. Call it selfish, but I don't think you'd approve of me reaching into your bank account and spending your money, even if it was to be spent wisely to help the poor or hungry simply because

I demanded the money and spent it without your consultation.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sun, 16 Sep 2007 19:17:27 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 16 September 2007 06:29 You don't get it, though. The government spending your money on other people is an infringement on your rights. From the sound of it, you see this as a good thing and fully support it. However, I don't. I don't like government spending. I don't care if I would benefit from a welfare program or not down the road. I don't want to have other people's money spent on me, and I don't want to have my money spent on others without my direct consent.

That's why I dislike Socialism. Socialism relies on the government to fix problems. I, on the other hand, view that it should be the community's responsibility to do so. If forced, people in a community WILL unite and help each other out. You can see this after natural disasters. If you don't rely on the government, people will rely on each other. Otherwise, people expect everything from the government which is not right. The government gains power over the people when this happens, and the government taxes more and spends more of my money on other people rather than me. Call it selfish, but I don't think you'd approve of me reaching into your bank account and spending your money, even if it was to be spent wisely to help the poor or hungry simply because I demanded the money and spent it without your consultation.

Let's put it this way, at least my country isn't spending huge proportions on a war that can't be won.

Also, you stated that the government spends your money, giving it to other people. While that is true, of course, it is kept to a minimum, and the money is used for keeping other people alive, and let's them have some form of room above their head. Also, don't forget that this is a choice of the people. If we didn't want this, it wouldn't be there. Of course, not everyone will agree, but that's the same in any democracy.

Another point, you state that people will help each other after a natural disaster. Well, looking at new orleans, the only thing you would be helped with is them eating your food, and others helping you get rid of anything you had left. Hell, even Cuba wanted to send help when your own government couldn't deliver. They were too busy evacuating the rich(er) people, while letting the others die.

Anyway, we will probably never agree, for one simple reason, being that we have been brought up with different morals and values.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 01:05:25 GMT

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

One thing I'm going to point out; the country as a whole is a community. A community must have a

leader, that is your government.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 02:32:09 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Sun, 16 September 2007 15:17Let's put it this way, at least my country isn't spending huge proportions on a war that can't be won.

How did i see that coming.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 09:45:51 GMT

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

@gm: true

DarkDemin wrote on Mon, 17 September 2007 04:32EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Sun, 16 September 2007 15:17Let's put it this way, at least my country isn't spending huge proportions on a war that can't be won.

How did i see that coming.

Well, mean, if you are going to complain about wasting money, then I think Iraq is a good example of how you can waste your money. I preffer our way then

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 13:21:33 GMT

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

I really wouldnt blame the war in Iraq as a waste of money, sure war always is, but look at the smaller goverments in your town, they waste tons more on their own crap, my town is so wasteful (not anymore since the new election) but say 7-8 years ago, they used to have a stone wall, now they replaced the stone with bricks and spent thousands on a fancy new brick wall all around the city, and then every 2 years they would put up new light poles with bigger fancier ones, I think every 2-3 when they did that type of crap that is only needed like once every 10-15 years, it waste a ton of money which could be used to do something else important.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 18 Sep 2007 10:20:20 GMT

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

Well, I must say that in the town I lived for the last 13 years I haven't noticed any waste on public stuff, perhaps on bureaucracy, but that's not really checkable.

Also, I prefer my freedom of speech:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,,-6930305,00.html>

Auwtsch, so for the USA freedom of speech.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [w0dka](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 14:22:11 GMT

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

Defense? Why you need a gun for defense?

serious question. In Germany i don't need a gun.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 14:54:27 GMT

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

w0dka wrote on Thu, 27 September 2007 10:22Defense? Why you need a gun for defense?

serious question. In Germany i don't need a gun.

Greed, corruption, and tyrannical governments.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [pillowgun1](#) on Mon, 08 Oct 2007 05:51:09 GMT

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

wall mart = n00b

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 08 Oct 2007 06:31:14 GMT

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

pillowgun1 wrote on Mon, 08 October 2007 07:51wall mart = n00b

wall-mart = racist motherfuckers

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 08 Oct 2007 14:10:00 GMT

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

You people are still talking about this thing?

And since when is there a mart that sells walls?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 08 Oct 2007 15:47:25 GMT

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

Caveman wrote on Mon, 10 September 2007 15:38 Sorry but the law in the US is just fucked. You shouldn't be allowed to have a gun.

It is in the Constitution which was written in the 1700s.

"All men have the right to bare arms"

And I disagree with what you said about having something that causes harm but doesn't kill. That is called torture. I would much rather have it your either ok, or your dead. No in between.

But no one has the right to take the life of another. However, lets just say that it was illegal to buy a gun in the US. Did you forget about smuggling?

Now not only do the criminals have guns, but the normal citizens don't. That is one reason why that law still stands.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 04:49:26 GMT

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

fucking rednecks and their guns need to be gone. i wish the south would've won the war so they could leave.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 08:08:17 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Tue, 16 October 2007 00:49 fucking rednecks and their guns need to be gone. i wish the south would've won the war so they could leave.

I live in Michigan, and I love my guns. I'm pretty sure that Michigan is a good distance from the Mason-Dixon line.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 16:42:55 GMT

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

Quote: i wish the south would've won the war so they could leave. iirc the South used slaves....
not really better than Guns, is it?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 16:58:01 GMT

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

How ironic, because he promotes slavery.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 17:59:29 GMT

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

Wow this topic is hilarious.

I think it's already been sufficiently argued though so I don't know if there's much for me to add. I pretty much agree with Cheesesoda's points. I also really liked this post by Nukelt:

http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=25911&prevloaded=1&rid=0&start=75#msg_num_14

I would definitely act if my family were in danger, no question. I would not regret it my entire life though because in my heart I would feel justified in my actions. As someone stated earlier when people engage in certain acts: burglary, assault, rape, they forfeit their right to safety and life. I completely support personal gun ownership and if they weren't so gosh darn expensive would probably have a gun by now.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 18:59:16 GMT

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

That post by Nukelt is probably one of the best posts ever created in this sub-forum. I only currently own a pellet gun and a 22., but there are plenty of others in this house(ei, the 12 gauge) that could easily be used in its stead. Each gun is locked up with the ammo separate, but they're still easily reachable if the need arises.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [KIRBY-098](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 19:42:19 GMT

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

razorblade001 wrote on Mon, 08 October 2007 16:47It is in the Constitution which was written in the 1700s.

"All men have the right to bare arms"

Rumor has it you can bare your legs and anything else you want to show as well.

We can also arm bears.

And to top it all off: We have the right to BEAR arms.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 16 Oct 2007 19:53:19 GMT

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

LMAO!

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 01:05:57 GMT

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

My opinion is that is someone broke into my house and started shooting all the members in my family, I would rather have a gun to shoot them with, rather then have to try running at him with a chair or something.

And even if you did require everyone to get a gun license, a person could still break into your house and steal your gun.

And if nobody could have guns it would be like on cops when someone steals a tank, and the cops have nothing to match it. So all they can do is stand there until it gets stuck or runs out of gas. Or as it would be in this case ammo.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 05:09:53 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 16 October 2007 20:05My opinion is that is someone broke into my house and started shooting all the members in my family, I would rather have a gun to shoot them with, rather then have to try running at him with a chair or something.

And even if you did require everyone to get a gun license, a person could still break into your house and steal your gun.

And if nobody could have guns it would be like on cops when someone steals a tank, and the

cops have nothing to match it. So all they can do is stand there until it gets stuck or runs out of gas. Or as it would be in this case ammo.
cops can't do anything against tanks right now anyways. they only have pistols or pump shotguns.....

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 08:50:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Read his post better.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 21:43:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 03:50Read his post better.

why do you follow my posts around flaming me for anything? that's really mean stop it please

I misread his post, I thought it said that cops can't do anything with his blah blah analogy, not that it was on Cops. it wasn't capitalized so when i read it i sort of overlooked it. Still, how can you compare a person fighting a burglar to that person fighting a tank?? lol

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 23:13:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 17:43Jecht wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 03:50Read his post better.

why do you follow my posts around flaming me for anything? that's really mean stop it please

I misread his post, I thought it said that cops can't do anything with his blah blah analogy, not that it was on Cops. it wasn't capitalized so when i read it i sort of overlooked it. Still, how can you compare a person fighting a burglar to that person fighting a tank?? lol

Why are simple analogies of principle lost on people so easily?

The principle he's discussing isn't equating a tank thief to a burglar. He's equating the police being helpless to stop the tank thief just as a homeowner would be helpless to stop a burglar if the homeowner was prevented from owning a gun legally.

Seriously, is it that hard to grasp?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 18 Oct 2007 02:10:02 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 18:13Rocko wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 17:43Jecht wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 03:50Read his post better.

why do you follow my posts around flaming me for anything? that's really mean stop it please

I misread his post, I thought it said that cops can't do anything with his blah blah analogy, not that it was on Cops. it wasn't capitalized so when i read it i sort of overlooked it. Still, how can you compare a person fighting a burglar to that person fighting a tank?? lol
Why are simple analogies of principle lost on people so easily?

The principle he's discussing isn't equating a tank thief to a burglar. He's equating the police being helpless to stop the tank thief just as a homeowner would be helpless to stop a burglar if the homeowner was prevented from owning a gun legally.

Seriously, is it that hard to grasp?

No because a homeowner is not completely helpless against a burglar even if they don't have a gun. You can compare the situation to the police on a tank but that doesn't make the analogy correct.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 18 Oct 2007 02:48:46 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 22:10cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 18:13Rocko wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 17:43Jecht wrote on Wed, 17 October 2007 03:50Read his post better.

why do you follow my posts around flaming me for anything? that's really mean stop it please

I misread his post, I thought it said that cops can't do anything with his blah blah analogy, not that it was on Cops. it wasn't capitalized so when i read it i sort of overlooked it. Still, how can you compare a person fighting a burglar to that person fighting a tank?? lol
Why are simple analogies of principle lost on people so easily?

The principle he's discussing isn't equating a tank thief to a burglar. He's equating the police being helpless to stop the tank thief just as a homeowner would be helpless to stop a burglar if the homeowner was prevented from owning a gun legally.

Seriously, is it that hard to grasp?

No because a homeowner is not completely helpless against a burglar even if they don't have a gun. You can compare the situation to the police on a tank but that doesn't make the analogy correct.

Neither are "completely" helpless. I didn't think I needed to be THAT specific.

The fact is, regardless if the police have the ability to bring in backup, just like people have the ability to call for help, it still doesn't change the fact that crime doesn't wait until both sides are

equally armed.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Angelobianco](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 13:48:50 GMT

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

eh ehe h here in Italy many boys play with pistols & rifles. American boys do this too. Who play with pistols and rifles in roads is mostly a retarded. Why USA government allows weapon detention to childrens? That sounds very strange. Fortunately, our Esselunga doesn't sell weapons.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:58:15 GMT

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

So has anyone heard about that shooting at a church and missionary center on Sunday? How was it stopped? Oh, yeah, by this volunteer security guard armed with a gun. I know it sounds crazy, but a citizen (though, she is a FORMER cop) owns a gun and used it on someone set on mass murder. Yeah, I know, this is just more proof that law-abiding citizens with guns is not a good idea, amirite?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 20:26:27 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 13:58 So has anyone heard about that shooting at a church and missionary center on Sunday? How was it stopped? Oh, yeah, by this volunteer security guard armed with a gun. I know it sounds crazy, but a citizen (though, she is a FORMER cop) owns a gun and used it on someone set on mass murder. Yeah, I know, this is just more proof that law-abiding citizens with guns is not a good idea, amirite?

If the mass murder wasn't able to buy a gun like every other citizen in the first place, then this wouldn't had happened.

Crazy idea that yes?

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 20:40:52 GMT

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

Throughout the thread, there was a point that was beaten into the heads of everybody so many times, I just figured I'd leave it out. That point being a murderer is going to get the weapon

regardless of its legality. I mean, if he's going to commit murder, weapon's illegally is the least of his worries.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 20:43:59 GMT

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

IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 14:26cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 13:58So has anyone heard about that shooting at a church and missionary center on Sunday? How was it stopped? Oh, yeah, by this volunteer security guard armed with a gun. I know it sounds crazy, but a citizen (though, she is a FORMER cop) owns a gun and used it on someone set on mass murder. Yeah, I know, this is just more proof that law-abiding citizens with guns is not a good idea, amirite?

If the mass murder wasn't able to buy a gun like every other citizen in the first place, then this wouldn't had happened.

Crazy idea that yes?

Maybe he would have built a bomb? Humans will find a way out of no way. Take away guns and you got knives which is the case in England I think.

@Cheesesoda

No you are not right. It was the Holy Spirit that helped her out. And God too.

Toggle SpoilerNah just kidding! I completely agree with you. Who knows, if she did not have the gun to end the rampage, the guy would have ended up killing more innocent people.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 20:53:39 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 14:43IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 14:26cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 13:58So has anyone heard about that shooting at a church and missionary center on Sunday? How was it stopped? Oh, yeah, by this volunteer security guard armed with a gun. I know it sounds crazy, but a citizen (though, she is a FORMER cop) owns a gun and used it on someone set on mass murder. Yeah, I know, this is just more proof that law-abiding citizens with guns is not a good idea, amirite?

If the mass murder wasn't able to buy a gun like every other citizen in the first place, then this wouldn't had happened.

Crazy idea that yes?

Maybe he would have built a bomb? Humans will find a way out of no way. Take away guns and you got knives which is the case in England I think.

@Cheesesoda

No you are not right. It was the Holy Spirit that helped her out. And God too.

Toggle SpoilerNah just kidding! I completely agree with you. Who knows, if she did not have the gun to end the rampage, the guy would have ended up killing more innocent people.

Good try in an answer but no.

It is harder to build a bomb then it is to pull a trigger on a gun.

It is much harder for a human to kill a other human with a knife then it is with a gun.

And trying to mass murder people with a knife is not like counter strike, also the chances of a person living after being stabbed is higher then it is with a gun.

I talk from experience my friend.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 21:02:43 GMT

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

Iron, I understand what you are saying but still...

So, you are saying that I (even though I can responsibly wield guns given the chance) have to sacrifice guns because I am automatically put in the category of people who will abuse it?

OMG UPDATE!

<http://www.cnn.com/2007/US/12/11/colorado.shootings/index.html>

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 21:29:38 GMT

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

IronWarriorGood try in an answer but no.

It is harder to build a bomb then it is to pull a trigger on a gun.

It is much harder for a human to kill a other human with a knife then it is with a gun.

And trying to mass murder people with a knife is not like counter strike, also the chances of a person living after being stabbed is higher then it is with a gun.

I talk from experience my friend.

The point is, if someone has the intention of hurting others, nothing is going to stop them.

If he obtained the rifle illegally, it would only further my point that you're not going to keep the weapons out of a criminal's hands if he wants it. Then, the best way to combat these situations is to let law abiding citizens who are on the scene respond to the situation. Obviously, anybody THERE would be able to respond to the shooter quicker than any police force ever could.

So now that we (should) realize that banning weapons doesn't affect a determined person's desires to go on a killing spree, there's no reasonable explanation as to why we should keep the gun out of the reach of law-abiding citizens. If a shooting does occur, law-abiding citizens react much quicker than an absent police force which would otherwise take minutes to arrive on the scene to combat the killer who may have already taken more victims. Oh, and citizens retain more of their liberties!

Yay for logic.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 22:58:09 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 15:29IronWarriorGood try in an answer but no.

It is harder to build a bomb then it is to pull a trigger on a gun.

It is much harder for a human to kill a other human with a knife then it is with a gun.

And trying to mass murder people with a knife is not like counter strike, also the chances of a person living after being stabbed is higher then it is with a gun.

I talk from experience my friend.

The point is, if someone has the intention of hurting others, nothing is going to stop them.

If he obtained the rifle illegally, it would only further my point that you're not going to keep the weapons out of a criminal's hands if he wants it. Then, the best way to combat these situations is to let law abiding citizens who are on the scene respond to the situation. Obviously, anybody THERE would be able to respond to the shooter quicker than any police force ever could.

So now that we (should) realize that banning weapons doesn't affect a determined person's desires to go on a killing spree, there's no reasonable explanation as to why we should keep the gun out of the reach of law-abiding citizens. If a shooting does occur, law-abiding citizens react much quicker than an absent police force which would otherwise take minutes to arrive on the scene to combat the killer who may have already taken more victims. Oh, and citizens retain more

of their liberties!

Yay for logic.

Just because you are a law-abiding citizen today, doesn't mean you will be tomorrow, this is where your logic fails.

This is the same logic to justify the Nuclear Arm race, they have nukes, we gotta have nukes, they have 10,000 tanks, we need 20,000 tanks and so on.

Thing about the guns in the USA, is that you can buy high grade military types, there is really no need for a person to have a machine gun of military grade.

Rifles and shotguns yes, they are used for hunting, if they are used in a crime, then the death toll should be lower as these weapons are slower loading then a mag fed weapon.

As always, if a person ever loses it, am happy to take him on if he holds a knife, but if he has a gun, all he needs to do is pull the trigger.

But with a knife, I have a fair chance of taking him down.

I also gotta say this, even if you do have a gun, doesn't mean you gotta use it to defend yourself, most humans will sit themselves while they let the guy carry on killing.

The answer is not to give guns to people, but have a bigger police force.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 22:59:46 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 11 December 2007 15:29IronWarriorGood try in an answer but no.

It is harder to build a bomb then it is to pull a trigger on a gun.

It is much harder for a human to kill a other human with a knife then it is with a gun.

And trying to mass murder people with a knife is not like counter strike, also the chances of a person living after being stabbed is higher then it is with a gun.

I talk from experience my friend.

The point is, if someone has the intention of hurting others, nothing is going to stop them.

If he obtained the rifle illegally, it would only further my point that you're not going to keep the weapons out of a criminal's hands if he wants it. Then, the best way to combat these situations is to let law abiding citizens who are on the scene respond to the situation. Obviously, anybody

THERE would be able to respond to the shooter quicker than any police force ever could.

So now that we (should) realize that banning weapons doesn't affect a determined person's desires to go on a killing spree, there's no reasonable explanation as to why we should keep the gun out of the reach of law-abiding citizens. If a shooting does occur, law-abiding citizens react much quicker than an absent police force which would otherwise take minutes to arrive on the scene to combat the killer who may have already taken more victims. Oh, and citizens retain more of their liberties!

Yay for logic.

It'd minimize murder though.

Subject: Re: Man returns gun ammo to walmart at 1300 feet per second

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Dec 2007 01:23:36 GMT

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

What part of "PEOPLE WILL OBTAIN THE WEAPONS REGARDLESS OF THEIR LEGALITY" do you people not understand? If they're going to murder someone, they're not going to care about whether or not the weapon is illegal.

If I'm going to snap, I'm going to harm someone whether or not I have a gun, and if I attack someone, it's probably going to be someone I can overwhelm WITHOUT the use of a gun, so you fighting back would be futile. However, a person planning a killing spree doesn't just "snap" and immediately take action. They usually plan out everything, which explains why people have several thousand rounds with them and several weapons. These are the people you have to watch out for, and these are the people you can't prevent from obtaining illegal weapons.

If I want a fully-automatic weapon, I should have every right to own one. Do I need one? No, but we don't NEED most of the things we have. We could do without computers and games. We could do without cars and currency. If you want to live with no luxuries, that's fine, but owning high powered weapons is just another luxury some people are interested in.
