

---

Subject: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 05:08:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

maybe now we can take that gun out of your hand

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 07:45:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

For people that are not on the same level as Rocko and actually enjoyed the actor in various roles:

<http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/front/la-me-heston6apr06,1,2698820.stor y>

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 09:44:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.geenstijl.nl/archives/images/gadverdammeman.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 13:48:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hahahahaha

so he kissed a monkey?  
roflmao

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 19:42:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

renalpha wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 08:48so he kissed a monkey?  
roflmao

I think it was a 'Muppet' . People kissed Muppets all the time back in those days.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

---

Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 20:10:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Who's charleston heston ?

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 20:15:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Madrockz wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 15:10Who's charleston heston ?  
Oh, here's all you need to know about him here:

<http://wikipedia.org/charleston-heston>

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 20:35:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 15:42renalpha wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 08:48so he  
kissed a monkey?  
roflmao

I think it was a 'Muppet' . People kissed Muppets all the time back in those days.

Was a woman in a "evolved" chimpanzee suit.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 21:06:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally Blue wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 21:15Madrockz wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008  
15:10Who's charleston heston ?  
Oh, here's all you need to know about him here:

<http://wikipedia.org/charleston-heston>  
omg i dont want to search in Google, i just wanted a simple answer..

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 21:10:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

1st Rule of Question asking: do all you can do yourself before you ask someone else.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [TD](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 21:59:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Surth wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 23:10 1st Rule of Question asking: do all you can do yourself before you ask someone else.  
Did I ask you for this information? Do not give people information unless they ask for it.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Sun, 06 Apr 2008 22:04:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Charleston Heston was a famous actor mainly for his role in the Planet of the Apes movie series.

There are 5 original movies and one really bad Tim Burton edition made in 2001.

Movie List:

Planet of the Apes  
Beneath the Planet of the Apes  
Battle for the Planet of the Apes  
Escape from the Planet of the Apes  
Conquest of the Planet of the Apes (My personal favorite)

Original trailer for Planet of the Apes:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CvR2mCx-Jnc>

The bottom line is that these movies are gold and you need to see them if you have not.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Mon, 07 Apr 2008 00:35:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He's a fag, he goes to a town right after there's a school shooting. Fuck him.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Mon, 07 Apr 2008 01:32:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 19:35 He's a fag, he goes to a town right after there's a school shooting. Fuck him.

Ok? lol

Heston has to be one of the greatest actors of all time, he is the star of many ground breaking

blockbusters in cinema. Plus he has so many quotes on and off the big screen.

Love him or hate him, you have to respect him which I doubt many of you will since you would rather slander him instead.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Mon, 07 Apr 2008 02:02:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh my God. I'm back. I'm home. All the time, it was... We finally really did it. You Maniacs! You blew it up! Ah, damn you! God damn you all to hell!

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 07 Apr 2008 02:26:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He was a great actor and he was one of my favorite actors due to his awesome movie Ben-Hur.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Mon, 07 Apr 2008 21:28:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Oh my God. I'm back. I'm home. All the time, it was... We finally really did it. You Maniacs!  
You blew it up! Ah, damn you! God damn you all to hell!

ITS A MADHOUSE...A MADHOUSE!

And that is not even his most famous quote from the movie.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Mon, 07 Apr 2008 23:52:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GoArmy44 wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 05:28Quote:Oh my God. I'm back. I'm home. All the time, it was... We finally really did it. You Maniacs! You blew it up! Ah, damn you! God damn you all to hell!

ITS A MADHOUSE...A MADHOUSE!

---

And that is not even his most famous quote from the movie.

Get your stinking paws off me, you damn dirty ape! I can quote whatever I feel like.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Tue, 08 Apr 2008 00:22:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Canadacd wrote on Mon, 07 April 2008 18:52GoArmy44 wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 05:28Quote:Oh my God. I'm back. I'm home. All the time, it was... We finally really did it. You Maniacs! You blew it up! Ah, damn you! God damn you all to hell!

ITS A MADHOUSE...A MADHOUSE!

And that is not even his most famous quote from the movie.

Get your stinking paws off me, you damn dirty ape! I can quote whatever I feel like.

That's what is great about Charlton Heston, there's just so many quotes because of how dramatic he makes everything seem.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 08 Apr 2008 00:24:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oblivion165 wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 17:04Charleston Heston was a famous actor mainly for his role in the Planet of the Apes movie series.

There are 5 original movies and one really bad Tim Burton edition made in 2001.

Movie List:

- Planet of the Apes
- Beneath the Planet of the Apes
- Battle for the Planet of the Apes
- Escape from the Planet of the Apes
- Conquest of the Planet of the Apes (My personal favorite)

Original trailer for Planet of the Apes:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CvR2mCx-Jnc>

The bottom line is that these movies are gold and you need to see them if you have not.

Actually, I didn't think that the first one was all that good.

YOU CUT HIS BRAIN OUT!! YOU DAMN DIRTY APES!!

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 08 Apr 2008 20:06:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nobody gives a shit, as he is "before their time".

If Britney Spears died though, there would be mass emocide.

The world has gone to hell.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 08 Apr 2008 20:20:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 15:06Nobody gives a shit, as he is "before their time".

If Britney Spears died though, there would be mass emocide.

The world has gone to hell.

I disagree.

Many many people "from his time" grieve Heston's death.

It is only logical for the younger generation to care for those in their time as they were not around then. It's life and this is how it works and this is how it had always worked...so need to say the world has gone to hell.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 09 Apr 2008 02:57:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 13:20Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 15:06Nobody gives a shit, as he is "before their time".

If Britney Spears died though, there would be mass emocide.

The world has gone to hell.

I disagree.

Wow! Holy fuck...you disagree...let's etch that into a gold disc and launch it on the next deep space probe!

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 13:20 Many many people "from his time" grieve Heston's death. Indeed. How many people on these forums are "from his time"? Thus my observation that most people here could care less, is still quite valid. Now I'm sure that there are a few "young" folks who can still appreciate a great actor even though they probably haven't even seen a single movie that he is in. But let's face it, most of the activity on these forums lately are from the likes of Renalpha, rocko, etc...where the boldest statement they can make is posting a picture of a "lol bird".

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 13:20

It is only logical for the younger generation to care for those in their time as they were not around then. It's life and this is how it works and this is how it had always worked...so (no?) need to say the world has gone to hell.

Perhaps some day you will let us come and sit around a fire with you, while you explain how life works and has always worked...maybe if we sacrifice a chicken you might reveal how life will work in the future.

As for no need to say ... I say what I please. Including that the world is in a sad state when kids are doing things like beating someone half to death just so they can post it on YouTube.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 09 Apr 2008 11:02:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 21:57 Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 13:20 Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 15:06 Nobody gives a shit, as he is "before their time".

If Britney Spears died though, there would be mass emocide.

The world has gone to hell.

I disagree.

Wow! Holy fuck...you disagree...let's etch that into a gold disc and launch it on the next deep space probe!

Nice offer! I will take that!

Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 21:57Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 13:20Many many people "from his time" grieve Heston's death.Indeed. How many people on these forums are "from his time"? Thus my observation that most people here could care less, is still quite valid. Now I'm sure that there are a few "young" folks who can still appreciate a great actor even though they probably haven't even seen a single movie that he is in. But lets face it, most of the activity on these forums lately are from the likes of Renalpha, rocko, etc...where the boldest statement they can make is posting a picture of a "lol bird".

You did not make it clear that you are taking about the forumers here. The whole world is not in Renegadeforums.

Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 21:57Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 13:20  
It is only logical for the younger generation to care for those in their time as they were not around then. It's life and this is how it works and this is how it had always worked...so (no?) need to say the world has gone to hell.

Perhaps some day you will let us come and sit around a fire with you, while you explain how life works and has always worked...maybe if we sacrifice a chicken you might reveal how life will work in the future.

I merely mentioned a social phenomenon.

Blazer wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 21:57[As for no need to say ... I say what I please. Including that the world is in a sad state when kids are doing things like beating someone half to death just so they can post it on YouTube.

True.

And what can you do to stop the stupidity...atleast in the forums? Ever thought of shutting down the Spam subforum and hiring 100 clones of Gozy?

You can't really blame renalpha and Rocko when they are able to get away with being retarded perfectly fine within your system.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 09 Apr 2008 14:04:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've seen quite a few Charlton Heston movies, and I really liked them all.

The Agony and the Ecstasy  
Planet of the Apes  
Spartacus  
Soylent Green

---

---



Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 09 Apr 2008 18:26:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

To name a few more that this young'un has seen in addition to the films already listed...

The Omega Man  
Midway  
Julius Caesar

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2008 13:56:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The Omega Man was really good.

Also: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-600208392552030041&q=the+simpsons+planet+of+the+apes&total=33&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&amplindex=7>

Terrible quality but the best I could find quickly.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 16:12:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Rocko wrote on Sat, 05 April 2008 23:08 maybe now we can take that gun out of your hand  
Oblivion165 wrote on Sun, 06 April 2008 03:45 For people that are not on the same level as Rocko and actually enjoyed the actor in various roles:

<http://www.latimes.com/news/print/edition/front/la-me-heston6apr06,1,2698820.stor y>

Rocko does have a point though.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 16:24:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He might have been a good actor, but he shoulda stayed teh fuck out of politics.

-Ghost-

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

---

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 17:01:27 GMT

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

---

I liked the fact that he completely backed gun ownership rights.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 05:21:05 GMT

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

---

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O0B\\_UZNtEk4&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O0B_UZNtEk4&feature=related)

hands reference

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 15:45:06 GMT

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

---

Rocko wrote on Fri, 18 April 2008

00:21 [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O0B\\_UZNtEk4&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O0B_UZNtEk4&feature=related)

hands reference

"Yeeeeeahh, I have guns and no one can take them away...now I am sooo cool!"

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 23:05:48 GMT

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

---

You like military weaponry, so why the sarcasm when someone is enthusiastic about guns and actually desiring to keep his right to own them?

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 23:39:43 GMT

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

---

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 18:05 You like military weaponry, so why the sarcasm when someone is enthusiastic about guns and actually desiring to keep his right to own them?

I don't like military weaponry. I keep myself knowledgeable of current military technology for the sole reason so that I know about them. I handle them (and the knowledge of them) with the respect weapons deserve. I never was enthusiastic about them and I would never wave them around saying "from my cold dead hands!" though I find nothing wrong with people "desiring" their

right to own them.

I understand people's desire to own firearms though I dislike people who live in a state of constant phobia thinking someone (the government perhaps?) will pass some anti-gun law or come and take away their guns in the middle of the night.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 00:38:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yeah, because there's not this huge debate over gun-control laws. It's just a small little disagreement along party lines...

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 01:03:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 19:38Yeah, because there's not this huge debate over gun-control laws. It's just a small little disagreement along party lines...

I cannot imagine a America where the government would pass a law banning firearms from the common citizen. That will never happen. Who can overturn the Bill of Rights, more specifically the Second Amendment?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 01:19:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

An entire political party bent on ridding of them who controls the media, the house of Congress, and the White House?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 03:03:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[LAWStarbuzz wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 21:03]cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 19:38Yeah, because there's not this huge debate over gun-control laws. It's just a small little disagreement along party lines...

I cannot imagine a America where the government would pass a law banning firearms from the common citizen. That will never happen. Who can overturn the Bill of Rights, more specifically the Second Amendment?

It's actually been in front of the Supreme Court again. Trust me, there are plenty of goofy liberals that want to ban firearms from the common citizen. They want to strictly limit it to military and police. There's still a majority of people supporting gun ownership, but it isn't a huge majority, from what I can tell. It's a fierce war between the two sides, too. It's definitely one of my touchiest political issues.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 04:17:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

fuck those drunken hicks wanting guns to shoot at squirrels. i dont want another columbine.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 07:43:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fuck you and your "blame the tool, not the user" mentality. I don't want your police state telling me what means I may or may not use to defend what I care about.

Charlton Heston was a man who commanded enormous respect both on and off the silver screen. For the record, if all the people in Columbine thought the way he did there wouldn't have been a massacre- because those two little shits, the human assholes who were responsible for the tragedy, would have thought twice about attacking a school where some of the staff might have been armed and ready to defend those halls. The man deserves better than to be laughed at from beyond the grave by ignorant little pukers who refuse to see the blindingly fucking obvious even after it has slapped them in the face. At least muster up the decency to respect the passing of a legend and keep your jeering little mouth shut, even if you don't agree with everything he may have done in life.

It takes a special kind of scum to attack an issue by making fun of a dead man.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 23:36:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 22 April 2008 02:43Fuck you and your "blame the tool, not the user" mentality. I don't want your police state telling me what means I may or may not use to defend what I care about.

Charlton Heston was a man who commanded enormous respect both on and off the silver screen. For the record, if all the people in Columbine thought the way he did there wouldn't have been a massacre- because those two little shits, the human assholes who were responsible for the tragedy, would have thought twice about attacking a school where some of the staff might have been armed and ready to defend those halls. The man deserves better than to be laughed at from

beyond the grave by ignorant little pukes who refuse to see the blindingly fucking obvious even after it has slapped them in the face. At least muster up the decency to respect the passing of a legend and keep your jeering little mouth shut, even if you don't agree with everything he may have done in life.

It takes a special kind of scum to attack an issue by making fun of a dead man.  
praise charleston heston the actor

fuck charleston heston the activist

also fuck you u drunken hick

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 00:27:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Rocko.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 06:27:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Don't u guys know the expression "nothing but good about the death"?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 06:49:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My oh my Rocko, it seems as if you graduated from Yuri University- Because it's obvious you did to be able to read the mind of Nukelt15.

Either that, or you're another generalizing stereotypical idiot who thinks every gun advocate is a "drunken hick".

I could just stereotype you saying you have a 1 inch cock and have no balls, because every anti-gun person must not have the balls to be able to defend themselves without relying heavily on police forces.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 23:04:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 01:49My oh my Rocko, it seems as if you graduated from Yuri University- Because it's obvious you did to be able to read the mind of Nukelt15.

Either that, or you're another generalizing stereotypical idiot who thinks every gun advocate is a "drunken hick".

I could just stereotype you saying you have a 1 inch cock and have no balls, because every anti-gun person must not have the balls to be able to defend themselves without relying heavily on police forces.

umm no retard

i dont need a gun to defend myself, i'm not a paranoid drunken redneck who is never going to need a gun but for some dumb reason decides they must hold on to them.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 23:06:12 GMT

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

---

LOL, NOPE, UR A PUSSY, LOL!

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 00:03:32 GMT

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

---

Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 18:06LOL, NOPE, UR A PUSSY, LOL!

no u r

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 02:39:20 GMT

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

---

Rocko wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 19:03Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 18:06LOL, NOPE, UR A PUSSY, LOL!

no u r

WOW, this is a microcosm of all internet arguments. Just when I think this forum can't sink any lower, I keep getting proven wrong.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 03:33:04 GMT

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

I was mostly parodying rocko's idiotic and troll-filled responses.

I find it funny that he's incapable of actually putting up a decent discussion, so instead he just trolls.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 04:04:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 22:33I was mostly parodying rocko's idiotic and troll-filled responses.

I find it funny that he's incapable of actually putting up a decent discussion, so instead he just trolls.

I am much more intelligent than to post something as idiotic as "LOL UR A PUSSY" i don't even use caps. you're a nerd who gets mad a lot.

and I repeat that the only people who want guns are the small-town retards and hillbillies who are only full of their ignorant paranoia.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 05:53:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:I am much more intelligent than to post something as idiotic as "LOL UR A PUSSY" i don't even use caps. you're a nerd who gets mad a lot.

Like I said, I wasn't being serious. Either you're not intelligent enough to notice this, or you're just trolling yet again. Either way, you fail. Oh, and once again, your ultra ability to read minds comes into play when you can read my mind over the internet and tell whether I'm mad or simply making fun of you.

Quote:and I repeat that the only people who want guns are the small-town retards and hillbillies who are only full of their ignorant paranoia.

Hmm, funny, because I don't live in a "small town", I don't have any mental disabilities, nor am I a "hillbilly". Yet I support gun laws.

Funny how that works out, huh?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 11:22:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Rocko wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 00:04Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 22:33I was mostly parodying rocko's idiotic and troll-filled responses.

I find it funny that he's incapable of actually putting up a decent discussion, so instead he just trolls.

I am much more intelligent than to post something as idiotic as "LOL UR A PUSSY" i don't even use caps. you're a nerd who gets mad a lot.

and I repeat that the only people who want guns are the small-town retards and hillbillies who are only full of their ignorant paranoia.

I'm employed, going to school, born and raised a city boy, and am middle-class. There's nothing "hillbilly" about me, yet I absolutely despise gun control laws. Care to take another crack at your baseless generalization?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 23:13:57 GMT

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

---

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 06:22Rocko wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 00:04Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 22:33I was mostly parodying rocko's idiotic and troll-filled responses.

I find it funny that he's incapable of actually putting up a decent discussion, so instead he just trolls.

I am much more intelligent than to post something as idiotic as "LOL UR A PUSSY" i don't even use caps. you're a nerd who gets mad a lot.

and I repeat that the only people who want guns are the small-town retards and hillbillies who are only full of their ignorant paranoia.

I'm employed, going to school, born and raised a city boy, and am middle-class. There's nothing "hillbilly" about me, yet I absolutely despise gun control laws. Care to take another crack at your baseless generalization?

i also included ignorant paranoia

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 23:34:33 GMT

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

---

You said it's the small-town retards and hillbillies that have the ignorant paranoia. Regardless, what "ignorant paranoia" do I exhibit?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 01:17:31 GMT

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

---

Rocko wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 18:13cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 06:22Rocko



wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 00:04Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 22:33I was mostly parodying rocko's idiotic and troll-filled responses.

I find it funny that he's incapable of actually putting up a decent discussion, so instead he just trolls.

I am much more intelligent than to post something as idiotic as "LOL UR A PUSSY" i don't even use caps. you're a nerd who gets mad a lot.

and I repeat that the only people who want guns are the small-town retards and hillbillies who are only full of their ignorant paranoia.

I'm employed, going to school, born and raised a city boy, and am middle-class. There's nothing "hillbilly" about me, yet I absolutely despise gun control laws. Care to take another crack at your baseless generalization?

i also included ignorant paranoia

Hi Rocko.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 03:49:08 GMT

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

---

when will you ever have a real use for guns other than for sport? its very unlikely that you're going to get robbed and be able to use that gun to defend yourself and kill the guy.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 10:33:49 GMT

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

---

Rocko wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 23:49when will you ever have a real use for guns other than for sport? its very unlikely that you're going to get robbed and be able to use that gun to defend yourself and kill the guy.

When the Zombies come, will you be ready?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 11:26:04 GMT

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

---

Rocko wrote on Thu, 24 April 2008 22:49when will you ever have a real use for guns other than for sport? its very unlikely that you're going to get robbed and be able to use that gun to defend yourself and kill the guy.

I disagree. If you're not a dumbass with the gun (Which I pray you wouldn't be), you'd stand as much of a chance of surviving then as the guy robbing you... If not more because you'd know the layout of your own home and etc.

Banning gun laws won't make crime any less. If anything, it'll just increase crime rates because

---

then, any form of robber will be like "Hey, they won't have shit to defend themselves- I can just rob this house and be fine, since I actually have a gun". And yes, believe it or not, it IS possible to get a gun illegally

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 12:29:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Robbers will just go "ow shit, the guy probably has a gun in his home, so I'll just kill him in his sleep before jacking his car and stereo instead of just jacking his car and stereo quietly, hoping he doesn't wake up.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 15:29:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Robbers, generally, aren't out to be murderers. They're not going to kill the owner of the house, but I don't doubt that they'll carry a weapon, at least a knife. Even if it was their intent, there's still a chance that you can wake up. I'd rather own a gun and bank on me waking up than just shrugging my shoulders and accept that the intruder is going to kill me before I wake up, so there's no point in getting a gun. That's just fucking stupid.

Plus, if you buy a gun for protection, you generally don't buy it EXPECTING to be attacked/robbed, you buy it IN CASE you are. You don't EXPECT to have a house fire, so you buy a smoke detector. You buy the smoke detector IN CASE it happens. The same thing goes for alarm systems and airbags in cars. Do you intend on getting into a car accident? I know I don't, but I feel safer having an airbag to protect me IN CASE I get into an accident.

Do some people buy guns out of paranoia? Sure, but I wouldn't say the majority of people are paranoid.

Guns aren't even just for protection, either. They are used for sport and hunting, too. Plus, if you take guns away from the law-abiding citizens, you leave the weapons in the hands of those with malicious intentions. Even if you were to somehow remove all guns from black markets worldwide and stop the production of weapons outside of military and police forces, you'd still have people making their own guns. They're not that difficult to create on one's own. Sure, the guns created won't be incredibly sophisticated, but with the technology available, they could be damn near as effective.

Not to mention that it's a fucking fantasy idea to think that removing guns is going to help reduce crime. As cliché as it is, guns don't kill people, people kill people. You can remove the weapon, but you can't remove the evil in people. It just won't happen, and there's been violence for millenia before guns were produced. Hell, there's violence in the animal kingdom. You'd have to be a

fucking idiot to think that we can escape human nature by eradicating guns from society.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 18:34:26 GMT

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

---

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 25 April 2008 10:29Robbers, generally, aren't out to be murderers. They're not going to kill the owner of the house, but I don't doubt that they'll carry a weapon, at least a knife. Even if it was their intent, there's still a chance that you can wake up. I'd rather own a gun and bank on me waking up than just shrugging my shoulders and accept that the intruder is going to kill me before I wake up, so there's no point in getting a gun. That's just fucking stupid.

Plus, if you buy a gun for protection, you generally don't buy it EXPECTING to be attacked/robbed, you buy it IN CASE you are. You don't EXPECT to have a house fire, so you buy a smoke detector. You buy the smoke detector IN CASE it happens. The same thing goes for alarm systems and airbags in cars. Do you intend on getting into a car accident? I know I don't, but I feel safer having an airbag to protect me IN CASE I get into an accident.

Do some people buy guns out of paranoia? Sure, but I wouldn't say the majority of people are paranoid.

Guns aren't even just for protection, either. They are used for sport and hunting, too. Plus, if you take guns away from the law-abiding citizens, you leave the weapons in the hands of those with malicious intentions. Even if you were to somehow remove all guns from black markets worldwide and stop the production of weapons outside of military and police forces, you'd still have people making their own guns. They're not that difficult to create on one's own. Sure, the guns created won't be incredibly sophisticated, but with the technology available, they could be damn near as effective.

Not to mention that it's a fucking fantasy idea to think that removing guns is going to help reduce crime. As cliché as it is, guns don't kill people, people kill people. You can remove the weapon, but you can't remove the evil in people. It just won't happen, and there's been violence for millenia before guns were produced. Hell, there's violence in the animal kingdom. You'd have to be a fucking idiot to think that we can escape human nature by eradicating guns from society.

I agree with all of what you are saying, but unless I have missed it in your post you are forgetting the number one reason people should be able to own guns and that reason is to keep the power into the hands of the people, to prevent the government from encroaching on people's civil liberties. Putting the fear of the people into the minds of the government makes them...somehow unwilling to try to restrict liberties of the populace. I am willing to bet that was the reason the founders put the Second Amendment into the Constitution. They saw the surprise and utter frustration the British had during the Revolutionary War in trying to disarm and pacify the colonies.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 18:44:45 GMT

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

---

GoArmy44I agree with all of what you are saying, but unless I have missed it in your post you are forgetting the number one reason people should be able to own guns and that reason is to keep the power into the hands of the people, to prevent the government from encroaching on people's civil liberties. Putting the fear of the people into the minds of the government makes them...somehow unwilling to try to restrict liberties of the populace. I am willing to bet that was the reason the founders put the Second Amendment into the Constitution. They saw the surprise and utter frustration the British had during the Revolutionary War in trying to disarm and pacify the colonies.

Oh, trust me, I agree completely. That argument just seems to be completely ignored by gun-control advocates. It's absolutely essential that we have the ability to fight back against our government. My argument was just against the whole "ignorant paranoia" assumption and Goztow's fucked up idea that somehow there's no point to defending your home because you're not going to get the chance to.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 19:10:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 25 April 2008 13:44GoArmy44I agree with all of what you are saying, but unless I have missed it in your post you are forgetting the number one reason people should be able to own guns and that reason is to keep the power into the hands of the people, to prevent the government from encroaching on people's civil liberties. Putting the fear of the people into the minds of the government makes them...somehow unwilling to try to restrict liberties of the populace. I am willing to bet that was the reason the founders put the Second Amendment into the Constitution. They saw the surprise and utter frustration the British had during the Revolutionary War in trying to disarm and pacify the colonies.

Oh, trust me, I agree completely. That argument just seems to be completely ignored by gun-control advocates. It's absolutely essential that we have the ability to fight back against our government. My argument was just against the whole "ignorant paranoia" assumption and Goztow's fucked up idea that somehow there's no point to defending your home because you're not going to get the chance to.

For one of my college classes I had to do a research paper on gun control, in that I place a lot of emphasis on the psychological aspect of gun control. You're right, robbers aren't out to murder people, they aren't that kind of criminal even though if put into the wrong situation they can be, they want to steal and take things from others, it just makes sense to rob someone who would be unable to properly defend themselves. If the robber knew the said person had a firearm he would most likely want to avoid his house because coming upon a confrontation is not his prerogative, it is bad business to do so. This is just the psychological component, the physical is even more real, it is a simple fact that guns kill people, and yes...they even kill bad people who are out to do you harm.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 19:20:39 GMT

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

---

Yeah, they're going to save their skin above all else. If you wake up while they're in your house, they're very likely to do you harm if you try to confront them (and why wouldn't you? It's your shit they're taking!). If you have a gun, this puts you on an equal level as them if they have a gun, or it puts you at an advantage if they have nothing, a knife, or a blunt object.

Gun control is nothing more than a feel good law. It makes sense that people would feel better knowing that a random person can't just go buy a gun... at a store. People seem to forget that you can get guns from so many different outlets, and the people buying the weapons aren't law-abiding. If people actually realized what gun control did, I don't know if anybody sane or law-abiding would support gun control.

Since you can't keep the guns out of the hands of the criminals, the only logical thing is to keep the innocent armed. Plus, the largest criminal is the government, and they're armed to the teeth.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 09:13:16 GMT

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

---

You know cheesesoda, it's not because someone disagrees with you that he has fucked up ideas.

Robbers will also avoid your house when you install a security system. Don't you find that a better way to protect your house than to buy a pistol to shoot the crap out of the guy?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 11:05:06 GMT

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

---

I find it weird that Canada has more guns (hunting rifles, etc.) per capita than the U.S. and yet has many less gun related deaths per year. Oh yea, in some Canadian suburbs, people sleep with their doors open, and nothing happens to them.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 12:19:21 GMT

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

---

sadukar09 wrote on Sat, 26 April 2008 13:05| find it weird that Canada has more guns (hunting rifles, etc.) per capita than the U.S. and yet has many less gun related deaths per year. Oh yea, in some Canadian suburbs, people sleep with their doors open, and nothing happens to them.  
d/c?

Quote: You know cheesesoda, it's not because someone disagrees with you that he has fucked up ideas. Why not? Dont you stand behind your opinion, dont you think that your opinion is right and the opposing opinion is wrong?

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 13:04:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote: Why not? Dont you stand behind your opinion, dont you think that your opinion is right and the opposing opinion is wrong?  
See, that's what went wrong in Germany 65 years ago...

I do think that his opinion is wrong, but he has every right to have it and if he arguments around it, I'll consider his arguments. I respect his opinion and I would like him to respect mine.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 13:07:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Goztow wrote on Sat, 26 April 2008 05:13 You know cheesesoda, it's not because someone disagrees with you that he has fucked up ideas.  
No, what's fucked up was the idea that there's no point in owning a gun because you'd never get the chance to use it. THAT is what I'm calling fucked up.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 13:38:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Goztow wrote on Sat, 26 April 2008 15:04 Quote: Why not? Dont you stand behind your opinion, dont you think that your opinion is right and the opposing opinion is wrong?  
See, that's what went wrong in Germany 65 years ago...

Uhm, thanks for the info?

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 14:13:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Okay, so Goztow, you support people having alarm systems, instead?

Okay, let's compare pricing:

For a watered down alarm system: \$112  
10 shot .40 S&W pistol: \$146

There were guns on that site for < \$100, but I really wouldn't feel safe wielding one of them. Though, I'd probably feel safer with a \$99 pistol than a \$112 alarm system.

Capabilities:

Now, what can you do with that shitty alarm system? Well, hope that it actually works because it doesn't look like it could protect your whole house. I don't know if it comes with stickers or not, which would help it, but it doesn't look like it.

What can you do with that \$34 more pistol (or even the \$13 cheaper)? You can protect your entire home with the pistol because it's mobile enough that you can grab it and hide (or confront the intruder). You can take the gun outside of your home (granting you can and do have a CCW permit) and protect you when you're on the go. You can use the gun for recreational purposes which, to me, would be fun.

Now the drawbacks to both of these available systems is that if you're away from your house, the protection is pretty much useless. Thankfully, you CAN have home security monitoring services and a better security system, but that's going to cost you considerably more, and if you do have a monitoring system, it'll cost you monthly. In America (at least), you can get ADT which looks to range from \$36 to \$49 dollars a month. As the monthly cost goes down, the installation cost goes up, too.

Even then, the ADT system doesn't provide you with mobile protection or the recreational abilities of a gun.

The logical thing for me would seem to be to purchase a gun.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 14:19:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Matter of fact is that of guns aren't freely available the likelihood of a burglar coming in your house with one is pretty low which means you can defend yourself with other means as well. And the problem is that thief will now msot likely also have a gun and he will proolly should before you do.

Its not blaming the tool, its keeping the irresponsible users from it.

-Ghost-

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 14:22:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, a perfect example of the ignorance that a feel good law provides...

Weapons are a worldwide market. Hell, if it's been possible to purchase nuclear submarines over the black market, I don't see there being a problem of purchasing guns. That would seem quite feasible. Not to mention that guns purchased on the black market aren't registered to the criminal, so that's another benefit for them to buy off of the black market, anyway.

Oh, and I'd still rather have a gun versus a knife, any day. Are you going to tell me that we should limit the sale of knives, too?

Edit: You know your house better than an intruder, right? I don't see it being too hard to take advantage of your knowledge of your surroundings to overcome an intruder and get the first shot off. It's always been a smart tactic to use your knowledge of your environment as an advantage over your foreign attacker.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 14:47:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:

Edit: You know your house better than an intruder, right? I don't see it being too hard to take advantage of your knowledge of your surroundings to overcome an intruder and get the first shot off. It's always been a smart tactic to use your knowledge of your environment as an advantage over your foreign attacker. He does have the advantage of not being asleep though ;P  
Guess there are some benefits when you're a light sleeper after all...

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:04:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'll concede that. I wouldn't bank my entire home security on a weapon, but I certainly wouldn't bank it on a pricey security alarm system, either.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Ghostshaw](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:09:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Your average criminal won't be able to afford a black market gun anyway...

Anyway I don't think banning weapons in the US would be a good idea. There are just too many guns already in circulation it won't really change anything except that then only the criminals will be armed. Banning weapons only works if you have that policy from the start IMO.

-Ghost-

---

---



Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:18:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Guns are great, they're just used in wrong ways by people who are out to do harm to others regardless of what is in their arsenal.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:18:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 26 April 2008 16:13 Okay, so Goztow, you support people having alarm systems, instead?

Okay, let's compare pricing:

For a watered down alarm system: \$112  
10 shot .40 S&W pistol: \$146

There were guns on that site for < \$100, but I really wouldn't feel safe wielding one of them. Though, I'd probably feel safer with a \$99 pistol than a \$112 alarm system.

Capabilities:

Now, what can you do with that shitty alarm system? Well, hope that it actually works because it doesn't look like it could protect your whole house. I don't know if it comes with stickers or not, which would help it, but it doesn't look like it.

What can you do with that \$34 more pistol (or even the \$13 cheaper)? You can protect your entire home with the pistol because it's mobile enough that you can grab it and hide (or confront the intruder). You can take the gun outside of your home (granting you can and do have a CCW permit) and protect you when you're on the go. You can use the gun for recreational purposes which, to me, would be fun.

Now the drawbacks to both of these available systems is that if you're away from your house, the protection is pretty much useless. Thankfully, you CAN have home security monitoring services and a better security system, but that's going to cost you considerably more, and if you do have a monitoring system, it'll cost you monthly. In America (at least), you can get ADT which looks to range from \$36 to \$49 dollars a month. As the monthly cost goes down, the installation cost goes up, too.

Even then, the ADT system doesn't provide you with mobile protection or the recreational abilities of a gun.

The logical thing for me would seem to be to purchase a gun. Considering most people get burglaried when they're NOT at home, I'd say your home security system would do a much better job than your pistol. Maybe they'll just steal your weapon as well,

if u keep it in your bedroom and you're not at home?

Yes: a half decent security system with movement detectors will cost you a bit more to get it. But it mostly has a preventive value! Most burglars just don't attack houses with a decent security system. Unless you have a picasso hanging in your living room, which I doubt.

If you don't have one but you have a gun instead and you're at home when they come in and you wake up, then you'll still have to pay for repairing your door / window they broke. You won't do that for 100 \$ unless u had very friendly and professional burglars . You'll have to change all your locks because they could have taken a key. Well, unless you managed to shoot him down ofcourse. But then he might go in trial because as far as I know u can only shoot if he's threatening you.

You're right about mobility. But if you get burglarized in the road, you'll probably not have the time to draw your weapon unless you're a cow boy who has it in his pocket. Most people will attack you by surprise which has the advantage of you being knocked out before you're able to do anything.

Edit: as for prices: you also need to take in account your firing training lessons at a fire range ofcourse. Though that could also be seen as something recreational.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:29:34 GMT

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

---

You still have to pay for broken glass if your alarm system thwarts a robbery, anyway. The thief isn't going to throw money into your window as a sign of respect for being beaten.

I've watched this one series on a TV network here. These two guys case a house they want to burglarize, then the producers of the show talk to the home owner, and if they agree, they put their house up to be burglarized, and in return they get a new, high tech security system. They get their stolen possessions back, too. The one guy, the "thief", breaks into the house when the residents are gone.

There have been plenty of times where the guy is still in the house when the residents return. Granted, they don't encounter the thief, but I'm sure in plenty of cases that this is a possibility. An alarm system isn't going to do you any good at this point.

If you're attacked outside of the home, it's not going to be in a highly populated area unless you get pick-pocketed or someone steals a woman's purse. The attacker is going to get the person in a secluded area, like after hours at a store when an employee is walking to their car. In these cases, the victim would have plenty of time to react... unless they're just that stupid. Even then, the attacker isn't going to be able to instantly demobilize the victim.

I agree it would be smart to have a home alarm system, but most people don't have the money to do it. Guns are relatively inexpensive, and are great if someone ever has to encounter an attacker.

Plus, you still have to concede the recreational abilities of a gun. What can you do with the alarm system, press all the buttons and make the alarm go off? Oh, hours of fun!

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:48:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

An alarm system AND a gun is even more handy, too.

And don't give me the bullshit of "but kids commit suicide with guns!" or "but there's people who use them for bad purposes!". For one, it's easier to catch someone who uses a registered and legal gun.

For two, if some kid brings his parents gun to his school, not only is that the parents fault, but also retarded that the school is too dumb to put up metal detectors and whatnot.

I guarentee you that shit like the Virginia Tech tragedy wouldn't have had near the casualties had any the students had guns.

A home security system can't quite stop the threat of some kid going nuts. But a gun sure can.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 15:56:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think that a gun with rubber bullets would be more than enough to defend you.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 16:10:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think it would be best to have a society without burglars!

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 17:40:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You missed the point of a home alarm system. Its whole point is to prevent burglars from choosing your house! Guess which house the burglar will choose: yours or one of your neighbours without an alarm? The guy ain't stupid .

The recreational part is pretty subjective. Some people will like shooting a gun, others won't find

any fun in it. Just like soccer, basketbal, ...

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 18:31:43 GMT

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

---

If someone has an agenda, they're just going to ignore the alarm system. Petty thieves won't, sure, but there are people who are ambitious enough to ignore the alarm. Those are the people you really want to have a gun to use against.

My point about the recreation is that we shouldn't get rid of it because the recreation aspect of owning a gun is a huge part of owning one for a lot of people. Just because you don't like the gun doesn't mean that I shouldn't be able to use it for recreation.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 20:51:32 GMT

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

---

okay lets all have a gun because they are fun, never mind the huge amount of danger associated with it.

didn't cho sung and a lot of these school shooting incidents get their weapons from legal gun stores?

Guns are legal now and i rarely see cases of potential murderers and robbers being gunned down by the victim before the crime happened.

and it seems really retarded to think as oblivion does that it would be good idea to have every young retarded college student, or even the rest of the population out there armed with a pistol.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 21:14:36 GMT

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

---

Listen to Rocko! He just made sence!

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 21:31:11 GMT

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

---

Rocko wrote on Sat, 26 April 2008 16:51okay lets all have a gun because they are fun, never mind the huge amount of danger associated with it.

---

didn't cho sung and a lot of these school shooting incidents get their weapons from legal gun stores?

Guns are legal now and i rarely see cases of potential murderers and robbers being gunned down by the victim before the crime happened.

and it seems really retarded to think as oblivion does that it would be good idea to have every young retarded college student, or even the rest of the population out there armed with a pistol. I didn't say that there's no responsibility involved with having a gun. Nice job twisting what I say.

I agree that mentally disturbed people shouldn't own guns, and we need better methods to prevent that, but other than that, there should be no waiting period. You should just go in, have your psychological health checked, then walk out with your gun.

The fact that you don't hear cases of that happening doesn't mean shit. You don't hear about it for more than one reason. One reason is that just the sight of a gun is more than enough to scare off a would-be attacker, and nobody reports a failed attack. Another is the fact that the media doesn't want to mention guns in a positive light. You rarely (if ever) hear of the one school shooting where two guys ran to their cars, got their guns, and subdued the shooter (without firing a shot).

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2008 07:49:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:have your psychological health checked  
Ermmmm how? :-S

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2008 19:08:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:  
Guns are legal now and i rarely see cases of potential murderers and robbers being gunned down by the victim before the crime happened.

You rarely see cases such as that because the victim is usually the law abiding citizen who under law is not supposed to carry a weapon around. I find it kind of funny that a lot of the major shootings in this country that drew a lot of publicity were in so called "gun free" areas such as schools. It is pretty easy to shoot and kill people when they don't shoot back.

Quote:  
Ermmmm how? :-S

In the state of Oklahoma at least, you have to go through a extensive background check to get a conceal to carry license. Thus if you have any history of mental health problems or were a felon..you don't get the permit. While I don't think the States should give psychiatric exams to get a gun, I do think they should have some kind of system to prevent obvious cases of mental degradation from owning a firearm.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2008 21:03:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:didn't cho sung and a lot of these school shooting incidents get their weapons from legal gun stores?

That's actually a fairly good point- but not for the reasons you made it. Here's the problem- there are rather large loopholes in current legislation which, in some places, permit the purchase of firearms given certain conditions are met. In the case of the VT tragedy, the shooter had in fact spent time in an institution- but that fact was not taken into consideration, as he had committed himself. Different states also have different laws regarding whether or not convicted criminals can purchase firearms- in many places, that right is not taken away unless you have been convicted of a violent felony or any domestic offense.

I'm of the opinion that anyone convicted of any felony should not be allowed to purchase a firearm; they gave up all their rights when they chose to violate someone else's rights.

I'm a bit torn about folks who have spent time in an institution, mainly because I know a few people who have and really didn't need to- I'd trust them with my life any day, and wouldn't think twice about handing them a weapon. However, that is highly specific to what sort of mental issue is present- depression in an of itself isn't enough, but things like paranoid schizophrenia, sociopathy, and phychotic tendencies should definitely factor into whether or not someone should be able to go and buy a gun. It isn't quite as cut-and-dried as "they're crazy, take it away," because each person's mind is different. What I do think is that anybody who has known mental health issues should be required, regardless of severity, to submit to a psychological evaluation before being granted a permit to purchase.

Beyond that, the government has absolutely no right to tell any citizen that they may not buy a gun and use it to defend themselves. Any restriction placed on a citizen with a clean record is analogous to presumption of guilt, which contradicts the very foundation of the justice system in this country (innocent until proven guilty). If given no reason to suspect that a person may be a danger to others, it is not the local, state, or federal government's place to interfere with the second amendment.

I'm openly critical of the effectiveness of gun control because I come from a state (New Jersey) that is a prime example of why it doesn't work. NJ is among the hardest states to legally buy a gun in (and getting a CCW permit is even harder), yet it boasts one of the highest if not the highest violent crime rate in the country- and is home to three of the nation's most dangerous cities (Trenton, Camden, and Newark). Do the gangs in those cities give a damn that they aren't

supposed to have their guns? No, not at all. Even in supposedly nicer areas, such as Princeton (my home town), there is an increasing gang presence and crime rate even as gun laws grow more and more restrictive. It doesn't take a three-digit IQ to see the connection, and I feel a hell of a lot safer knowing that I'm one of the dwindling number of armed citizens in the state.

As for alarms- alarms are wonderful tools, but they are hardly a catch-all solution to crime- or even home invasions. Police response times being what they are (laughable), an alarm is only a deterrent to the easily spooked as it will take way longer than they need to clean your home out for anybody to arrive and do something about it. That's not to say alarms are useless; they are a great way to increase home security and are extremely helpful when you're not around. However, they are no substitute for a good weapon when you are around. I'm a huge proponent of security systems, especially the kind that automatically report any incidents to the authorities, but if you are at home and the police won't respond for fifteen minutes to an hour or more (in some places), that's a very small comfort indeed. A weapon- any weapon, even a baseball bat- increases your chances of staying alive in the face of a person determined to do you harm, but a gun is by far the most effective means of personal protection.

Honestly, I have no objection to less-lethal weapons like tazers, but they are not and never will be a replacement for guns. Not until somebody invents a magical stun beam that knocks its target out cold, guaranteed.

Remember also that the Second Amendment was not ever meant to be changed or removed; like the rest of the Bill of Rights it is an amendment only because it was not written into the original document yet was demanded by an overwhelming majority of the states. Given that it was written during a time when citizens with personal firearms made the difference between a free nation and a colony, I truly believe that there will always be a place for guns in the hands of citizens. It may seem today like the threat of tyranny is remote, but we live in turbulent times- it is far, far better to be armed against threats we have yet to recognize.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2008 00:59:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nukelt15 wrote on Sun, 27 April 2008 17:03 It doesn't take a three-digit IQ to see the connection, and I feel a hell of a lot safer knowing that I'm one of the dwindling number of armed citizens in the state.  
Don't you mean you feel a lot LESS safe?

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2008 17:18:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You're right- I should rephrase that: I feel a hell of a lot safer than pretty much everybody else in that damned state.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 15:26:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ghostshaw wrote on Sat, 26 April 2008 10:09 Your average criminal won't be able to afford a black market gun anyway...

Anyway I don't think banning weapons in the US would be a good idea. There are just too many guns already in circulation it won't really change anything except that then only the criminals will be armed. Banning weapons only works if you have that policy from the start IMO.

-Ghost-

I think the same too.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 15:59:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Most homicide's are unintentional and happen when emotions are running high, when this happens it doesn't matter what type of person you are or how much gun training you have, emotions rule you, you do not rule them and when they take control of you, people suffer or die.

The likelihood of you killing a person is increased when firearms are around and are accessible, this is a well known and proven fact.

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

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

I'll myself do not agree with a total gun ban, I was brought up with firearms in my life and use them every so often for sport.

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

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

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

So, you enforce these rules on a state, how do you remove all the now very legal weapons, for the



first month, everyone has a chance to hand them into your local police station, where you are registered and ticked off, anyone who is registered with a firearm and hasn't handed them in after this time, would get a visit from the Police to find out what the story is.

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

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

The system is not perfect but it would reduce death by firearms.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 16:44:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Perhaps in England most homicides are unintentional. That's certainly not the case in America. It still happens in America, too, but anything can be used as a weapon in the heat of the moment. A knife, a rock, a lamp, an ax, a wrench, fists, etc... Because of such, even if gun murders went down, you'd see a rise in murders by other methods. You can take the cat out of the jungle, but you can't take the jungle out of the cat.

Removing firearms would only make it so that criminals are the only ones with guns besides law enforcement and military. That's just what an American like myself wants. I want to be completely defenseless against a tyrannical government and a bunch of assholes who think they deserve my stuff more than I do. What a wonderful society I'd be looking at.

I fully support lethal weapons to be used in self-defense. Once you decide that your rights are more important than someone else's that you attack them, you basically forfeit your own. I wouldn't enjoy killing someone, but if it means preventing some asshole from harming me and my family, then so be it.

I don't actually own a gun. Though, I do have every intention of getting one when I come into the money for the gun itself and the license.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 18:39:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

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

Quote: The likelihood of you killing a person is increased when firearms are around and are accessible, this is a well known and proven fact.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here's my proposal: Keep your sporting weapons locked up away from their ammo- fine. However, keep your defensive weapons loaded and ready in a case that, while securely locked, can be quickly unlocked if you need it- at which point you'd chamber a round from your already loaded mag and be prepared rather than still be fumbling for the ammo when Shady Bob busts down your bedroom door. As long as you don't hand out keys or combinations to people who you wouldn't trust with a gun anyway, you're never going to have a single problem with gun storage safety. Ever.

Quote:So, you enforce these rules on a state, how do you remove all the now very legal weapons, for the first month, everyone has a chance to hand them into your local police station, where you

are registered and ticked off, anyone who is registered with a firearm and hasn't handed them in after this time, would get a visit from the Police to find out what the story is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fixed.

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

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 19:03:22 GMT

I'll let you speak for me from now on.

---

---

**Subject:** Re: RIP charleston heston  
**Posted by** [GoArmy44](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 20:56:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

scum breaking into your house has their gun in a locked case in their backpack, with its ammo out in the glovebox just in case? Here's an example of a rule that reeks of terminal stupid.

Here's my proposal: Keep your sporting weapons locked up away from their ammo- fine. However, keep your defensive weapons loaded and ready in a case that, while securely locked, can be quickly unlocked if you need it- at which point you'd chamber a round from your already loaded mag and be prepared rather than still be fumbling for the ammo when Shady Bob busts down your bedroom door. As long as you don't hand out keys or combinations to people who you wouldn't trust with a gun anyway, you're never going to have a single problem with gun storage safety. Ever.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Gun
2. A friend with a gun
3. Taser
4. Club or Knife

5. Pepper Spray/ Mace. And some folks are resistant to it.

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

Fixed.

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

Nicely put.

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

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 21:58:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ignorance is awesome to see on the internets.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2008 22:03:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What about rape horns?

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 30 Apr 2008 00:02:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 29 April 2008 17:58Ignorance is awesome to see on the internets.  
I'm glad you can recognize your ignorance. Admittance is the first step to recovery.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 30 Apr 2008 00:53:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Generally, there is a HUGE split in opinion between Americans and Europeans when it comes to gun control. And I don't think there will ever be any kind of same-ground.

A lot also depends on the attitude of the masses. The gun-friendly culture in the United States is simply too mature and advanced for some random ban to work. There will be outrage and people



will feel their freedoms infringed upon if any thing is done to take away these rights. And quite frankly, it is just a waste of time to try to do just that.

That's not the case in most of the EU nations as the various governments have worked together for many years through many programs to stop a widespread gun-friendly culture from developing in their lands. The respective peoples attitude reflects that progress.

In most European lands, a anti-gun sentiment is part of the collective minds of the society...so when arguments rise as to who is right, it will only come down to heated exchanges due to the vast difference of opinion.

I don't think anyone is on the "wrong."

This is what it all comes down to...two major pools of opinion battling it out. It does not work that way. Most Europeans (and most Indians too) feel a heck of a lot safer in a gun-free society. By no means are they in police states but simply maintain a trust in their government.

Americans were raised in the culture of freedom and the rights so they too have the right to demand whatever they want.

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 30 Apr 2008 01:38:31 GMT

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

---

I believe that part (or most) of that arises from the fact that we, as a nation, gained our independence because we were able to use our guns to kick a corrupt government off our shores. Our government is meant to be founded on not trusting the government to keep the best interests of the people in mind- and looking at many of the policies currently in place, we've got good reason to question their motives. Notice, if you will, how states with the most restrictive laws (not just towards guns, but in general) are also the states which are most notorious for corruption- New Jersey being among them.

This isn't a coincidence; if We the People allow our government to run unchecked, it will grow beyond our control and begin instead to control us. There are examples known to everyone of governments, in the midst of a crisis, claiming too much power (as much as I hate to use the most popular example, the Nazi Party is perhaps the most obvious one) to the detriment of its own citizens and other nations as well. It can happen without anyone even taking notice until the process is to far advanced to turn around- they take away a right here, a right there... all in the name of preserving peace and order, or the tired old excuse of "national security." All leads toward one end, and that is a government which exists solely to pursue its own agenda, with a subservient population which serves only as a resource to further those goals.

Make no mistake- the government represents the nation, but it is not a nation in and of itself. It is when the two words become synonyms that we have reason to fear for our rights- and we're perilously close to that right now. In the past, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights have guaranteed protection against that sort of thing- as it did when President Adams attempted to shove through legislation banning criticism of the Government (look up the Alien and Sedition

Acts). The fact is that it is, always has been, and always will be a real threat that citizens need to remain aware of.

That is the reason for the incredible amount of self-protection built into the Constitution, and it is also the reason behind the Bill of Rights. Each and every one of the first ten amendments pertains to one or more rights of the People that has, in the past, been abused all to hell and back by the government- whether the United States government or some outside power (as with Great Britain). The First and Second amendments are quite often referred to as the lynchpins of the Constitution; if they are infringed upon then any right may be, as together they represent the People's last line of defense against a corrupt and tyrannical government. Without free speech, we may not bring our concerns into the public eye for scrutiny, and without the right to keep and bear arms we have no means to resist- however unsuccessfully- the forced quartering of troops in our homes, unlawful searches and seizures, and any number of other egregious violations of the Peoples' trust and liberty.

---

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 00:19:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My parents had 2 guns before I was born. They know how to use them and since we have 2 black walnut trees that need cutting down, my dad was thinking of giving a gunshop some of the wood in exchange for a Quigley down under rifle. If not for protection, which isn't really needed where we live, then for the prestige of owning a 34 inch long (the barrel) gun.

---