

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 14 Sep 2004 22:51:57 GMT

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

---

...and I, for one, am celebrating the fact that Congress actually did something that made sense for a change. What makes me even happier is that the paperwork for my firearms ID card should be coming through in a few weeks, meaning I'll be legally able to purchase a Constitutionally-protected firearm of my own.

This ban centered not around all weapons of a certain type(though several weapons were prohibited by the ban), but features that could be found on some models of firearms- things like flash suppressors, pistol grips(for long guns such as rifles), bayonet lugs, silencers, etc. Thus, the ban did not prohibit the actual working mechanism of the firearm, but various add-ons that don't really augment the functionality(or in some cases, reduce it in favor of other areas of performance) of the weapon.

The ban also prohibited the sale of magazines that held more than a certain number of rounds(I forget whether it was 10 or 15). However, if the magazines were manufactured before 1994, they were still legal. That, and I believe importing them from other countries was legal in some way, as well.

So here's good riddance to a worthless piece of legislature that did nothing but unnecessarily limit the average, law abiding citizen's ability to keep and bear arms. And here's to the hope that my firearms ID card arrives swiftly, so that I may purchase a firearm of my own and go target shooting without parental supervision if I so choose.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [NeoX](#) on Tue, 14 Sep 2004 23:25:08 GMT

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

---

You will take that back soon enough. Once gang bangers are having m16s blazing from a car in LA.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Tue, 14 Sep 2004 23:29:14 GMT

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

---

Insult Los Angeles again and I'll break your neck.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 14 Sep 2004 23:30:20 GMT

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

---

NeoXYou will take that back soon enough. Once gang bangers are having m16s blazing from a

---

car in LA.

Too bad the ban doesn't have anything to do with banning the M-16.

In fact, it really has nothing to do with assault weapons.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 00:15:19 GMT

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

---

Firearms laws in Canada are still pretty much in effect. They don't affect me to a very personal extent. I get to play with all those guns you could never own at work.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 01:02:13 GMT

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

---

Actually, in Canada, a firearm is as unneeded as a car (some of us use dogsleds) just kidding, it's vice versa.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 01:10:55 GMT

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

---

To clarify for anyone who really just doesn't pay any attention at all:

This ban did NOT deal with fully automatic firearms. Those have been illegal for private citizens to own for quite some time. This ban applied to SEMI-automatic clip-fed firearms- one bullet per trigger pull.

And the notion that any one type of weapon or another will "enable" criminals has been, and always will be ridiculous. Criminals don't give a flying fuck what they use to commit a crime with, be it legal or illegal- they have already demonstrated that they don't care about the law by committing FELONIES. What's a few years worth of imprisonment for a federal firearms charge if you're already facing execution for murder 1? What makes you think a criminal will care whether they got their firearm legally or through some douche on the black market? A SMART criminal wouldn't buy a LEGAL firearm in the first place- those leave a paper trail that leads right back to the owner. All any kind of ban or "gun control" law does is limit the ability of good, law-abiding citizens to defend themselves and their families.

And it was the founding fathers of this country who plainly stated in the US Constitution: "...the right of the people to keep and bear arms SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED." If you're a citizen, you have a right as a citizen to purchase a firearm and keep it for your own defense, or in times of extreme crisis organize a militia with your fellow citizens and use that firearm to defend your rights

and your way of life.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 04:12:58 GMT

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

---

100% correct, Nuke, 100% correct.

One thing you didn't seem to mention, though. Those formerly banned weapons were already in the hands of criminals, so the ban wasn't doing any good in the first place.

Now all I'll have to do is quote Nuke's second post when SuperFlyingEngi comes in here and says "No! Legalizing these weapons will make them more readily available to criminals!! We need more laws and more government to make sure they don't get those guns!"

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 06:01:41 GMT

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

---

Apart from whether or not banning guns is a good idea, it's not much use if one state decides to ban them when you can simply go to another state and buy one, I suppose. Besides, everyone who has one will probably keep it.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Dante](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 16:56:36 GMT

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

---

NeoXYou will take that back soon enough. Once gang bangers are having m16s blazing from a car in LA.

You know, i thought about this a lot prior to moving to orange county in California, i thought that with all the gang bangers, and the murderers that i would have to just act like that kid that got picked on in school, just face forward and shut up, never talking to anyone or arguing with anything.

then i moved here, and you know what, in my 3 years of living in southern california, i think i have heard about 1 or maybe 2 of these incidents, which is quite odd considering that back in Indiana almost nightly there was news of someone being killed by some idiotic farmer who decides to murder his family.

My girlfriend works in the coroners office, and you wanna know what the #1 killer is in southern california? Suicide of immigrants & transients.

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [kurt421](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 18:31:17 GMT

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

---

i live in the U.K and generally firearms are banned.... exept things like shotguns which are hard to get licences for and mostly only farmers can get them lol.

i totally disagree with firearms to the public even for self protection.

It would be so strange to me seeing anyone with a gun for me... thus why i wouldnt like to live in america or any country where they are allowed.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 15 Sep 2004 21:22:26 GMT

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

---

Since the US was founded with the notion that the people have the right and the duty to overthrow a corrupt government(it says so very clearly in the Declaration of Independence), it makes perfect sense to give the people- average citizens- the ability to defend themselves against any threat, whether it comes from invaders, a criminal, or their own government. The second amendment to the US Constitution adds to that idea by giving citizens that right- with the only hitch that if ever the country comes upon a crisis so serious that the armed forces(this includes the National Guard) cannot or will not deal with it, the citizens who have exercised their right to bear arms have the duty to form a militia.

IMHO, NO weapon is dangerous if in the hands of a well trained, responsible citizen. Only humans have the ability to use a weapon for evil purposes; the weapon itself could just as easily be used for good. If citizens are allowed to arm themselves, arm themselves they will- and society in general will become less dangerous; criminals will not be so willing to choose their victims at random, not knowing who might be carrying a weapon has been proven to be a powerful deterrent time and time again.

The government(federal or state) oversteps its authority every single time it passes any kind of law that limits the people's right to keep and bear arms OF ANY KIND. End of story.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2004 10:13:12 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15IMHO, NO weapon is dangerous if in the hands of a well trained, responsible citizen.

The key words being "well trained, responsible". Some sort of drivers license for guns seems a good idea to me, although I don't know if it already exists. Then again, it'll probably differ per state.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2004 15:21:05 GMT

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

---

The problem with that is, cars are not guaranteed as a right in the constitution. Firearms are.

And you already have to get fingerprinted, background checked, interviewed, and present multiple forms of ID just to get a Firearms ID card- that allows you to purchase firearms(only long guns, though, at least until you turn 21!). However, you still have to get ANOTHER background check, present MORE ID, and do lots of paperwork when you go to actually make the purchase. If that weren't enough just to exercise your right to KEEP the firearm, you have to go through EVEN MORE paperwork, EVEN MORE fingerprinting, present EVEN MORE ID, and get YET ANOTHER background check if you ever want to exercise your right to BEAR the firearm.

Since you brought up the comparison, any old schmuck can buy a car. You don't even need a license to BUY it, you just need one to use it. And even then, driving without a license(even though a car is potentially more deadly to driver and bystander than any firearm) does not carry with it anywhere near as serious of penalties as a firearms charge. And the funny thing is, most of the drivers on the road, even with licenses, can't drive for shit.

In my whole life, only once have I been within a mile of any kind of shooting(a police officer popping a bank robber), but I could rattle off a whole list of car accidents, most of them caused by drunk drivers(including, amusingly enough, the mayor and a local judge). It's a poor comparison at best; the vast majority of gun owners are far more resonsable than the vast majority of drivers.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [kurt421](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2004 21:37:33 GMT

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

---

i know this will be unpopular but.... the american consitution shud bechanged. its out of date b a few years

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2004 21:39:38 GMT

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

---

kurt421i know this will be unpopular but.... the american consitution shud bechanged. its out of date b a few years

Ya, that whole cruel and unusual punishment part shouldn't be in there.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2004 22:00:34 GMT

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

---

You know, for once I agree with Nodbugger completely...

It's in the BILL OF RIGHTS, you schmuck. The whole reason those amendments were added on under a different title than every other amendment is so that the flaming idiots of future generations would never screw with those ten amendments. They are meant to be permanent, not subject to editing or adjusting, tampering, pissing on, or removal. If ANY of the first ten amendments were EVER changed or repealed, that would be grounds for the population to denounce the entire government as oppressive and overthrow it. That is why they are THERE; the framers of the Constitution did not believe that enough protections were guaranteed to the citizens' rights by the original document alone.

Because every citizen of the United States of America is guaranteed by the Second Amendment the right to keep and bear arms, the government has absolutely no legal authority to in any way prevent a citizen from exercising that right. Period.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2004 22:06:13 GMT

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

---

In certain cases what I said shouldn't be taken sarcastically.

I think there are times we should let that one slide.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [kurt421](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 2004 15:25:45 GMT

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

---

i said it would be unpopular lol!

all i mean is that parts of the american consitution should have no brearing in modern times. i.e when it was made they wasent guns that could easily kill every person in a room in seconds.

i know the consitution cant be changed, to my knowlage it needs the concent of all states so its almost impossable to do. is that right?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 2004 18:40:14 GMT

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

---

The Bill of Rights was written with the intent that it should never be changed, no matter how popular the changes may be. Never in over two centuries has a word in any of the first ten amendments been changed or edited; they should remain untouched as long as this country exists. Popularity is not an issue; amendments 1-10 are to be considered part of the original constitution and treated with the same reverence.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Rex](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 2004 18:43:48 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15NO weapon is dangerous if in the hands of a well trained, responsible citizen.

Which doesn't exist, btw...

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 2004 19:45:43 GMT

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

---

I'm sure none of you listened to roughly every police chief we have when they were calling for this ban to be re-instated...

It only wasn't re-instated because the NRA owns the Republicans.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 2004 21:59:20 GMT

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

---

I'm sure you didn't listen to common sense when it tells you that a if a criminal wants an assault rifle, he can obtain that rifle regardless of whether or not it is an illegal weapon. This ban only kept law-abiding citizens from keeping certain types of weapons; the criminals already had them.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 00:25:18 GMT

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

---

So making it harder for criminals is a waste of time? And, ordinary citizens don't need assault rifles to hunt the odd duck or deer.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 00:49:08 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiSo making it harder for criminals is a waste of time? And, ordinary citizens don't need assault rifles to hunt the odd duck or deer.

Since when has modern life been about necessity?

---



Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [cokemaster](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 00:51:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiordinary citizens don't need assault rifles to hunt the odd duck or deer.

Exactly. :rolleyes:

The only people who benefit from this are gun collectors (which is ok as long as they are sensible) or people who abuse them (which for those who didn't realize, thats bad).

Of course, there are many illegal ways of obtaining weapons and its extremely difficult to stop that but making the guns legal and easily obtainable... well I guess we'll see the results.

Here in New Zealand those types of weapons are banned and they'd aren't being unbanned anytime soon. Its also harder to get guns as well.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [AlostSOul](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 00:55:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I illegally own and operate an M-16, semi-automatic 50.cal machine gun, A sniper rifle, and hand grenades. I use them all for hunting deer. Bought them from Shotgun news, Published three times a month.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 01:16:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ha ha ha ha ha!!!! So predictable, SuperFlyingEngi, so predictable!!!

SuperFlyingEngiSo making it harder for criminals is a waste of time?

I KNEW you would say that, which is why I said I'd only have to quote Nuke's second post when you did since he already addressed this argument....

Nukelt15And the notion that any one type of weapon or another will "enable" criminals has been, and always will be ridiculous. Criminals don't give a flying fuck what they use to commit a crime with, be it legal or illegal- they have already demonstrated that they don't care about the law by comitting FELONIES. What's a few years worth of imprisonment for a federal firearms charge if you're already facing execution for murder 1? What makes you think a criminal will care whether they got their firearm legally or through some douche on the black market? A SMART criminal wouldn't buy a LEGAL firearm in the first place- those leave a paper trail that leads right back to the owner. All any kind of ban or "gun control" law does is limit the ability of good, law-abiding citizens to defend themselves and their families.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Weirdo](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 06:15:28 GMT

---



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

---

AlostSOull illegally own and operate an M-16, semi-automatic 50.cal machine gun, A sniper rifle, and hand grenades. I use them all for hunting deer. Bought them from Shotgun news, Published three times a month.

You use handgrenades when hunting .

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 10:21:53 GMT

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

---

WeirdoAlostSOull illegally own and operate an M-16, semi-automatic 50.cal machine gun, A sniper rifle, and hand grenades. I use them all for hunting deer. Bought them from Shotgun news, Published three times a month.

You use handgrenades when hunting .

I wouldn't hold it past him. Lucid dreaming has the potential to give you lots of firepower you don't actually own.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 13:58:57 GMT

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

---

hydra1945Ha ha ha ha ha!!!! So predictable, SuperFlyingEngi, so predictable!!!

SuperFlyingEngiSo making it harder for criminals is a waste of time?

I KNEW you would say that, which is why I said I'd only have to quote Nuke's second post when you did since he already addressed this argument....

Nukelt15And the notion that any one type of weapon or another will "enable" criminals has been, and always will be ridiculous. Criminals don't give a flying fuck what they use to commit a crime with, be it legal or illegal- they have already demonstrated that they don't care about the law by comitting FELONIES. What's a few years worth of imprisonment for a federal firearms charge if you're already facing execution for murder 1? What makes you think a criminal will care whether they got their firearm legally or through some douche on the black market? A SMART criminal wouldn't buy a LEGAL firearm in the first place- those leave a paper trail that leads right back to the owner. All any kind of ban or "gun control" law does is limit the ability of good, law-abiding citizens to defend themselves and their families.

So if it doesn't make a difference, why not keep the ban? Might as well keep it since it doesn't do any harm.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 15:18:14 GMT

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

---

Hydra, making criminals have to go through all of this illegal stuff before they can even commit the crime with illegal weapons allows a lot of them to be caught in the process of obtaining such weapons, instead of just paying Colt a visit and purchasing an assault rifle for some extra firepower in a hostage situation. But then, Colt would get a couple hundred dollars for selling the gun, so they got their NRA to buy the Republicans and make sure the assault weapons ban didn't come about again.

And I again say that almost all of our police chiefs want this ban re-instated. They want the people to be safe, not for some whackos with assault rifles firing on everyone.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 18:38:27 GMT

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

---

Where are you pulling this "fact" that "almost all" police chiefs want the ban reinstated?

Nodbugger Since when has modern life been about necessity?

You forget who you're talking to. These are the same people who think that some people make "too much" and should have to "share".

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 19:31:53 GMT

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

---

AlostSOull illegally own and operate an M-16, semi-automatic 50.cal machine gun, A sniper rifle, and hand grenades. I use them all for hunting deer. Bought them from Shotgun news, Published three times a month.

ROFL. WTF do you hunt?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 18 Sep 2004 19:35:04 GMT

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

---

bigejoe14 Insult Los Angeles again and I'll break your neck.

You live there?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 08:30:57 GMT

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

---

Quote:One thing you didn't seem to mention, though. Those formerly banned weapons were already in the hands of criminals, so the ban wasn't doing any good in the first place.

Let's legalize drugs.

</troll>

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [kurt421](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 12:30:18 GMT

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

---

mrpirateQuote:One thing you didn't seem to mention, though. Those formerly banned weapons were already in the hands of criminals, so the ban wasn't doing any good in the first place.

Let's legalize drugs.

This kids got the idea

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 13:34:51 GMT

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

---

The difference between drugs and guns is that guns can be used responsibly, drugs are hardly ever used responsibly.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 14:28:46 GMT

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

---

I know! I mean, maybe weed would be acceptable if it were used to do things like induce the appetite for aids patients, stop vommiting from chemo patients, or reduce eye pain for glacoma patients! I mean, it's not nearly as useful as alcohol, which you can use to sterilize wounds...or a gun, which you can use to kill a deer to feed your starving family...

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 14:42:25 GMT

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

---

SEALI know! I mean, maybe weed would be acceptable if it were used to do things like induce

---

the appetite for aids patients, stop vommiting from chemo patients, or reduce eye pain for glacoma patients! I mean, it's not nearly as useful as alcohol, which you can use to sterilize wounds...or a gun, which you can use to kill a deer to feed your starving family...

They do use it for those reasons.

Quote:drugs are hardly ever used responsibly.

You can't sit there and tell me this statement is wrong. Who uses more drugs? People with legitimate reason or people looking to get high?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 15:20:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Me.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 16:12:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:And I again say that almost all of our police chiefs want this ban re-instated. They want the people to be safe, not for some whackos with assault rifles firing on everyone.

From where I'm sitting, that's bullshit. I live in a very, VERY pro-gun-control area, and I know for a fact that both the boro and township police chiefs wanted the ban gone. Why? Because it wasn't doing a damn thing to make people safer.

And by the way, it is not in any way easy to aquire a firearm legally.

I applied for a firearms ID card one week after my birthday (August 9). It still hasn't come in, because the FBI and State Police are STILL doing background checks, filing away my fingerprints, etc. I have never been arrested, never comitted any crimes, have no traffic violations, and do not do drugs of any kind, but they are still going to scan their entire database from A to Z to see if they get any matches. And even after I'm cleared and have my Firearms ID card, I still can't buy a gun until I go through another background check.

Please tell me how that is easier than just buying a gun illegally. I will bet every cent I own that I would have had a gun by the end of August if I had bought one illegally. Since I am a law-abiding citizen, I probably won't be able to until some time in October.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

---

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 23:02:05 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerThe difference between drugs and guns is that guns can be used responsibly, drugs are hardly ever used responsibly.

One could say that guns are hardly ever used responsibly. You're forgetting that guns are often used in things I like to refer to as criminal acts, especially ones involving robbery. You can't rob a bank with a bag full of crack, but you sure can with an Uzi.

Guns present more danger to the general public than drugs do. People kill themselves with drugs, but people kill other people with guns. There should be restrictions on both.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 23:35:24 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerThe difference between drugs and guns is that guns can be used responsibly, drugs are hardly ever used responsibly.

You're definately right about the latter statement. But you've got to remember that guns can also be used irresponsibly and dangerously to anyone. Keep in mind that irresponsible use of guns can be anything from just fooling around with them (unloaded or not) to running around playing paintball with a .22 round in the chamber.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 23:36:31 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiNodbuggerThe difference between drugs and guns is that guns can be used responsibly, drugs are hardly ever used responsibly.

One could say that guns are hardly ever used responsibly. You're forgetting that guns are often used in things I like to refer to as criminal acts, especially ones involving robbery. You can't rob a bank with a bag full of crack, but you sure can with an Uzi.

Guns present more danger to the general public than drugs do. People kill themselves with drugs, but people kill other people with guns. There should be restrictions on both.

You forget the fact that all drugs are illegal. So if you use a drug you are committing an illegal act. Which makes almost every use of drugs irresponsible.

Have you ever heard of a drug related crime? They far outweigh what weapons do.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 23:39:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavaxcxNodbuggerThe difference between drugs and guns is that guns can be used responsibly, drugs are hardly ever used responsibly.

You're definately right about the latter statement. But you've got to remember that guns can also be used irresponsibly and dangerously to anyone. Keep in mind that irresponsible use of guns can be anything from just fooling around with them (unloaded or not) to running around playing paintball with a .22 round in the chamber.

You also forget that guns are meant to be used responsibly and even if they are controlled they will still be used irresponsibly.

The illegal substances are rarely ever used responsibly. And they are being controlled. Controlling something only takes it away from responsible users.

If someone wants to use drugs or have a gun they will do it no matter what the law says.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 19 Sep 2004 23:44:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not sure about your laws on medicinal narcotics, but when they're distributed, they're supposed to be used responsibly. But hell, you can use over-the-counter Tylenol irresponsibly.

Trust me, I don't condone the use of narcotics for a "good time" at all. I find such people to be of low self-control or esteem.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 01:46:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiOne could say that guns are hardly ever used responsibly.

Sure, one could say that, but he'd be wrong.

Quote:You're forgetting that guns are often used in things I like to refer to as criminal acts, especially ones involving robbery. You can't rob a bank with a bag full of crack, but you sure can with an Uzi.

You're forgetting those robberies are committed to obtain money with which to buy drugs.

You're also forgetting that even legal guns can be used in criminal acts, so going by your logic, we should ban all guns since they are often used in criminal acts. While we're at it, let's ban all knives since they can be and are often used in criminal acts. Let's ban rat and bug poison from being sold to the general public since they are also often used in criminal acts. I'm surprised you're not calling for a ban on all cars since they are involved with even more crimes than guns are.

Quote:Guns present more danger to the general public than drugs do. People kill themselves with drugs, but people kill other people with guns. There should be restrictions on both.

People mug other people in dark alleys at night in the city so they can use the money they just stole to buy drugs. They use the money they stole from the Piggly Wiggly down the street to buy a dimebag of crack. People kill other people for money to buy drugs.

Why should you hinder the responsible, law-abiding citizen's ability to defend himself from these attackers?

The one thing you fail to realize is that no matter how much we ban these "assault" weapons and how terrible we make the penalties, people will still be able to obtain them.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 18:36:40 GMT

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

---

So getting back to my question that no one seemed to want to answer...

If the ban was doing no harm, then why get rid of it? Does anyone think there should be a more effective ban in place? Or does everyone here think that everyone should be able bear any guns they wish?

People defend their right to own a gun because (besides that whole amendment thing ) we want to be able to protect ourselves, and we want to be able to hunt. Do you really need an Ak-47 or an M16 to protect yourself from a robber? What about hunting?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 18:39:41 GMT

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

---

The ban WAS doing harm by inhibiting the common law-abiding citizen's ability to exercise his second amendment right to keep and bear arms.

A "more effective" ban should not be placed. Instead, we should concentrate on actually enforcing the existing laws.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 18:59:03 GMT

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

---

I meant physical harm...

And speaking of the second amendment, what do you think the mindset of our country's founders



was? Does it make sense in this day and age?

If all guns were illegal for all civilians, do you think law enforcement would be a lot easier? The same?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 21:49:58 GMT

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

---

Quote:Do you really need an Ak-47 or an M16 to protect yourself from a robber? What about hunting?

Once again, the ban in question did not have anything to do with the M-16 or the AK-47.

Quote:And speaking of the second amendment, what do you think the mindset of our country's founders was? Does it make sense in this day and age?

Their mindset was that people should be able to keep and bear arms for defensive purposes- defense of country, defense of community, defense of family, and defense of self. And you're damn right it makes sense in this day and age. I don't know if you realize it, but it is NOT the duty of a police force to watch over every individual in their jurisdiction; they are only required to act after they have seen a crime committed or receive a report of a crime that has been/is being committed. Self defense is still up to the private citizen, and yes, that does include a need for firearms.

And yet again, this should not even be an issue, since the right to keep and bear arms is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, which should never be changed in any way, shape, or form. If you don't like the beliefs and ideals on which this country was founded, you don't have to live here; you can move to some country that has banned firearms- I think you'd quickly find out that crime is a bigger problem there than here.

Quote:If all guns were illegal for all civilians, do you think law enforcement would be a lot easier? The same?

Harder. Harder because criminals would know beforehand that their victim would not be armed, so they would become more bold and violent than ever.

In many cases, the mere possibility that a potential victim could be armed is enough to prevent a crime. Why don't you hear about those cases? Simple- because no crime took place. It was diffused before it could happen because the victim had the firepower to defend themselves against a criminal.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 23:20:29 GMT

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

---

Okay, but which gives you a better chance of survival from a robber: a rifle or a pistol?

Quote: If you don't like the beliefs and ideals on which this country was founded, you don't have to live here; you can move to some country that has banned firearms- I think you'd quickly find out that crime is a bigger problem there than here.

Umm...not only was telling me to leave my own country uncalled for, the point you are trying to make is dead wrong. Other countries don't have anywhere NEAR the amount of gun related deaths or general crime as the US--even countries with comparable populations.

Please stop bringing up the 2nd Amendment. We have the right to bear arms...I GET IT. I'm trying to bring up the logic behind it all.

Say there is a country X. X has a population of around 100 million, and civilians are not allowed guns in any way, shape or form. Only X's military and police are allowed to have guns. Anyone caught with a firearm serves 20 years in prison. And people selling guns would be given life in prison (harsh, eh? ). Because X's government is so strict about guns, buying a simple .45, for instance, can cost thousands and thousands of dollars.

Would you predict that crime would be higher or lower than that of the US?

(I ask these questions not to push a point, but I really want to know what you guys think)

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 20 Sep 2004 23:32:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The funny part is, countries with strict gun control have deaths rates higher than that of the US.

Go figure.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 00:41:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:The U.S. has a high gun murder rate, whereas a country like England with strict gun controls has almost no gun murders and a very low murder rate. Doesn't this show that gun control is effective in reducing murder rates? Not exactly. Prior to having any gun controls, England already had a homicide rate much lower than the United States (Guns, Murders, and the Constitution: A Realistic Assessment of Gun Control, Don B. Kates Jr.). Japan is another country typically cited (see Japanese Gun Control, by David B. Kopel). (Briefly discussing the difference in homicide rates between England and the U.S. is Clayton Cramer's, Variations in California Murder Rates: Does Gun Availability Cause High Murder Rates?)

Gun control opponents can play similar games. The Swiss with 7 million people have hundreds of

thousands of fully-automatic rifles in their homes (see GunCite's "Swiss Gun Laws") and the Israelis, until recently, have had easy access to guns (brief summary of Israeli firearms regulations here). Both countries have low homicide rates. Likewise this doesn't mean more guns less crime. Source: [http://www.guncite.com/gun\\_control\\_gcgvinco.html](http://www.guncite.com/gun_control_gcgvinco.html)

Ah, so it appears that gun control has little to no effect on the number of gun related deaths. And that no gun control doesn't translate to more gun related deaths. So why does the US have any gun control laws at all? Why does the US have so many more murders than other countries? Micheal Moore thought it was fear, although I've always wanted a more concrete answer...

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 00:56:55 GMT

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

---

SEALQuote:The U.S. has a high gun murder rate, whereas a country like England with strict gun controls has almost no gun murders and a very low murder rate. Doesn't this show that gun control is effective in reducing murder rates? Not exactly. Prior to having any gun controls, England already had a homicide rate much lower than the United States (Guns, Murders, and the Constitution: A Realistic Assessment of Gun Control, Don B. Kates Jr.). Japan is another country typically cited (see Japanese Gun Control, by David B. Kopel). (Briefly discussing the difference in homicide rates between England and the U.S. is Clayton Cramer's, Variations in California Murder Rates: Does Gun Availability Cause High Murder Rates?)

Gun control opponents can play similar games. The Swiss with 7 million people have hundreds of thousands of fully-automatic rifles in their homes (see GunCite's "Swiss Gun Laws") and the Israelis, until recently, have had easy access to guns (brief summary of Israeli firearms regulations here). Both countries have low homicide rates. Likewise this doesn't mean more guns less crime. Source: [http://www.guncite.com/gun\\_control\\_gcgvinco.html](http://www.guncite.com/gun_control_gcgvinco.html)

Ah, so it appears that gun control has little to no effect on the number of gun related deaths. And that no gun control doesn't translate to more gun related deaths. So why does the US have any gun control laws at all? Why does the US have so many more murders than other countries? Micheal Moore thought it was fear, although I've always wanted a more concrete answer...

Criminals.

Welfare.

No Education.

Drugs.

Many other things lead to murder, but these are the main ones.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 18:16:48 GMT

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

---

Criminals? No shit, man. The question is asking WHY we have so many more criminals (that perform gun related crimes)

Welfare causes an increase in crime? Explain, please. I would think that it keeps people on a steadier path who are so poor that they would otherwise resort to crime.

What's wrong with our education system? If I do recall correctly, we are one of the few countries to offer free education (up to high school, at least) to any citizen. We have the best universities in the world...so, how does our educational system cause the US to have more crime than other countries?

Drugs? Why does Amsterdam not have a lot of crime? Other countries don't have drug problems?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 18:25:25 GMT

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

---

Add to that jealousy, greed, ambition, revenge...there's a zillion reasons why a person would kill someone, and very few of them can be justified.

My answer still stands. If John Q. Public were not allowed to have guns, it would be harder to enforce the laws. Using the prohibition of alcohol in the 20's as an example- people will keep doing what they have always done, and they will continue to buy firearms for their own private use. All a full ban would do is turn every citizen who refused to give up their weapon into a felon overnight- that alone makes law enforcement more difficult, because it increases the number of criminals astronomically by banning their possessions. Of course, most of those gun owners have no malicious intent whatsoever- they would simply feel too vulnerable without that firearm for protection. However, by keeping such a weapon under a complete and total ban, they would forfeit their freedom, possibly their life, if they ever had to use it in defense. I know that is not the reasoning behind gun control- most of the people who support it mean well, but it simply does not work.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 19:20:25 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15 Add to that jealousy, greed, ambition, revenge...there's a zillion reasons why a person would kill someone, and very few of them can be justified.

But people from other countries are not immune to things like greed. Why is the US crime rate so high?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 19:27:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerWelfare.

Many other things lead to murder, but these are the main ones.

Think that one through again, young padawan.

And for the record, I do not support a full ban on guns, regardless of whether or not anyone has questioned me on it. I just read Nukelt's last quote and WonderBugger's.

I only support banning assault weapons like M-16s, Uzis, and the kind.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 19:29:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiNodbuggerWelfare.

Many other things lead to murder, but these are the main ones.

Think that one through again, young padawan.

And for the record, I do not support a full ban on guns, regardless of whether or not anyone has questioned me on it. I just read Nukelt's last quote and WonderBugger's.

I only support banning assault weapons like M-16s, Uzis, and the kind.

Those weapons still are banned.

Families get suck on welfare. When on welfare you cannot have any other income. So people either stay on welfare or they get a job. Many people turn to crime for an extra income that does not get rid of their welfare. And crime leads to killing people. Drugs, stealing, and all of these things.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 20:07:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SEALI meant physical harm...

How can words written down on a piece of paper do physical harm?

Quote:Okay, but which gives you a better chance of survival from a robber: a rifle or a pistol?  
Who cares as long as the fucker who's trying to rob you dies?

---

Quote:Umm...not only was telling me to leave my own country uncalled for, the point you are trying to make is dead wrong.

Re-read what he posted. He was not making a command. He made an "if" statement that said you had the ability to leave if you did not agree with the beliefs on which the country was founded.

Quote:Other countries don't have anywhere NEAR the amount of gun related deaths or general crime as the US--even countries with comparable populations.

Where'd you find that statistic?

Quote:Would you predict that crime would be higher or lower than that of the US?

Higher. Criminals would be free to attack defenseless, law-abiding citizens with any weapon they chose, including a gun.

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 20:09:00 GMT

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

---

Do you (Nodbugger) have anything to support your point?

Another thing is that America's old inner cities are often derelict, poverty-stricken, half-deserted places where noone who can avoid it wants to be (not all of them, probably, but quite a few are). Developments like that are dangerous, those inner cities are in a downward spiral difficult to get out of.

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 21 Sep 2004 21:31:59 GMT

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

---

hydra1945

How can words written down on a piece of paper do physical harm?

Things that result from the ban. Use your brain.

Quote:

Who cares as long as the fucker who's trying to rob you dies?

If it didn't make a difference, then there is no need for rifles to be available to the public for defense.

Quote:

Re-read what he posted. He was not making a command. He made an "if" statement that said you had the ability to leave if you did not agree with the beliefs on which the country was founded.

And by making that conditional statement, something was implied. Again, use your brain.

Quote:

Where'd you find that statistic?

Try google searching. In fact, you may want to try simply opening your eyes and becoming aware of your surroundings.

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 22 Sep 2004 14:26:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'll just quote a friend, she got it nailed down perfectly.

Quote:As most of you probably know, the Assault Weapons Ban expired last Tuesday, September 14th, and has been a pretty big topic of debate ever since. Including on the Deviant Art forums.

What scares me is not that there is so much debate over it, but how little those with very strong "feelings" on the subject actually know about the assault weapons ban. Everyone seems to have this notion that, all of a sudden, fully-automatic weapons can be purchased at Wal Mart, and that, for some reason, crime is going to go way up. Others - John Kerry, to be exact - have said that the expiration of the ban "makes it easier for terrorists to attack."

All I can do is shake my head about this, and maybe clear up some things. For example, while the ban was still in effect, if I put a 20 round trench mag into my bolt-action Mauser K98 rifle, it was considered an assault weapon. Also, I could always own an AR-15 (the civilian, semi-automatic equivalent of a military M-16), but if it was a post-ban weapon it could not have certain features such as a bayonet lug, or a telescoping stock if I wanted to turn it into an M4.

The ban was purely cosmetic, and that's what people don't understand. I have heard every silly argument in the forums, ranging from people thinking that assault weapons are somehow more powerful than your average bolt-action hunting rifle, to people thinking every Bubba and Junior will now have fully automatic AK-47s in their possession as they drive down to the 7-11 for their six packs.

Little knowledge is, indeed, a scary thing. As always, I serve to enlighten, so I want to share the article below from the Texas City Sun newspaper. The Texas City Sun, and many other newspapers throughout the United States had good articles on this subject, so I'll share one of those rather than delve into the subject myself.

Consider This: Weapons ban not about safety  
from the Texas City Sun



confirms what I have believed all along. The people who wrote the law don't understand weapons or criminals.

The ban wasn't on weapons, it was on cosmetic features of certain weapons. Basically, the writers and backers of the legislation believed that if a gun looked bad, it must be bad. So, a semiautomatic rifle that had a flash suppressor, pistol grip or collapsible stock was bad. The same rifle without those things was good.

I have listened to people complain about the poor police officers who will be outgunned by the criminals who are now rejoicing because they can legally purchase assault rifles. Well, here's a couple of things any honest police officer will tell you:

First, criminals can't legally buy firearms. That was the case before the ban, during the ban and it remains the case after the ban. Convicted felons give up various rights. Those include the right to vote and the right to keep and bear arms. The expiration of the ban does nothing to change that.

Second, criminals have always had the ability to buy assault rifles. Notice that I didn't say the right, I said the ability. It really should come as no surprise that people who sell drugs and include among their hobbies rape, robbery and murder, aren't impressed by yet another law. They generally ignore laws, preferring instead to do whatever they want, regardless of the law. That was true before the ban, during the ban and will remain true after the ban. The expiration of the ban does nothing to change that, either.

One of the things about this debate that really chaps me is the assertion by politicians that no one really needs assault rifles. Therefore, they say, they should be outlawed. That's a double standard that should anger any law-abiding gun owner. Let me explain. I don't own an assault rifle and have no intention of owning one. I have friends who own them, and I can honestly say

People are killed or injured in car wrecks each year, but no one is clamoring to ban high-performance cars. The same could be said for motorcycles, speed boats, skateboards, water skis and hang gliders. During eight years of service in the U.S. Coast Guard, I came to hate personal water craft. If you ever see a serious accident involving these waterborne death

such a device. But they are legal, and people have the right to own things they don't

just one of the hundreds of people injured each year in equestrian accidents. If our government is going to get into the business of regulating our needs, I say there should be some legislation on the ownership of horses.

Why doesn't the government ban these items and activities? I'll tell you why. It's because law-abiding citizens have the right, under our Constitution, to engage in legal activities that don't hurt anyone else. And, those law abiding citizens shouldn't be made to suffer a loss of their rights just because other people choose to be stupid, careless, criminal or unlucky.

That is where the double standard comes into play.

The people I know who own assault rifles are collectors. They like to own the weapons because they are fun to shoot and many of them have some historic value. A good friend of mine owns a Thompson submachine gun, a British Vickers machine gun from World War I and various other historic weapons. He is properly licensed and obeys the laws of the state of Texas and the United States of America.

No police officer has to worry about facing my friend in a dark alley with his Thompson.

My friend obeyed the law during the ban and he will continue to obey the law now that the ban has expired. Taking away his right to engage in a hobby he enjoys doesn't make anyone safer.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Aurora](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 02:26:50 GMT

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

---

NeoXYou will take that back soon enough. Once gang bangers are having m16s blazing from a car in LA.

You've never been to L.A.

--

And if you people would quit making yourselves look retarded over the 2nd amendment, that'd be fine. There are reasons it exists, trust me, I know. Just because something has never happened to you that makes you wish you had a gun doesn't mean it hasn't happened to someone else.

And about those graphs showing numbers of non-natural deaths in various countries:

Yeah, the U.S. looks like it has a lot of homicides. It does.

Know why?

I bet you can guess.

No?

We've got a shitload of people living here. DING DING! Who would have thought of such a thing! More people equals a greater chance of things happening?! NO WAY!

Seriously. Look at the fucking graph SEAL posted. It shows the United States, then right under it is... Finland? What the fuck is that? Finland has a population of FIVE MILLION. (source: <http://virtual.finland.fi/finfo/english/populat.html> ) The United States has a population of 294,341,179. (source: <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/popclock> ) Round it up, that's 300 million.

According to SEAL's handy graph from the most enigmatic source of "google", We see that Finland has about, say, 4,500 homicides a year. Also according to this obviously correct random Internet page, the United States has about 95,000 homicides a year. (I believe the actual number is closer to 20,000.) Here comes the fun part.

Finland: 5,000,000 people

United States: 300,000,000 people

The United States has 60 times more people than Finland.

Do the math, people.

Proportionally, if Finland had as many people as the United States, it would have 270,000 deaths by firearm. each year.

Curse you, America, and your second amendment!

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [TheMouse](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 03:44:49 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerThe funny part is, countries with strict gun control have deaths rates higher than that of the US.

Go figure.

actually, I don't believe that is true... have you seen bowling for columbine? I'm sure that is exaggerated, but the idea is right, methinks. or was that just murders?

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 05:23:04 GMT

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

---

<http://www.bowlingfortruth.com/bowlingforcolumbine/scenes/countries.htm>

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 11:31:15 GMT

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

---

AuroraX0And about those graphs showing numbers of non-natural deaths in various countries:

Yeah, the U.S. looks like it has a lot of homicides. It does.

---

Know why?

I bet you can guess.

No?

We've got a shitload of people living here. DING DING! Who would have thought of such a thing! More people equals a greater chance of things happening?! NO WAY!

Seriously. Look at the fucking graph SEAL posted. It shows the United States, then right under it is... Finland? What the fuck is that? Finland has a population of FIVE MILLION. (source: <http://virtual.finland.fi/finfo/english/populat.html> ) The United States has a population of 294,341,179. (source: <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/popclock> ) Round it up, that's 300 million.

According to SEAL's handy graph from the most enigmatic source of "google", We see that Finland has about, say, 4,500 homicides a year. Also according to this obviously correct random Internet page, the United States has about 95,000 homicides a year. (I believe the actual number is closer to 20,000.) Here comes the fun part.

Finland: 5,000,000 people

United States: 300,000,000 people

The United States has 60 times more people than Finland.

Do the math, people.

Proportionally, if Finland had as many people as the United States, it would have 270,000 deaths by firearm. each year.

Curse you, America, and your second amendment!

The graph posted in this thread is per 100.000 children aged <15, so population is irrelevant.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 18:48:25 GMT

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

---

SEALThings that result from the ban. Use your brain.

I already told you what resulted from that ban. Use your brain and actually read what people have said time and again.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 19:47:27 GMT

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

---

I said: How does the ban do any harm?

And you, being a smartass, said: How can a piece of paper do harm?

by saying "Things that result from the ban", I meant: "NO, smartass, of course I'm not asking how a piece of paper could hurt someone...I'm asking how the things that result from the ban could hurt someone."

I was just countering your smartass-ness.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 23 Sep 2004 21:32:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It doesn't do harm, it just lulls people into a false sense of security and fuels ignorance of what an assault rifle really is. Which is, in my opinion, much more dangerous than letting assault rifles be legalized.

---

---

Subject: That stupid "assault weapons" ban finally expired  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Fri, 24 Sep 2004 01:48:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Remember! False senses of security and guns don't kill people. People kill people.

---