

---

Subject: inc flaming

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Mon, 28 Jun 2010 19:01:09 GMT

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

---

<http://liveshots.blogs.foxnews.com/2010/06/28/high-courts-big-ruling-for-gun-rig-hts/>

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Mon, 28 Jun 2010 21:26:48 GMT

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

---

cool story bro.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 02:59:14 GMT

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

---

lol.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 03:14:30 GMT

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

---

i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 03:38:35 GMT

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

---

liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 03:44:27 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:38liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010  
22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down  
I'll go out and buy the cops to shoot your ass down.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 04:30:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 21:38liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down  
Ill go out and buy the damn gunstore

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 10:25:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 23:30GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 21:38liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down  
Ill go out and buy the damn gunstore  
who said you may speak faggot?

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 10:34:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 05:25Zeratul wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 23:30GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 21:38liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down  
Ill go out and buy the damn gunstore  
who said you may speak faggot?

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 10:35:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 04:25Zeratul wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 23:30GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 21:38liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down  
Ill go out and buy the damn gunstore  
who said you may speak faggot?  
ummm the bill of rights...

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 14:28:03 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 12:35sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 04:25Zeratul wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 23:30GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 21:38liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 28 June 2010 22:14i'm so angry i could go out and buy a gun  
I'll go out and buy two guns and shoot your ass down  
Ill go out and buy the damn gunstore  
who said you may speak faggot?  
ummm the bill of rights...  
No, that just says you're allowed to have an opinion. It does not state you may express this opinion on renegadeforums.com NOW DOES IT FAGGOT?

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 29 Jun 2010 16:16:05 GMT

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

---

Well at least it was a 5/4 decision, so all America needs to do is wait for the right SupCourt justice to die off, and then maybe this can be reversed. We can only hope. :/

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 00:36:56 GMT

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

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 09:16Well at least it was a 5/4 decision, so all America needs to do is wait for the right SupCourt justice to die off, and then maybe this can be reversed. We can only hope. :/

Thanks to gun rights, that can now be sooner rather than later. Wouldn't that be an ironic twist of fate?

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 02:49:28 GMT

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

---

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 08:28  
No, that just says you're allowed to have an opinion. It does not state you may express this opinion on renegadeforums.com NOW DOES IT FAGGOT?  
The internet is based off of american laws therefore i have freedom of speech on the interwebz

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 03:03:38 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 19:49The internet is based off of american laws

lol

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 04:59:04 GMT

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

---

hurrdurrr guns iz bad

derp de derr

this is fine faggots, don't bitch

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 05:03:57 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 21:03Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 19:49The internet is based off of american laws

lol

i forgot to add that cant be enforced

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 05:21:50 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 22:03Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 19:49The internet is based off of american laws

lol

it sorta is, considering that shit like child porn isn't exactly welcome in the internet, despite it being legal in some countries

though I wouldn't say it's American laws, just... general rules of non-retarded society

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 07:10:26 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 23:59hurrdurrr guns iz bad  
derp de derr

this is fine faggots, don't bitch

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

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

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 12:10:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 00:21Dover wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 22:03Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 19:49The internet is based off of american laws

lol  
it sorta is, considering that shit like child porn isn't exactly welcome in the internet, despite it being legal in some countries

though I wouldn't say it's American laws, just... general rules of non-retarded society  
internet is a retarded society.

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [troopr02](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 18:08:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 00:21despite it being legal in some countries  
thats the most made up thing ive ever heard

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 20:23:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 22:03Dover wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 21:03Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 19:49The internet is based off of american laws

lol  
i forgot to add that cant be enforced

lol. Of course, America invented the internet so their laws are hte ones governing it, but we just haven't gotten around to creating our internet police task force. You don't really believe that, do you?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 22:21Dover wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 22:03Zeratul wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 19:49The internet is bassed off of american laws

lol  
it sorta is, considering that shit like child porn isn't exactly welcome in the internet, despite it being legal in some countries

though I wouldn't say it's American laws, just... general rules of non-retarded society

Brilliant deduction. Because child pornography isn't welcome on US-based websites, American must control the entire internet! USA! USA!

>:[

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 20:45:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 02:10GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 23:59hurrdurrr guns iz bad  
derp de derr

this is fine faggots, don't bitch

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

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

It's fine in the states that have it. Besides, that shit already happens...

America was meant to have this shit anyways, so...

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 30 Jun 2010 21:36:45 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 04:49 EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 08:28  
No, that just says you're allowed to have an opinion. It does not state you may express this  
opinion on renegadeforums.com NOW DOES IT FAGGOT?

The internet is based off of american laws therefore i have freedom of speech on the interwebz  
Actually, the internet is designed to be very robust, this means that it is very much possible to do  
things that are illegal under US law, without repercussions.

A law cannot be a law when more than half the people are breaking it. Freedom of speech is  
obviously not tolerated on most websites.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 01 Jul 2010 03:20:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i will willingly drop my constitutional right to own a firearm if instead the government allows me to  
instead have a tank

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [DRNG](#) on Thu, 01 Jul 2010 03:30:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 22:20 i will willingly drop my constitutional right to own a  
firearm if instead the government allows me to instead have a tank

That's just a firearm on steroids and covered in armor..

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 01 Jul 2010 03:39:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

racist

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Thu, 01 Jul 2010 06:07:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DRNG wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 21:30 liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 22:20 i will  
willingly drop my constitutional right to own a firearm if instead the government allows me to  
instead have a tank

That's just a firearm on steroids and covered in armor..

---

i wouldnt be surprised if somone used that to own one

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [DRNG](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2010 01:17:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Z3RATUL99 wrote on Thu, 01 July 2010 01:07DRNG wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 21:30liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 22:20i will willingly drop my constitutional right to own a firearm if instead the government allows me to instead have a tank

That's just a firearm on steroids and covered in armor..  
i wouldnt be surprised if somone used that to own one

Down south..

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2010 02:00:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hey dey need dem protection against dem niggras.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2010 02:02:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 02 July 2010 21:00hey dey need dem protection against dem niggras. says the Canadian

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [DRNG](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2010 02:57:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 02 July 2010 21:02sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 02 July 2010 21:00hey dey need dem protection against dem niggras. says the Canadian

They're more "sandier" down here.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [FACEBUTT](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2010 10:57:57 GMT

---



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

---

In soviet russia, huns steal people from shops!

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2010 15:56:32 GMT

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

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 02:10GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 23:59hurrdurrr guns iz bad  
derp de derr

this is fine faggots, don't bitch

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

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

Yes, but they already are getting them fairly easily. The problem that criminals only understand force, and this is basically the only way to deal with the crims. MAD may be old, but it works when relating to people that are blatantly ignoring the law. Gun crimes have gone down in DC since the ruling, and states with less gun control laws for the most part\*, have lower gun crimes because people can defend themselves and it makes crims more leery of attacking someone if they don't know if the person has a gun or not. It's a crude method, but the only way to assure that gun crimes don't get out of hand because the crims are the only ones running around with guns because the rest of us have handed them in.

\*disclaimer

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Fri, 09 Jul 2010 05:21:20 GMT

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

---

Hmm, we have strict gun control laws, and there are incidents about once every decade...

Not convinced.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

---

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 10 Jul 2010 02:59:25 GMT

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

---

Muad Dib15 wrote on Thu, 08 July 2010 08:56nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 02:10GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 23:59hurrdurrr guns iz bad derp de derr

this is fine faggots, don't bitch

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

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

Yes, but they already are getting them fairly easily. The problem that criminals only understand force, and this is basically the only way to deal with the crims. MAD may be old, but it works when relating to people that are blatantly ignoring the law. Gun crimes have gone down in DC since the ruling, and states with less gun control laws for the most part\*, have lower gun crimes because people can defend themselves and it makes crims more leery of attacking someone if they don't know if the person has a gun or not. It's a crude method, but the only way to assure that gun crimes don't get out of hand because the crims are the only ones running around with guns because the rest of us have handed them in.

\*disclaimer

It's sad that people actually believe this bullshit.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 10 Jul 2010 07:32:56 GMT

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

---

DRNG wrote on Fri, 02 July 2010 19:17Z3RATUL99 wrote on Thu, 01 July 2010 01:07DRNG wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 21:30liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 22:20i will willingly drop my constitutional right to own a firearm if instead the government allows me to instead have a tank

That's just a firearm on steroids and covered in armor..  
i wouldnt be surprised if someone used that to own one

Down south..

that would surprise me even less especially if it was in the mississippi area

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 11 Jul 2010 19:29:46 GMT

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

---

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 09 July 2010 00:21Hm, we have strict gun control laws, and there are incidents about once every decade...

Not convinced.

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

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

nikki6ixxIt is bad when undesirable people have easy access to some very dangerous, concealable weaponry. It then escalates to something worse when good, decent people need to buy those same weapons in order to feel safe.

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

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

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

just kill you to eliminate the possibility of you identifying them later. Every single confrontation with a criminal has the potential to kill you. I don't believe I'm ever going to be okay with the notion that it's somehow better to toss the dice and let them decide whether or not I live long enough for the cops to arrive.

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

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

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

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

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Mon, 12 Jul 2010 00:34:42 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Fri, 09 July 2010 21:59Muad Dib15 wrote on Thu, 08 July 2010 08:56nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 30 June 2010 02:10GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 29 June 2010 23:59hurrdurrr guns iz bad  
derp de derr

this is fine faggots, don't bitch

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

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

Yes, but they already are getting them fairly easily. The problem that criminals only understand force, and this is basically the only way to deal with the crims. MAD may be old, but it works when relating to people that are blatantly ignoring the law. Gun crimes have gone down in DC since the ruling, and states with less gun control laws for the most part\*, have lower gun crimes because people can defend themselves and it makes crims more leery of attacking someone if they don't know if the person has a gun or not. It's a crude method, but the only way to assure that gun crimes don't get out of hand because the crims are the only ones running around with guns because the rest of us have handed them in.

\*disclaimer

It's sad that people actually believe this bullshit.

Just completely ignore what I said. That's cool, just keep drinking the Koolaid and don't go crying to your government when your city falls into major gun crime because nothing has been done to help people protect themselves from illegal guns because all the legal ones have been regulated away.

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 12 Jul 2010 01:48:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

Not convinced.

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

Of course, in Great Britain, there's also the issue of many people believing that authority comes

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

nikki6ixxIt is bad when undesirable people have easy access to some very dangerous, concealable weaponry. It then escalates to something worse when good, decent people need to buy those same weapons in order to feel safe.

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

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

Regardless of whether or not the presence of a weapon escalates any given confrontation, the police cannot be relied upon to defend the people. There are not enough of them; hiring enough of them would bankrupt the municipality- thus when you really need them to be there, they often are several minutes away. Yes, most of the time the bad guy is just looking to make off with some of your stuff, but you have no way of knowing what their intentions are. They could be telling the truth when they claim they won't hurt you if you hand over your wallet... but then again, they might just kill you to eliminate the possibility of you identifying them later. Every single confrontation with a criminal has the potential to kill you. I don't believe I'm ever going to be okay with the notion that it's somehow better to toss the dice and let them decide whether or not I live long enough for the cops to arrive.

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

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

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

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

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [jimmyny](#) on Tue, 13 Jul 2010 19:42:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 09 July 2010 00:21Hmm, we have strict gun control laws, and there are incidents about once every decade...

Not convinced.

no we dont, have you seen how easy it is to get a shotgun licence?

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Wed, 14 Jul 2010 01:02:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

jimmyny wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 15:42CarrierII wrote on Fri, 09 July 2010 00:21Hmm, we have strict gun control laws, and there are incidents about once every decade...

Not convinced.

no we dont, have you seen how easy it is to get a shotgun licence?  
You can't exactly conceal a shotgun in a public place.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 14 Jul 2010 01:49:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nukelt's better at the debate thing than I am, but, yeah... this is what America SHOULD be, stop complaining, dickwads

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 04:32:56 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 18:49Nukelt's better at the debate thing than I am, but, yeah... this is what America SHOULD be, stop complaining, dickwads

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 18:49but, yeah... this is what America SHOULD be, stop complaining, dickwads

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 18:49this is what America SHOULD be, stop complaining,

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

[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/05/us/05guns.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/05/us/05guns.html?_r=1)

Senators elected by their marksmanship? Guns in our kindergardens? Granted, only a shithole like Arizona would be this retarded, but this isn't the kind of thing you want to be glorifying.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 18:49this is what America SHOULD be

Really?

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 08:08:29 GMT

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

---

SHUT UP DOVER

WEAPONS ARE GREAT  
JOIN THE REDNECK ARMY

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 08:18:24 GMT

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

---

nope.avi wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 19:02jimmyny wrote on Tue, 13 July 2010 15:42Carrierll wrote on Fri, 09 July 2010 00:21Hmm, we have strict gun control laws, and there are incidents about once every decade...

Not convinced.

no we dont, have you seen how easy it is to get a shotgun licence?

You can't exactly conceal a shotgun in a public place.

get a nicely sized trenchcoat with custom inside pockets and that is a different story

---

---



Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 10:46:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ziggy Sobotka wrote on Fri, 16 July 2010 01:08SHUT UP DOVER

WEAPONS ARE GREAT  
JOIN THE REDNECK ARMY

That's easy for you to say. You're over in Germany where the women are blonde and the beer doesn't suck. If you were in some of the shittier parts of America, where WEAPONS ARE GREAT and evolution is still a theory, you'd actually care that there are people this stupid in existence.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 11:15:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Fri, 16 July 2010 05:46Ziggy Sobotka wrote on Fri, 16 July 2010 01:08SHUT UP DOVER

WEAPONS ARE GREAT  
JOIN THE REDNECK ARMY

That's easy for you to say. You're over in Germany where the women are blonde and the beer doesn't suck. If you were in some of the shittier parts of America, where WEAPONS ARE GREAT and evolution is still a theory, you'd actually care that there are people this stupid in existence.WHY DO YOU HATE AMERICA? DOES FREEDOM MEAN NOTHING TO YOU?

Sorry

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [bunka](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 20:57:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

myabe hes commie.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 21:23:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Sir Baby De Porky wrote on Fri, 16 July 2010 13:57myabe hes commie.

Would a bunka by any other name still be as retarded?

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2010 22:04:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cMO8Pyi3UpY>

HOLY SHIT LOOK AT HIM GO!!

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Sat, 17 Jul 2010 21:06:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

liquidv2 wrote on Thu, 01 July 2010 04:20i will willingly drop my constitutional right to own a firearm if instead the government allows me to instead have a tank  
Worst part is, you don't need to, but you need to get a license, and you will be thoroughly checked-out.

The tank & ammunition would be REALLY expensive as well, so people that could afford this wouldn't be driving around drunk and shooting at houses.

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 17 Jul 2010 21:08:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Thu, 15 July 2010 23:32Senators elected by their marksmanship? Guns in our kindergardens? Granted, only a shithole like Arizona would be this retarded, but this isn't the kind of thing you want to be glorifying.

...yes, let's find a few very specific examples of something I'm not even talking about

I do agree, that shit's retarded, but that hardly means we suddenly should give up the right to own firearms...

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 04:55:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Guns = gun control  
gun control = over gun control  
over gun control = protests over not enough gun control and ban of guns  
ban of guns = protests  
protests = guns  
and the cycle continues

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 05:08:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Z3RATUL99 wrote on Sat, 17 July 2010 23:55Guns = gun control  
gun control = over gun control  
over gun control = protests over not enough gun control and ban of guns  
ban of guns = protests  
protests = guns  
and the cycle continues

lol

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 09:48:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Sat, 17 July 2010 14:08Dover wrote on Thu, 15 July 2010 23:32Senators elected by their marksmanship? Guns in our kindergardens? Granted, only a shithole like Arizona would be this retarded, but this isn't the kind of thing you want to be glorifying.  
...yes, let's find a few very specific examples of something I'm not even talking about

I do agree, that shit's retarded, but that hardly means we suddenly should give up the right to own firearms...

Heaven forbid you can't carry around machine guns, and how dare they make you fill out some paperwork for the rest of your guns.

Z3RATUL99 wrote on Sat, 17 July 2010 21:55Guns = gun control  
gun control = over gun control  
over gun control = protests over not enough gun control and ban of guns  
ban of guns = protests  
protests = guns  
and the cycle continues

You're a fucking idiot.

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 19:55:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Z3RATUL99 wrote on Sat, 17 July 2010 22:55Guns = gun control  
gun control = over gun control  
over gun control = protests over not enough gun control and ban of guns  
ban of guns = CRIME

CRIME = Event.ini not found

then the government will step in and do something stupid... or in a lucky event something that will save everyone

I have realized my mistake and fixed accordingly

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 21:09:56 GMT

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

---

Z3RATUL99 wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 12:55Z3RATUL99 wrote on Sat, 17 July 2010

22:55Guns = gun control

gun control = over gun control

over gun control = protests over not enough gun control and ban of guns

ban of guns = CRIME

CRIME = Event.ini not found

then the government will step in and do something stupid... or in a lucky event something that will save everyone

I have realized my mistake and fixed accordingly

Still retarded. Why does gun control = over-control? Why would people be protesting about not enough gun control if there's supposedly too much? Why would a ban of guns lead to CRIME in capital letters, when criminals would be set at the exact same weapons footing as honest citizens? Because you're a fucking idiot.

And every time someone says "the government" as if they're some kind of far off foreign entity that you have no ties to or influence over, a baby sheds a tear somewhere. Stop making babies cry.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 22:29:31 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 16:09

And every time someone says "the government" as if they're some kind of far off foreign entity that you have no ties to or influence over, a baby sheds a tear somewhere. Stop making babies cry.

The irony also being that this 'anti-government' sentiment is virulently conjured up by organizations like the NRA who endorse candidates that are generally Republican. Under Bush's watch, America's government and bureaucracy increased dramatically in size. If the NRA was truly for a distancing between government, and people's daily lives, they'd be touting Libertarians, or be politically agnostic.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 18 Jul 2010 23:36:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 15:29Dover wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 16:09  
And every time someone says "the government" as if they're some kind of far off foreign entity that you have no ties to or influence over, a baby sheds a tear somewhere. Stop making babies cry.

The irony also being that this 'anti-government' sentiment is virulently conjured up by organizations like the NRA who endorse candidates that are generally Republican. Under Bush's watch, America's government and bureaucracy increased dramatically in size. If the NRA was truly for a distancing between government, and people's daily lives, they'd be touting Libertarians, or be politically agnostic.

That would make too much sense though, wouldn't it.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Mon, 19 Jul 2010 03:28:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 15:09 of guns lead to CRIME in capital letters, when criminals would be set at the exact same weapons footing as honest citizens?  
Think about it if more laws are made... the same laws they just made are broken... Things such as M-16s and AK-47s and RPGs are sold all the time... its against the law it doesnt stop it with the Over gun control.. this is the redneck side with the protests its the peace loving retard side.. though both sides are equally retarded we all are for having opinions in the end its all the same guns then banned guns then repeat this is all my opinion mainly

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 19 Jul 2010 03:51:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Z3RATUL99 wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 20:28this is all my opinion mainly

So basically you admit it's all bullshit. I'm glad we agree.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [bunka](#) on Mon, 19 Jul 2010 05:04:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Imao commies desperate to take american guns crying bout it on gameing forums

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Mon, 19 Jul 2010 05:25:20 GMT

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

---

Sir Baby De Porky wrote on Mon, 19 July 2010 00:04lmao commies desperate to take american guns crying bout it on gameing forums

lmao

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 21 Jul 2010 20:59:55 GMT

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

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 17:29Dover wrote on Sun, 18 July 2010 16:09  
And every time someone says "the government" as if they're some kind of far off foreign entity that you have no ties to or influence over, a baby sheds a tear somewhere. Stop making babies cry.

The irony also being that this 'anti-government' sentiment is virulently conjured up by organizations like the NRA who endorse candidates that are generally Republican. Under Bush's watch, America's government and bureaucracy increased dramatically in size. If the NRA was truly for a distancing between government, and people's daily lives, they'd be touting Libertarians, or be politically agnostic.

The NRA is a single-issue organization. If the candidate doesn't support the 2nd Amendment, they do not get endorsed- regardless of what else is on their record. They've been known to refuse support to otherwise exceptional candidates for the sole and exclusive reason that they advocated more restrictive gun laws. You don't see as many Democrats as Republicans getting NRA support is simply because fewer Democrats are pro-gun (most of the ones who are come from districts where they wouldn't get elected if they weren't pro-gun). If the Democratic Party changed its stance on gun control, I think that the NRA would swing back to center pretty quickly.

The reason why the NRA doesn't support Libertarian candidates is because they usually don't have a chance in hell of actually winning- which is ironic because a Libertarian backed by the NRA in the right place at the right time would stand a very good chance of winning. Believe me, I would love to see them support more Libertarians... but it's not going to happen unless the party grows strong enough to be a major contender. The NRA is interested only in putting candidates in office who share the organization's agenda, and there's a stronger chance of that with mainstream candidates.

Incidentally, this is also why the ACLU is usually seen as a left-wing organization- and also why they have never taken a firm, definitive stance one way or the other on guns (it changes based on who's writing the press releases). The practical realities of political maneuvering don't leave much room for incorruptible pure idealism no matter what issue or agenda you're promoting. In theory, however, both organizations would likely take a libertarian position if they could afford to do so without eroding their vast influence.

---

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Thu, 22 Jul 2010 04:20:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What was this topic originaly about anyway

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [The Party](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2010 16:55:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Stop throwing around the word faggot, it offends me.

---

Subject: Re: inc flaming  
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2010 17:07:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Epic bumps over a month offend me.

---