
Subject: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 19:30:17 GMT

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

Think again.....

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/keyword?k=armedcitizen>

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 20:13:23 GMT

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

How long did you have to search to find that site? Can you look up the site with all the murders committed with handguns for me please?Thank You.

Subject: Not all BS after all

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 20:33:02 GMT

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

First, I do my homework before I post. Besides you said "...if you try to tell that to the gunslingers they tell you stories about all the homeowners who defended their homes. Its all BS but you cant win with these guys.?Why don't you ask those that refused to be vicitms if it's all BS. I bet they are happy not to included in the murder stats....ColinPS, Look up your own information.

<http://audioroundtable.com/Dungeon/messages/3014.html>

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 03:20:30 GMT

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

Are you against handguns? I'd guess at least 75% of murders are with hand guns. 90% with guns. that leaves maybe 10% for beating bare handed, blunt objects, poison and knives. Guns are just the preffered weapon of a murder. not the reason.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [DaveLoneRanger](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 04:16:56 GMT

This is DaveLoneRanger and I specialize in finding and posting stories of citizens using firearms to save life and limb. I hail from FreeRepublic.com. I'd like to answer your claims about guns. I'm using an anti-gun website's numbers on the deaths of handguns:-----In 2003 (the most recent year for which data is available), there were 30,136 gun deaths in the U.S: * 16,907 suicides (56% of all U.S gun deaths), * 11,920 homicides (40% of all U.S gun deaths), * 730 unintentional shootings (2% of all U.S gun deaths), * 347 from legal intervention and 232 from undetermined intent (2% of all U.S gun deaths combined).-Numbers obtained from CDC National Center for Health Statistics mortality report online, 2006.-----A chart of such statistics reaching back to 1979 can be located here:<http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0764212.html>A few notes on this. First, more than half of those are deaths by suicide. When someone is suicidal, they will find a means of death regardless. Likewise, it could be argued that if someone is hateful enough to commit a murder, they will find a way if they have to drown the suspect. Interestingly enough, there were 42,636 deaths by automobiles in 2004. Your argument appears to be that guns should be banned because they can also be used for harm. Using this logic, we would ban cars because they kill people too. This means matches, kitchen knives and baseball bats. Interestingly, Gary Kleck, a criminologist at Florida State University is a leading expert on the links between guns, violence and gun control laws in the United States. According to Wikipedia, "He has done statistical analysis of crime in the United States and argues that while in 1993 there were about four hundred thousand crimes committed with guns, there were approximately 2.5 million crimes in which victims used guns for self-protection." Economist John Lott wrote a work called "More Guns, Less Crime" which essentially agrees with Kleck. According to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, ownership of guns in America is at an all-time high. The number of privately owned guns in the U.S. is at an all-time high, and rises by about 4.5 million per year. Meanwhile, according to the FBI, the nation's violent crime rate has decreased every year since 1991 and is now at a 30-year low. More people die from motor vehicles (40%), poisoning (17%), falls (15%), suffocation (5%), drowning (3%), fires (3%), medical mistakes (2%), environmental factors (1%), and bicycles and tricycles (1%) than they do from guns (.65%). I should also mention that from personal experience finding and posting such stories of armed citizens, they are not uncommon. The past two weeks, there have been at least 14 stories. Do the math, that's one per day. You can read more of them here: <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/keyword?k=armedcitizen>

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Damir](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 09:18:07 GMT

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

I didn't know about those statistical numbers when I wrote this a few days ago: "IMO - "average" gun owner in the long run has much more chance to shoot himself (accidentally or suicide), the member of the family (arguing+gun in the pocket), someone else `cos of small incident (traffic, bar, work, etc.); then to somehow defend himself of thieves/killers or so." The interpretation of this statistic isn't simple, and many things are missing. But, subjectively - many of those "self defence" situations aren't "clear". For example, in many countries incident where shop owner shot dead, say, 20 years old junkie who tried to rob the store - this is not self defence on the court... Yeah, the

clerc had the gun behind the desk and murdered the kid for \$100...but is it the right path for the society and for the individual persons? Anyway, number of the death from firearms use is scaringly high, even for the big country like US - 30 000 dead per year is more then in many wars!

Subject: Re:Who's Next POPGUNSAM?

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 10:43:40 GMT

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

DaveLoneRanger;....O'Kay.Damir; these people are what we call fanatics and they will say anything to twist and turn the truth to get their way.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 10:51:28 GMT

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

Yes; actually I am against the manufacture and distribution of handguns except where an authorised law enforcement need exists.I think Cops are trianed and counseled on a regular basis in the use and safety requirements of handguns. They have the job to lose if they misuse them. And reasonably someone has to be able to deal with any illegal weapons used for force. But I don't think every Tom Dick and Harry should be owning and carrying handguns on their person in public.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Eric](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 11:51:37 GMT

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

I was once a member of Handgun Control Inc. I knew nothing about the use of guns except a few stories from the media. Then I moved out of MA into the VA countryside and see then used all the time. For example, a guy leaving a bad situation with his wife (she's fighting with some other women there). He isn't going to shoot anyone, but the gun is there for protection against the possibility of harm. These aren't perfect people or perfect situations, but it's a lot more safe out here in the country then in the city or suburbs.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 12:43:15 GMT

That's one of the points. there should be more training. Kids should not be weilding handguns because they are cool. or sneaking one into school to be a show off. It's the attitude of the people on the street waving guns in your face and shooting people silly or no reasons that needs to change. I see those people as killers. a gun is the weapon of choice. take away the gun and you still have a killer; the killer finds a new weapon.

Subject: Well said (nt)

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:04:13 GMT

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

Subject: Re:Who's Next POPGUNSAM?

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:13:18 GMT

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

Dave was kind enough to answer your question. Why try to be funny in the subject line?Gun owners are not fanatics. Can you cite where you came up with this, or is this your opinion? If it's your opinion that's fine, but don't use the word "we." They are just average citizens that refuse to be victims.....

Subject: Re:Who's Next POPGUNSAM?

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:14:59 GMT

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

O'Kay; but it is a funny name. And knowing many gun owners in "My Experience" they are fanatics.

Subject: Re: Well said (nt)

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:24:36 GMT

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

I am going to have to disagree with Bill here. While I think that is a very reasonable and well thought out opinion I see things a little differently. Can people kill by means other than handguns? Sure; but many more are killed with them than I believe would be without them. Armed robbery; what would be a robbers advantage to bringing a baseball bat into the store? No; that requires firepower. Domestic Violence; yes many are killed by other means. But it takes a lot of serious hard work to kill someone with a knife or a bat. This is part of the teaching awarded to Policemen here. A small person generally cannot overpower a larger person with a bat or knife. Second you must be in very close proximity. Third you must be very able and capable with that device to kill. That's why Special Forces guys get so much training in that field; because it isn't easy. Then it takes a lot longer to kill by a rage induced hand weapon like a bat; that is time to prevent or stop the event. Random Killing. This is rare but can happen. Much more difficult with a stick than a gun. People are wary of strangers and will be on guard. I think my point is made. Handguns are the weapon of choice for a reason; kill quickly; Kill at a distance; guaranteed kill over a stick. Light and easy to conceal. But the real issue is random violence is almost impossible without them. Road rage; domestic violence etc is a non-entity with a bat.

Subject: You own guns

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:26:12 GMT

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

Are you a fanatic?

Subject: Re: You own guns

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:32:43 GMT

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

I ascribe the fanaticism to those who demand the rights to own any type of weapon; gun/auto-matic/rapid-fire/rocket-propelled etc. Then the people who support the gun lobby who want carry rights within city limits with locked and loaded weapons. People who feel that any curb on the personal possession of heavy arms or auto-matic arms is somekind of trespass on their inviolable rights as citizens; regardless of the danger that provokes for others. And the people who want the permission from their fellow citizens to carry what amounts to a deadly killing machine in public with ammunition live and ready. In my experience these type of individuals have no concern for their neighbors right to live in safety and security without fear of weapons related damage.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Eric](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 13:44:25 GMT

About the kids: I believe in training kids for gun safety. I do that with my godson and his friend, rifles for now, handgun maybe later. They might think it's cool, but if they do one unsafe thing then it's over, no more access. I don't think that having experience with guns like that is going to make any difference in the crime rate. I teach respect for life too which might make a difference. But one thing is for sure, they will know about gun safety, they will not accidentally shoot themselves or anyone else.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 14:09:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Reasonable response. Good work.

Subject: Re: Well said (nt)
Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 14:09:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I dont see it happening. I think the cave man could reach beside his easy rock recliner, grap his club and swat the old lady out the door just as easy. Maybe getting cut off by a stage coach isnt the same as a little puff box with the windows bulging from the 4 woofers in the back seat, but hey, most everyone had a gun 100 years ago and road rage wasnt a problem.It's the people and there attitude. Everyone is too busy, in hurry, wants it now, and more than anything the seperation of classes is making a lot of people feel unfairly treated. So, what can we do? taking away hand guns will of course slow down the crime rate. I wouldnt argue that point. Taking away hand guns is only a bandaid to problem that really does need some attention. You cant take away long guns so whats the point of taking away hand guns. semi auto weapons are a bit much for the average guy, but I think the criminals will always find a way to get those guns. We need better people. not better laws.

Subject: Re: Well said (nt)
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 14:17:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well you bring up a good point Bill; if we outlaw guns then only criminals will have guns; thats the usual rap on that.But my response is two-fold. One in the majority of civilised countries the laws

are concrete. No personal possession of handguns. We know the crime rates in most of those places are much lower than here; especially the deaths from handguns figure. Why doesn't the criminal gun theory operate over there? Next; that's why I address the manufacture of handguns. Stop making them for private sale; offer a bounty for the remaining guns in the society at large; make it a serious penalty for handgun possession and a very serious mandatory sentence for any kind of unauthorized use. Fine anyone caught importing them into the country.

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [DaveLoneRanger](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 14:50:43 GMT

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

I don't think you quite understand. You said: "IMO - 'average' gun owner in the long run has much more chance to shoot himself (accidentally or suicide). If you read those statistics, you find that the unintentional shootings numbered 730. Since gun deaths account for .65% of deaths in the United States, 730 is 2% of that .65%. In other words, 2% of .65% is 1.3×10^{-4} power, or 0.00013% of all deaths in America. For argument's sake, let's say Gary Kleck's numbers are ridiculously inflated. The numbers really aren't nearly so big as he says. Subtract a million from that number. So now there are only 1,500,000 uses of firearms to save life and limb. Versus accidents totalling 30,000? Dividing it out, this would mean that there are fifty defensive uses of guns for every one unintentional death. 50:1. I'm sure we could find that just as many accidental deaths occur by automobile versus the number of cars used safely. You didn't answer that argument from my previous post. You wrote: "The interpretation of this statistic isn't simple, and many things are missing. But, subjectively - many of those 'self defence' situations aren't 'clear'. For example, in many countries incident where shop owner shot dead, say, 20 years old junkie who tried to rob the store - this is not self defence on the court... Yeah, the clerk had the gun behind the desk and murdered the kid for \$100... but is it the right path for the society and for the individual persons?" I must respectfully ask, how in the world do you know this? What is missing? Which SPECIFIC examples of self defense are not "clear"? What about them makes them unclear? You wrote: "Anyway, number of the death from firearms use is scarily high, even for the big country like US - 30 000 dead per year is more than in many wars! And our crime rate is the envy of the world."

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [GarMan](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 15:13:15 GMT

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

Bill, if your message is "Guns don't kill, people do", I can't disagree with that. Guns are just a tools used by killers. But you can't ignore how guns have created a different type of killer and killings not seen with other "tools". When I was a kid in school, most fights were bare fist. On special occasions, a knife or two might come out and at worst, you end up with some knife wounds and a bloody mess. To kill someone with a knife, you really have to mean it. You have to

roll up your sleeve, get in there down and dirty, and have the persistent to finish the job. Usually, after the first cut and the sight of blood and screams, the knife-holder backs off. But guns are oh so efficient; you don't get a chance to change you mind.I find the argument of "guns don't kill, people do" to be correct but flawed. Take that logic to the extreme of "WMD's don't kill, people do". No need for war. Just train Iraq on responsible use of WMD instead.Gar.

Subject: Your math is wrong!

Posted by [Damir](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 17:12:13 GMT

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

From CDC/NVSS deaths data for 2003. in US:-number of deaths (all cases) = 2.448.288 or 100%-death by accidents (unintentional) = 109.277 or 4,46%-deaths by firearms = 30.136, or 16.907 suicides, 11.920 homicides, accidents 730, interventions 232+347. This 30.136 deaths from firearms are actually $30.136 / 2.448.288 = 0,0123$ or 1,23% of all deaths in USA - NOT 0,65 %!Then, 730 deadly accidents with arms is $730 / 2.448.288 = 0,0003$ or 0,03% of all deaths, NOT 0,00013%! Yes, someone cynical can say that 0,03% is a small number, but we`re talking about 730 dead people too many, or two per day.-interestingly, death by firearms is $30.136 / 109.277 = 0,2758$ or about 27,6% of all various accidents, and homicides $11.920/109.277 = 0,109$ or 10,9% of all "accident" deaths, and $11.920 / 2.448.288 = 0,0049$ or about 0,5% of all deaths in US!

Subject: Re: Don't think guns save lives

Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 17:22:28 GMT

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

Gar, Your right, there is a new killer out there today. I still protest 100 years ago more kids had guns or very open access to them. they were not all angry and pissed off, like todays kids. Look, I hate to see packs of kids running around with guns. I hate to see robberies at gun point, girls raped at gun point and doestic violence, getting shot over a cold dinner, warm beer or lovers triangle. Kids being killed by stray bullet or other kids is far beyound even tragidy. I cant even imagine being a parent in that case. I had a friend shot by another kid when I was twelve. I dont see how in the long run taking away hand guns will change it. Whats the percentage of the gun killings that are done with registered handguns, vs, an illegal weapon? You can make it harder to get a gun but not impossible. People wont stop shooting each other until; they dont want to shoot each other. WMD ? "what good is a secret weapon, if you keep it a secret?"

Subject: Re: Your math is wrong!

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 20:03:59 GMT

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

Hah; I was waiting for you to jump on that. His supposed data is all cockeyed. 1.5 million what??? You did a great job. I don't think we'll be seeing him around anymore. They all fold under pressure.

Subject: Re: Your math is wrong!

Posted by [DaveLoneRanger](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:18:41 GMT

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

So, say, if I am still around, this would disprove your idea that "they" all fold under pressure? Off to work, be back later to answer the math question. I note that none of you are giving a response to the logic and reasoning of why we should ban guns but not all of the other objects which can be used constructively, but which also cause far more deaths than guns do. Baseball bats and cars can be used as murder weapons, implements of suicide, or to cause unintentional injury. Did'ja have an answer for that, Bucko?

Subject: Re: Your math is wrong!

Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:08:06 GMT

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

Well, your opinions based on "creative" and wrong use of statistic is your right, and I doubt that everything I (or MB) can say will change this. Personally, I don't like discussions with "arguments" like this... If we, say, divide gunshot victims with number of the people on this World, we'd get a very low %... is this a argument? However, to answer to the "cars" analogy... this area (traffic) must be covered with various laws - you must have driver exam, a licence, fasten the safety belt, respect the speed limits, no alcohol, and various other regulations. Of course, IMO - similar laws/limitations must exist about possessing, carrying, using, etc. of various firearms. But, I noticed that this is a hot right/left political question in USA, and I can't be a part of this. I only can say my opinion that I hate to see the statistic where's more then 30.000 dead from guns ab(use) every year. I live in the town big like that...

Subject: Re: Your math is wrong!

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:09:47 GMT

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

The "Alternative Weapons" theory is facile and has no merit. It begs the question why baseball games have low murder rates. Since there are so many "weapons" in use. We addressed that already in an earlier post. We also addressed the data mining methods of fanatics. Unreliable and impossible to track. The supposed "Experts" with no standing in the scientific community. The

endless deconstruction of meaningless data while the real point is not addressed. No premise; no conclusion. Logical syllogism.
