

---

Subject: Re: RIP charleston heston

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2008 21:03:40 GMT

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

---

Quote:didn't cho sung and a lot of these school shooting incidents get their weapons from legal gun stores?

That's actually a fairly good point- but not for the reasons you made it. Here's the problem- there are rather large loopholes in current legislation which, in some places, permit the purchase of firearms given certain conditions are met. In the case of the VT tragedy, the shooter had in fact spent time in an institution- but that fact was not taken into consideration, as he had committed himself. Different states also have different laws regarding whether or not convicted criminals can purchase firearms- in many places, that right is not taken away unless you have been convicted of a violent felony or any domestic offense.

I'm of the opinion that anyone convicted of any felony should not be allowed to purchase a firearm; they gave up all their rights when they chose to violate someone else's rights.

I'm a bit torn about folks who have spent time in an institution, mainly because I know a few people who have and really didn't need to- I'd trust them with my life any day, and wouldn't think twice about handing them a weapon. However, that is highly specific to what sort of mental issue is present- depression in an of itself isn't enough, but things like paranoid schizophrenia, sociopathy, and phychotic tendencies should definitely factor into whether or not someone should be able to go and buy a gun. It isn't quite as cut-and-dried as "they're crazy, take it away," because each person's mind is different. What I do think is that anybody who has known mental health issues should be required, regardless of severity, to submit to a psychological evaluation before being granted a permit to purchase.

Beyond that, the government has absolutely no right to tell any citizen that they may not buy a gun and use it to defend themselves. Any restriction placed on a citizen with a clean record is analogous to presumption of guilt, which contradicts the very foundation of the justice system in this country (innocent until proven guilty). If given no reason to suspect that a person may be a danger to others, it is not the local, state, or federal government's place to interfere with the second amendment.

I'm openly critical of the effectiveness of gun control because I come from a state (New Jersey) that is a prime example of why it doesn't work. NJ is among the hardest states to legally buy a gun in (and getting a CCW permit is even harder), yet it boasts one of the highest if not the highest violent crime rate in the country- and is home to three of the nation's most dangerous cities (Trenton, Camden, and Newark). Do the gangs in those cities give a damn that they aren't supposed to have their guns? No, not at all. Even in supposedly nicer areas, such as Princeton (my home town), there is an increasing gang presence and crime rate even as gun laws grow more and more restrictive. It doesn't take a three-digit IQ to see the connection, and I feel a hell of a lot safer knowing that I'm one of the dwindling number of armed citizens in the state.

As for alarms- alarms are wonderful tools, but they are hardly a catch-all solution to crime- or even home invasions. Police response times being what they are (laughable), an alarm is only a deterrent to the easily spooked as it will take way longer than they need to clean your home out

for anybody to arrive and do something about it. That's not to say alarms are useless; they are a great way to increase home security and are extremely helpful when you're not around. However, they are no substitute for a good weapon when you are around. I'm a huge proponent of security systems, especially the kind that automatically report any incidents to the authorities, but if you are at home and the police won't respond for fifteen minutes to an hour or more (in some places), that's a very small comfort indeed. A weapon- any weapon, even a baseball bat- increases your chances of staying alive in the face of a person determined to do you harm, but a gun is by far the most effective means of personal protection.

Honestly, I have no objection to less-lethal weapons like tazers, but they are not and never will be a replacement for guns. Not until somebody invents a magical stun beam that knocks its target out cold, guaranteed.

Remember also that the Second Amendment was not ever meant to be changed or removed; like the rest of the Bill of Rights it is an amendment only because it was not written into the original document yet was demanded by an overwhelming majority of the states. Given that it was written during a time when citizens with personal firearms made the difference between a free nation and a colony, I truly believe that there will always be a place for guns in the hands of citizens. It may seem today like the threat of tyranny is remote, but we live in turbulent times- it is far, far better to be armed against threats we have yet to recognize.

---