Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 19:57:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Tough to reply to this. Apples and oranges is what comes to mind; meaning no disrespect.Regarding Germany; they always had strict gun laws. If you are saying that the concentration camp victims would have had a chance look at the history. There were several uprisings accomplished by small arms partisans and isolated groups. They gave up; because the Germans slaughtered whole villages if even one person fought back. It doesn't work in modern society. To address your point I would mention the Afghans; who have successfully defeated or delayed modern armies using small arms for the most part. But we know the terrain and the infighting amongst the political forces governing the situation is really how they can be successfull.But I digress; The largest genocide in our time occured in Rwanda and was primarily accomplished with machetes. If they all had handguns it would have been much worse.I don't see this issue as a reactive response. We see a problem; the problem is severe and very costly in terms of life as well as in terms of medical resources required to treat victims who might be paralysed or something as grevious. We see innocent children dead as a result of mistakes or worse. We have to act. It is reasonable as a society to say; hey; why do we need these pistols? Or machine guns that are so damaging to our society. Well; there is no reasonable answer. Self-defense? A myth. So we ban them as reasonable people. We allow rifles and shotguns even though they too are harmfull because they have a purpose and it is fair to allow them. You can't legislate life a hundred per cent safe; but you do have a responsibility to address the obvious dangers.