Subject: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 13 Feb 2006 23:08:11 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Growing up my father always said this to us kids concerning guns,"There are no accidents, there is only carelessness or stupidity."No excuse.

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Bill Martinelli on Tue, 14 Feb 2006 03:29:25 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have to agree with you here MB. I havnt been out in years, but it was always drilled in my head as a hunter to make sure you have a clear view and know exactly what your shooting at. or a wiggle in the trees or similar. Strange such a mishap was from someone you take to be intelligent.

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 14 Feb 2006 13:15:58 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Bill; where you been?See you know the drill; as a kid I couldn't take more than two steps into the woods without one of the men telling me;,"Keep that damn gun down, watch the safety,remmember who's around you at all times, make absolutely sure of your target, then check again before you pull that trigger, blah,blah." But I don't emmember any one of them ever shooting anyone.

Subject: Considering he was bird hunting Posted by Old Brown Eyes on Tue, 14 Feb 2006 14:01:11 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That makes the whole matter even harder to understand/forgive. Unwritten rule, you don't shoot birds on the ground. And I hear he hunts from inside his car??? Real sportsman huh?So I could understand, to some extent, if he was say deer hunting....but bird hunting??? Something don't add up! Kinda makes you wonder how many dogs he goes through.Russ

How many dogs; thats good.I give up trying to figure these guys out. What people can possibly see in any of them in this administration is a complete mystery to me. They all think they are Gods gift to mankind. And they do nothing for anyone except their buddies. They think no one has the right to question anything they do.

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Shane on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 03:25:53 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Man I remember the lectures growing up hunting! We never wore blaze orange back then, especially bird hunting. We usually wear an orange cap now, knowing that it's visiablility is invaluable. I had my Dad's accountant swing on me dove hunting one time at a farmstead that sloped down as I was walking up the outside edge. Heck we were all in a line and he just didn't even think. Pellets hit me way quicker than I could hit the ground. I was lucky and just ended up with pitted sunglasses and some pellets right under the skin. I'd been hunting with this guy for years and for some reason that day common sense just wasn't with him. Needless to say I never bird hunted with anyone else for about 10 years after that, including my Dad. Just didn't want to take the chance.

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 14:02:37 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yep; those lectures were something! They waited 24 hrs to take the mandatory blood test required after a shooting accident; I think he was drunk. No reasonable hunter of his age would make that kind of error.

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by PakProtector on Wed, 15 Feb 2006 18:46:23 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

which of course explains how the victim was approaching from the rear: he had to stop and water a bush.cheers,Douglas

Yeah; now they are saying Carl Rove put in a call to the Worthington's the night of the shooting. Hah? Are they close friend's or something? Oh what a crooked web we weave.My dad says concerning the spin about him creeping up from behind,"Bullshit!".Thats from an 83 yr old who has hunted all his life all over the U.S. for every kind of game you can name and who can't be conned.

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by akhilesh on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 16:24:28 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

WOuld you say the same to traffic accidents?

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 16:41:52 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Would you?

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by akhilesh on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 13:09:56 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi John,I was merely trying to point out that an accident is something that is unintentional. Yes, it is usually the result of carelessness on someone's part. That does not make it a crimional offence, whether it is a traffic accident or some other type of accident. Wouldn;t you agree?

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 17:07:51 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message Actually; were he under the influence of alchohol at the time it most certainly would be a criminal offence. Also there are laws regarding the allowable time frame in which the event is reported. Then we have the original point which was this; that all hunters are trained from day one to act in a certain manner that prevents these very things from happening; one of those proscriptions is know where your companions are at all times and be absolutely certain the field of fire is clear. If it could be proven that he was negligent in following these rules he would be a candidate for a lawsuit at the least. Experienced hunters don't have "accidents".

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by akhilesh on Fri, 17 Feb 2006 23:58:45 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"were he under the influence of alchohol at the time it most certainly would be a criminal offence. "That's a shoulda woulda coulda hypothetical. Not a statement of fact. If he wore women's clothes that would make him a transvestite, you know. "that all hunters are trained from day one to act in a certain manner that prevents these very things from happening"HUnters are not God. Most hunters are not trained, they grow into it and learn by example. They are human too. "one of those proscriptions is know where your companions are at all times and be absolutely certain the field of fire is clear. If it could be proven that he was negligent in following these rules he would be a candidate for a lawsuit at the least. Experienced hunters don't have "accidents". "I disagree. THe same argument can extend to saying that experienced drivers don;t have accidents, and the truth is, they do. That's why they call them accidents.-akhilesh

Subject: Re: There are no hunting accidents Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 18 Feb 2006 00:56:01 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well; he admitted to one beer at lunch; but why wait 24 hrs to report it? Time enough to clean out. All hunters are trained; they must take a training course to get their liscence; and they learn from other hunters who teach them the rules as per the posts at the beggining of the thread. Your analogy regarding driving and hunting just doesn't fly. Thats what I tried to make clear. Driving puts you in a setting with lights and stop signs and two way traffic and all of the other rules of the road along with countless others who speed and make illegal turns and run stop signs and cut you off. The roads are crowded and conditions are not controlled and organised but in reality people dis-obey the driving rules all the time. Hunting is done in a closed system out in the open with a very small group of companions all aware of the conditions and the rules. Except for the possibility of a small group of other hunters which is highly unlikely since the hunting party was on private land; they were in effect all alone with their small and very experienced party of very experienced long time hunters. As I said he was either drunk or careless; no excuse for either condition for experienced hunters. So again; there are no hunting accidents only carelessness or stupidity or

Subject: Re: Considering he was bird hunting Posted by akhilesh on Sun, 19 Feb 2006 14:59:56 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

What Do you think about the theory that they rigged the elections and really shouldn;t be in office?

Subject: Re: Considering he was bird hunting Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 19 Feb 2006 15:56:12 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AK; I just saw this post. When you say rigged I have no knowledge of that; were all the votes fairley counted? No. The first election was the steal; they stole that from the voting public when the other Bush forced the court to resolve that in GW's favor.Lets be square here; Bush failed at everything he ever did; his businesses his schooling his military service. Cheney flunked out of Yale and was arressted twice for DWI. See a pattern here? Spoiled arrogant rich brats who think the country belongs to the very wealthy and screw the rest of us. Any one who can say that this administration has made the country a better place with a straight face, is so out of touch that truthfully I can't be bothered taking them seriously. The arguments are specious and false and I firmly believe that they came into office with the express purpose of bankrupting the federal government so as to destroy all of the social safety net and put more money into the marketts and the pockets of the rich. Anyonne who thinks that by removing all of the benefits our parents and forefathers worked so hard to enjoy will make their lives better is in a dreamworld. When they are done; all the working people including yourself and everyone you know will be worse off; not better. Thats my belief and I see more and more happening to confirm that suspician; and now they are getting panicky because the Bushe's time is running out and they haven't stolen enough of the peoples hard-earned benefits yet. So look for them to start pushing all the hot buttons again; gay marriage/taxes/school prayer; all the irrelavant nonsense that riles all the yahoos up so as to take the spotlight off off the trashing of the country. Our rights/benefits and personal happiness; under the name of terrorism, while they let thousands of terrorists into the country every day across the southern borders in order to provide cheap labor and drive down wages. They are willing to sacrifice all of our security in order to keep salaries low.

Subject: No no Posted by akhilesh on Sun, 19 Feb 2006 23:59:14 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message John,don;t be bashful. PLease tell us what you really think! BTW, in all fairness to the current administration, a) the economy has done very well, given we have had so many upheavals. To the extent that any presidency can take credit, these guys deserve credit for that in my opinion. b) we haven't been hit by any suicide bombers or any other terrorist attack since 9-11, THe above a) & b) are facts and not opinions or beliefs. I'm not throwing them out to provoke an argument,just facts that reflect that the current admin has done SOME good.

Subject: Re: No no Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 20 Feb 2006 01:34:48 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I would only qualify that by saying you can't prove anything by negative association. There were no attacks before 9/11 either for ten years. The economy is doing good? I'm confused; whats the average rate of return on equity investments for the past five years?The average wage has decreased in real terms. My state and local taxes have risen dramatically; almost doubling in the past 6 years because of the Federal Govts reducing the tax allocation for the states and education.Don't have to mention energy prices.The charade of wealth due to the increase in real estate valuation will fade as the inflation is whipped into the economic stew over the next few yrs.Lots more where this came from.How many high paying jobs in the last 6 yrs have been lost to low wage service sector jobs?You may be doing well and I certainly hope that is true; but many are not.

Page 6 of 6 ---- Generated from AudioRoundTable.com