Subject: Man I hate to do this...
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:21:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bureau Of Justice Handgun Figures for !996According to Victim Survey and the NCVS 25% of all rapes sexual assualt robbery and aggravated assualt faced an offender armed with a handgun.83% of all gun related crimes involved a handgunThe FBI's supplemental Homocide reports show 57% of all murders reported were committed with handguns.3% with rifles 5% with shotguns.I can't continue because they are dedicated to twisting these types of statistics and presenting them as if they were real. They leave out important data that you can't tell unless you do voluminous research and then they tie you up with an endless series of deconstructions of every word and sentence you write. When you return with a truthfull stat to contradict one of their points they search out a weakness in one of your sentences and focus on some trivial meaningless stat while disregarding the real picture. The process has a name; it's called "dissembling". Like the creationists do; presuming that science is undecided on Darwin then pushing stats that are essentially meaningless but take up all your time to refute. Then they find some sympathetic science proffessor to qoute from and you never get to find out that that guys theories and papers have no weight in the scientific community.It's a con game and a shell game and it isn't worth spending the hours they spend doing; disregarding the litter of the dead from gunshot wounds. I suggest you speak to an emergency room trauma nurse in a big city; thats real information.

Subject: Re: Man I hate to do this...
Posted by Bill Martinelli on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 16:50:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There's no need for research is there? Of course all those number are true, the Emergancy room people have camp side stories about gunshot vistoms till the end of time. You cant take away all the hand cuns from criminals. You cant take away the long guns, which will take the place of the short gun. to get back to your 2 points about gun control. The countries with gun control dont have less gunshots because there are less guns. I believe it is a different way of thinking in Europe and other countires. There is different thinking going on in those societies. It's not the US. the trash that litters our streets selling drugs, robbing and killing is the problem. For your second point strong laws are great if someone will make them. Too many mamby pambies in office these days. I'll buy you dinner when laws like you suggest get passed. What about the middle east, a place where the presance of a young lad perhaps 12 or 14 is toating about an AK? Lots of them. most everyone is armed. Lots of violance too. I dont think theres too many hand guns and if you take away the assault weapons they would use a muzzle loader. take away that and those folks would be carrying a bat with a rusty nail. What about the Romans? often prtraid as bloody society. true or not there's a lot knifing in the movies. no guns, they all carried swords and killed each other on a whim if so felt.It's the people, not the weapons.

Subject: Re: Man I hate to do this...
Posted by colinhester on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 17:45:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the stats. They are appreciated.I think Bill said it best, "What's the percentage of the gun killings that are done with registered handguns, vs, an illegal weapon?" I bet it's close to zero
http://audioroundtable.com/Dungeon/messages/3157.html

Subject: Re: Man I hate to do this...
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 17:51:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Weelp; we talked over the premise of too many guns mean more crime. We discussed the figures and what they mean. So let me say this; your Middle East analogy is perfect; to me that means look, here we have another society where everyone is armed and what do we see? Lots of killing.Can it be that the more guns =the more deaths? Is it possible that is a valid statement based upon the evidence of all the heavily armed societies have all the highest death rates?The laws; the gun lobby is very strong and their piggy-banks overflow with cash. Cash=power in Washington. What to do? Keep pushing; there is ample evidence that persistance wins out in the long run. Vote the initiatives write your representatives and donate to gun law responsibilty groups. Thats what we can do as responsible citizens.

Subject: Re: Man I hate to do this...
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 17:54:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

But what is the signifigance of that fact? If there were less guns as we suggest there be; than there would be less to go around. That means less for everybody.

Subject: Are you giving up yours? (nt)
Posted by colinhester on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 18:07:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Subject: Unarmed populations
Posted by Wayne Parham on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 19:03:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Then there of course are the other examples of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. Those were probably the worst possible environments, yet they had strictly enforced gun laws.Seems to me that genocide is usually suffered by populations that have had strict gun laws imposed upon them. It's a little harder to murder those that are as armed as you are. I think that is what was meant by having an "armed militia".Surely, you don't want lawlessness, and that's what we see in the troubled regions of the world. But I don't think going too far the other way and being overly intrusive is good either. Punish a man for what he does, not what you think he might do. That's what I think is the best policy.

Subject: Re: Are you giving up yours? (nt)
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 19:42:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have two rifles. I think maybe that is not clear. If you re-read the posts we will see that it is handguns that I am concerned with. I don't think I have given the impression that rifles whose primary use is for hunting game has ever been my concern. And if you look at the FBI stats you see that only 3% of gunrelated killings involved a rifle.There is no point that I can see in abusing a priveledge; that includes the priviledge to direct how other citizens behave. I believe that as a citizen I have the right to be as safe from anothers behaviour as a reasonable person would expect. I don't see where I should have any right to dictate to anyone an unreasonable restriction. So; rifles have a purpose, they are easily sighted, hard to conceal. They don't work well up close where the bad guys live. I would think that it is fair for people to own them.The second amendment is not to be taken lightly. A rifle like the rifles our forbears owned fits the description in my eyes of arms as stated in the Constitution. You have to draw a line I know you believe that. People can't walk around with any weapon on earth just because the colonists wrote that into the rules; it has also to be considered a reasonable interpretation.The people who group together to fight any ban on any weapon are just shortsighted or worse.

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.

Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Wayne Parham on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 21:17:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, if you think about it, America was founded by reactionaries fighting what they thought were intrusive laws from an unreasonable government. As it turned out, our founding fathers are seen as heroes. But had it turned out differently, they might have been seen as traitorous bloodthirsty criminals. The Redcoats would have definitely said Americans were zealous rebels that shouldn't have guns.

Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 21:41:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So I assume that means there are no boundaries regarding weapons? Or if not then what would you prohibit?

Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Wayne Parham on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 21:47:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I would not ban handguns at all. I would also not ban rifles. I think I would probably ban automatic weapons, or maybe only those exceeding a certain firing rate. Bombs, bazookas and

missles probably should be allowed only by permit.

Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 12 Jun 2006 22:28:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Let me ask; is it true they buy semi-automatic rifles then file down the pin and convert them?Do you own handguns?The gun lobby fights the legal attempts at banning auto-matic weapons; how do you feel about that?If you donated money to the NRA and they supported automatic weapons legalisation would you rescind the donation?I just need to see exactly where the limits are.

Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Bill Martinelli on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 00:10:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

John, my standpoint is that there should be hand guns allowed by permit; with strict procedures to be followed. NY has a tough gun permit program. Used to be you couldn't get a permit for NYC area either. Some states all you need is a drivers license and you can have a hand gun. maybe you have to wait a week now! I think that's a little 'loose' some states you cant even get a carry permit, a permit to take the handgun to a target range only is allowed. That's a little 'strict' the way I see it. I used to have a bunch of handguns but not anymore. but if I want to get another someday I'd like to be able to do that. By allowing guns by permit. I think the police should crack down on illegally held guns and give these people the death penalty. They are a menace to society and cause nothing but heart ache and sorry, pain and suffering. Get a permit, take a safety course, guns are not to be cool or to just fuck around with.

Subject: Re: Unarmed populations
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 11:00:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes; thats the other real solution. If we can't ban them; strict restrictions and heavy penalties for illegal posession is a viable alternative and good law.Makes sense to me. I'd like to go further but I see the fairness in that.

Subject: Here's a thought

Posted by akhilesh on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 13:08:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

WOuld you prefer that these perpetrators used knives to intimidate their victims? Or baseball bats?In a duel between a little old lady and a 250 lb gorrilla perp, i'd prefer the choice of weapon be handgun rather than knife or baseball bats, if I were the little old lady. As they said, Colonel Colt made everyone equal. John, You should be aware that rifles are FAR more lethal than handguns (they can kill people at far greater ranges) and overall in the WORLD, far more people die through rifles than handguns (look at all the conflict zones in the world). The world would be a MUCH better place if ther were no rifles (at least according to your ethos). Maybe you should start by giving away (or destroying) your rifles as a start to making this world a better place. What do you say?-akhilesh

Subject: Re: Here's a thought
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 14:46:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AK thanks for your valued input as always. But in this case if you look down the thread these arguments have been expressed already and answered numerous times. If I repeat it all i run the risk of boring the hell out of everyone. I would like to hear your commentary on the positions stated in this thread though. A few posts down is a good start.Lot of stuff to read down there!

Subject: Re: Here's a thought
Posted by akhilesh on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 20:31:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"If I repeat it all i run the risk of boring the hell out of everyone"I am so tempted but I will pass! akhilesh

Subject: Re: Here's a thought
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 21:39:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Of course; thats why I made it so obvious. Otherwise someone might have jumped on that.Like shooting ducks ina barrell.