
Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:44:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

More proof that the major populace centers of California need to be deported to someplace like Iran where they'll feel safe among their own kind.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0%2C2933%2C143081%2C00.html>

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:01:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

stupid idea, then the average joe is defenseless against criminal marv who will get guns from out of state or country. very dumb indeed.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:13:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doesn't make sense for safety.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:43:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That seems like the most stupid idea ever. Like the article said "the criminals flock to a city that ensures they won't be shot at by the people they're robbing" Plus banning guns doesn't seem to have helped in Washington.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Panther](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 22:40:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There are points for both sides of the argument.. I suppose it's up to voters.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 23:05:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Let me guess....Break up the 11th circuit?

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 23:19:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just to clarify, you would still get to carry rifles. It is a handgun ban, not a total firearms ban.

So while I don't agree with it, I'm sure for the sake of security, because that seems to be what MOST people are annoyed about, having an AK47 might be more palatable than a handgun anyway. Albeit more expensive.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:11:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:"When you get guns out of people's homes and off the streets, it means that that gun is not going to be used in a shooting that kills someone".
That's a complete lie. Sure, it will stop pedestrians from having guns, but how is that going to stop criminals? Criminals don't abide by the law. They'll get a gun anyway they can.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:27:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yep, seems to me this is 100% on all sides. We can get along! WE ALL THINK ITS STUPID!!!!

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 01:14:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lol Java,

Quote:Just to clarify, you would still get to carry rifles. It is a handgun ban, not a total firearms ban.

I'm all for it then if it gives me the right to keep an ak47 on a shoulder strap on my person at all times... lol

Seriously though you aren't allowed to walk around with a rifle anyhow. If you ban handguns you

ban the most effective home defense weapon. Only people who's last names end with atfield and coy sleep with a loaded double barrel shotgun.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 03:05:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doitllef you ban handguns you ban the most effective home defense weapon.

That's a matter of opinion, my friend.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 03:13:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i guess thats true Java, in other words...weapon of choice?

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 23:15:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sigh....

In the UK, we aren't allowed to attack burglars in any way, otherwise we would get a longer sentence than he would. I am not exaggerating.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 23:17:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It is the same scam here. Of course, unless they do something to do physically first.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 23:54:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Toolstyle Plus banning guns doesn't seem to have helped in Washington.

An actual newspaper headline Mayor Says DC is Safe Except For Murders.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 00:01:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpoonyIn the UK, we aren't allowed to attack burglars in any way, otherwise we would get a longer sentence than he would. I am not exaggerating.

I see a flaw with the UK's law system. Its up there somewhere

Seriously tho, thats ridiculous.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 17:43:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well this all came into public view when a farmer shot dead burglar as he ran away. While yes it is unreasonable that the victim should get imprisoned for hitting somebody for robbing his/her house, shooting them as they run away is overboard. Reforms are being introduced that will allow us to use "reasonable force" to stop burglars which is all down to interpretation, I see that as anything short of killing or mortally wounding as reasonable and hopefully so would the police and courts.

@rm5248

Ok fair enough I didn't pay that much attention before I posted that bit =P

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 20:25:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would love to see them going into my house and try to take my gun, they are not going to take my right to bare arms if i lived there, and anyway how are they going to get ALL the handguns from the people in that area?? THEY WON'T, so why take from some and not others and leave some defenseless??

Stupid idea.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 21:30:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well you need licences don't you? They'll just mooch around and take all the ones off licence holders and the criminals who's stolen a gun will be able to keep theirs...makes sense yeah?

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 02:47:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"I don't feel like I need to own a gun to protect myself. Certainly, I am a high-profile elected official and now a lot of gun owners don't like me individually, but if I'm in a situation where I feel threatened, I'll call the police," Daly said.

And when they show up and find his dead body I can laugh my ass off.

The Criminal mind in my head says... "Wow a city I can go rob any house and not worry about getting shot."

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 02:50:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That crook wouldn't have looked at the fine print. It is a HANDGUN ban. There is nothing there about banning unnecessarily high powered assault rifles.

So it merely means that those Criminals won't need to worry about being shot... by anything short of something with a 10+ round magazine.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 20:36:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Except you can't have unnecessarily high powered rifles... There are restrictions on those already. He would have to worry about being shot by a rifle from the ottoman oppression. "You better just... You just wait soon as I get this... Shot, ok hang on... (Homeowner pours powder in barrel) I'll I'll blast you motherfucker just... uh... Where are those balls... You are gonna be so sorry when I get this all done. (Minutes Pass) Alright prepare to die sucker... Uh?

Meanwhile the robber was in and out and on his merry way already.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 20:44:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hehe, tell that to the Michigan Militia. There knee-deep in 50mm Rifles that tear cars in two.

Subject: San Franscisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 13:13:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^^ hehehe... Michigan Militia pwns you..

Subject: San Franscisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2005 04:52:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm more worried about the automatic (semi?) ban that expired. I'd rather be confronted with a hand gun than an Uzi.

But I'd support this thing SF is doing. A ban on handguns in a major city makes perfect sense.

I think they should ban guns altogether.

The constitution allowed guns when it was first written, but that was a good 200 years ago. AFAIK, there are no invaders, no British Soldiers, indians or any wild cattle atacking me. I don't think there is a need for that sort of "defense" anymore. Guns get into the hands of criminals too often.

Guns should only be in the hands of Policemen, and Military personelle.

Subject: San Franscisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2005 05:02:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

1. Bill of Rights were put into the Consitution as Amendments for one VERY good reason: They wanted these rights for the American public for the rest of the country's existance.
 2. Criminals are going to get guns any time that they want. Letting the general public will help prevent crime because there will always be the chance that the person they're attacking is packing heat.
-

Subject: San Franscisco considers firearm ban
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2005 05:24:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Get in touch with reality, please.

You only restrict law-abiding citizens from ownings guns with which to protect themselves from purchasing firearms. Criminals are going to break the law anyway, so it wouldn't matter to them if they break one more law to get a gun. Just making them illegal won't solve the problem; if anything, it'll exacerbate the problem. Criminals will know their victims are defenseless, thus

making San Francisco a prime target for murderers, armed assaultists, rapists, etc.

I'll make this more clear with two scenarios, one with that handgun ban in place and one without.

With the ban: I'm a law-abiding citizen sound asleep in my San Francisco apartment, when I awake to a crashing sound. I look over to the window ten feet from my bed and see glass on the floor and a dark figure climb through. I knew I lived in sort of a dangerous part of town, so I always had a phone on the end table right next to my bed so I can quickly call 911. I pick up my phone and try to dial 911, and the call connects, but before I can utter a single word to the 911 operator, the intruder has run over to my bed and bashed my skull in with his crowbar. The operator traces the call to my apartment and dispatches the police. They arrive ten minutes later to find my invaded apartment that's been torn to pieces by the intruder and all the valuables stolen and my body with half a skull.

Without the ban: I'm a law-abiding citizen sound asleep in my San Francisco apartment, when I awake to a crashing sound. I look over to the window ten feet from my bed and see glass on the floor and a dark figure climb through. I knew I lived in sort of a dangerous part of town, so I always had a loaded gun on the end table next to my bed so I can quickly respond to any such situations. I reach over, grab the gun, aim it at the intruder's head. "If you so much as twitch, I swear to God I will blow your fucking brains out. Put whatever it is you have down, put your hands up and don't fucking move." I say to the intruder. I keep the gun trained on his head, not looking away for a second, and I pick up the phone and call 911. I tell the operator my apartment has just been invaded and I have the intruder held at gunpoint. The police come to my apartment and apprehend the intruder.

Which scenario would you rather take, the one with the ban on handguns, or the one without? The logical choice, of course, would be the second, and I hope you agree.

Subject: San Francisco considers firearm ban

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 07:00:45 GMT

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

I see no reason to ban handguns. As stated before, criminals will just get them illegally. For responsible people who know how to handle guns properly, a gun can be a security blanket. I do think that people should have to take a test before owning a gun, however, to prevent them from accidentally shooting family members because of their own stupidity. (If you blow your own brains out, it's your goddamn fault, but having others become the victim of your stupidity is unacceptable.)
