
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.
