

---

Subject: Jack's Back!

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 25 Mar 2007 01:35:24 GMT

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

---

[http://www.gamespot.com/news/6167843.html?action=convert&om\\_clk=latestnews&amp;tag=latestnews;title;0](http://www.gamespot.com/news/6167843.html?action=convert&om_clk=latestnews&amp;tag=latestnews;title;0)

Very funny.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sun, 25 Mar 2007 01:40:56 GMT

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

---

Lawsuit! Lawsuit! I'll counter your lawsuit with a lawsuit of my own, and another lawsuit!

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Sun, 25 Mar 2007 12:32:56 GMT

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

---

Can someone please shut this guy up? Wouldn't it be worth life in jail to save the rest of the world from Jack Thompson?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Sun, 25 Mar 2007 18:58:20 GMT

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

---

What pisses me off is that he is spending tax payer dollars for this. If he wants to be a jackass and go after them then fine. Let the courts decide. But don't do it using the hard earned money of the men and women of this country.

I think this pisses me off more than the whole steroids in baseball thing.

There are REAL problems in the country for your government time/money you asshole.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [Renx](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 00:12:23 GMT

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

---

Games that came out after 9/11 still contributed to the terrorist's cause

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2007 02:08:48 GMT

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

---

luv2pb wrote on Sun, 25 March 2007 12:58 What pisses me off is that he is spending tax payer dollars for this. If he wants to be a jackass and go after them then fine. Let the courts decide. But don't do it using the hard earned money of the men and women of this country.

I think this pisses me off more than the whole steroids in baseball thing.

There are REAL problems in the country for your government time/money you asshole.

This pretty much sums it up. I'm so sick and tired of this blow-hard. Can't he find something constructive to do with his time... Games don't warp people, people warp people.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 11:20:52 GMT

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

---

gbull wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 21:08 Games don't warp people, people warp people.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 12:33:01 GMT

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

---

NOTE: You are going to flame me for saying this but I got to say it:

Some games are just so damned violent. I have to agree with Jack when he goes against the Manhunter 2 game.

I saw someone play Manhunter...oh man it was a SICK game. It was so unnecessarily violent...stalking around...killing people with plastic bags and baseball bats.

Games that use ordinary household items for killing will have a dangerous effect on the player.

I know games are not fun without guns and all but there is a line that in-game violence should not cross.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 14:21:48 GMT

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

---

IronBalls wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 13:33NOTE: You are going to flame me for saying this but I got to say it:

IronBalls wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 13:33

Some games are just so damned violent. I have to agree with Jack when he goes against the Manhunter 2 game.

In your opinion.

IronBalls wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 13:33

Games that use ordinary household items for killing will have a dangerous effect on the player.

I played every single GTA game, Manhunter and a few others. I haven't killed anyone, nor do I get violent with weapons.

IronBalls wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 13:33

I know games are not fun without guns and all but there is a line that in-game violence should not cross.

I play Real Flight Sim G3.5, I think that is quite fun at times. It's even better multiplayer.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 14:55:40 GMT

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

---

You and I may not lose our heads after encountering violence in games but there are plenty of whacks out there who are poisoned by it.

Video games can be fun but if that fun is NOT controlled, then it can lead to an addiction and this in turn will severely hinder social development.

There are PLENTY of cases where "violent" games played a part in screwing up the lives of the player and others:

-Devin Moore became a whacko after playing the GTA games...he killed 3 police officers and the SOB was only 18.

-And don't forget the Columbine shooters...they were Doom addicts and created their own game levels to make it look like their high school.

When I said "games are not fun without guns and all," I was referring to FPS/RTS games. I play (and have) every Microsoft Flight Sim up to the last one and they are quite fun.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 15:47:22 GMT

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

---

I'm going to say this yet again because nobody ever seems to understand: PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY!

What is it, you illiterate morons ask? Simple. It's the idea that your actions are your own. You, and you alone, are responsible for your actions. It is not the job of the government or any other group/organization to censor things simply because people are corruptible. It's not the responsibility of the companies, either.

The companies only have to produce a product/service that people will purchase. After that, they really have no responsibility, as long as it doesn't physically harm someone (i.e. food poisoning from KFC or whatever). You may say that this gives the people incentive to do it, but who ultimately commits the violent act? Certainly not the companies.

This is just like gun control. Sure, the companies may be supplying these wackjobs, but the companies' intent are not to arm these people, but to sell their product. It's not their fault that people are corruptible.

If an underage kid gets a hold of the game, that's the fault of the parent for not doing anything about it. My mom found out that I bought Grand Theft Auto: Vice City, and she took it away, and returned it to Best Buy and kept the money. She didn't blame the game companies. She blamed Best Buy for selling a Mature game to a minor, but she wasn't out to eradicate violent games because of it.

I believe in the responsibility of the people. You can do whatever as long as you deal with the consequences of your actions, and as long as it doesn't interfere with others' rights.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 16:15:27 GMT

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

---

What if someone stole £10 from an old lady because they had a gun to their head.

@IronBalls

What made you conclude that the games were doing it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 16:25:04 GMT

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

---

Quote:You and I may not lose our heads after encountering violence in games but there are

plenty of whacks out there who are poisoned by it.

...and the vast, vast majority of those whacks are the very same whacks whose parents never bothered to teach them such silly, trivial things as the difference between right and wrong. I hate to break it to you, but if someone's mind is impressionable enough to be led to violence by playing video games, then there are more than enough other things out there that would have the same effect on them- because they're already fucked up; they're just time bombs waiting for a trigger and any trigger will do. The only way to get around that is to hammer into a kid's head early and often that it is wrong to hurt other people- if that never happens, it is a failure in parenting and other gamers shouldn't have to suffer for their incompetence through bullshit legislation.

Quote:Video games can be fun but if that fun is NOT controlled, then it can lead to an addiction and this in turn will severely hinder social development.

Reality check, bud- laws and regulations exist to protect people from other people, not from themselves. Should we start allowing the courts and the legislators come in and start dictating to us how and when we're allowed to have fun because we just might take it too far? Fuck no- that's our responsibility. If some silly sod wants to hide in their room and use an MMO to substitute for real-world social interaction, let them. It's none of anybody else's business.

If you're a parent and you let your kid do that with their life, then it's your failure. Put the blame where it belongs.

Quote:There are PLENTY of cases where "violent" games played a part in screwing up the lives of the player and others:

-Devin Moore became a whacko after playing the GTA games...he killed 3 police officers and the SOB was only 18.

-And don't forget the Columbine shooters...they were Doom addicts and created their own game levels to make it look like their high school.

There is so much wrong with that argument that it hurts to look at it.

Are you honestly just going to completely overlook the underlying mental issues in both of those cases? Please don't insult your own intelligence.

Devin Moore:

Quote:Moore's father, 48-year-old Kenneth Moore, said after the hearing that had trouble disciplining his son for years and that his son deserved to be charged with capital murder.  
[LINK](#)

Quote:Walsh says this diminished impulse control becomes heightened in a person who has additional risk factors for criminal behavior. Moore had a profoundly troubled upbringing, bouncing back and forth between a broken home and a handful of foster families.

"And so when a young man with a developing brain, already angry, spends hours and hours and

hours rehearsing violent acts, and then, and he's put in this situation of emotional stress, there's a likelihood that he will literally go to that familiar pattern that's been wired repeatedly, perhaps thousands and thousands of times," says Walsh.

LINK

Yeah, because the abuse and unstable family life for years on end surely had nothing to do with his breakdown. It must have been the GTA that set him off. Because, you know, having a stable and loving family is so much less important than being "protected" from violent video games. Moore was a whacko long before he ever touched a GTA title.

Columbine:

I'm just going to briefly run through this one, since I have somewhere I need to be in a few minutes. Apologies; I'll look up some references later on.

Both of the Columbine killers were social outcasts at their school. So they played Doom, huh? Guess what- Doom has you killing demons from Hell, not high school students. Oh wow, they created their own levels to look like their school- because that was totally the intention of the game, and not two very sick kids rendering their own destructive fantasies.

I've been around video games of all types as well as guns of almost all types my whole life, and let me be the first to say that there is no correlation whatsoever between being a game god and being able to peg a target with supersonic lead. None. You could play GTA, or Doom, or Area 51, or even America's Army (the most realistic shooter in existence today) for years and still suck at shooting in the real world. Conversely, you could be (like me) a regular crack shot with rifles, handguns, etc and be an utter and complete incompetent at gaming. Games do not train people to shoot.

Neither do games train people to be violent- In every single case which is cited to "prove" the link between virtual and real-world violence, there is something else going on under the surface. Something like paranoid schizophrenia, psychosis, substance abuse, a rough upbringing, etc- which would have a far more damaging effect than even the most depraved game ever could. I won't deny that the wrong game in the wrong place at the wrong time can be the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back, but it is hardly cause numero uno- and if we go around trying to control every single little thing that could take the place of that little bit of straw we're going to wind up on perpetual lockdown because nobody will be allowed to do anything that doesn't involve hugging their pillow to let off steam.

Put the blame where it belongs.

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 16:51:29 GMT

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

---

In essence, the majority of psycho high-school-shooting assholes buy violent games BECAUSE they are psycho high-school-shooting assholes. It lets them act out fantasies they already have, not create new ones.

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 17:05:16 GMT

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

---

gamemodding wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 12:15What if someone stole £10 from an old lady because they had a gun to their head.

@IronBalls

What made you conclude that the games were doing it?

What the hell does that have anything to do with what we're talking about? Being robbed happens all the time.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 17:33:51 GMT

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

---

Another win for the gaming community.

Jack Thompson won't just settle for being told he's a dumbass, he needs proof.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 18:09:02 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 18:05gamemodding wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 12:15What if someone stole £10 from an old lady because they had a gun to their head.

@IronBalls

What made you conclude that the games were doing it?

What the hell does that have anything to do with what we're talking about? Being robbed happens all the time.

I'm saying, the person stealing has a gun to their head. They are responsible for their own actions, but are they? read my post...

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [havoc9826](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2007 19:09:59 GMT

gamemodding wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 11:09j\_ball430 wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 18:05gamemodding wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 12:15What if someone stole £10 from an old lady because they had a gun to their head.

@IronBalls

What made you conclude that the games were doing it?

What the hell does that have anything to do with what we're talking about? Being robbed happens all the time.

I'm saying, the person stealing has a gun to their head. They are responsible for their own actions, but are they? read my post...

You might find these interesting:

Stanford Prison Experiment

Milgram Experiment

The Wikipedia article on the Milgram Experiment is accurate, according to everything I've heard from my professors and seen on documentary videos. This kinda goes off on a tangent, but I felt that these experiments are relevant enough that some people might enjoy reading about them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2007 01:33:43 GMT

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

---

gamemodding wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 14:09j\_ball430 wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 18:05gamemodding wrote on Thu, 05 April 2007 12:15What if someone stole £10 from an old lady because they had a gun to their head.

@IronBalls

What made you conclude that the games were doing it?

What the hell does that have anything to do with what we're talking about? Being robbed happens all the time.

I'm saying, the person stealing has a gun to their head. They are responsible for their own actions, but are they? read my post...

Oh, you may want to rephrase what you said then. It wasn't very clear.

Ultimately, yes... it's his decision, and he's responsible. Regardless if the decision he made was for his own survival, HE made that choice. HE is responsible for his action. While most may see that he didn't really have any other logical option in the situation, he made the decision to rob the old lady.

Any way you slice it, HE made the decision. Unless he was under some mind control device, he is



at fault. He would still be sentenced even if he used this excuse in court (and rightly so).

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2007 07:21:08 GMT

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

---

I don't think that is fair though, and if then gunman was known to have killed before.. So lets say, someone strikes alot of fear into someone and makes them drink poison thats suicide?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2007 13:23:56 GMT

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

---

gamemodding wrote on Fri, 06 April 2007 03:21 I don't think that is fair though, and if then gunman was known to have killed before.. So lets say, someone strikes alot of fear into someone and makes them drink poison thats suicide?

Yeah, it's been done before, too. Caligula, 1st Century (AD) Rome.

I still don't think you grasp the main idea. Your actions are your own. Regardless if you're "forced" or not, you, ultimately, have made that decision.

Listen, with the whole thief scenario, it's all about what he values more. Does he value his life more or the old lady? If he chooses to accept the threat, he'll get sentenced for committing a crime (rightly so), and he'll serve jail time. It's still a crime no matter what's the driving force behind it.

He'll survive jail time, and he'll be alive and back on the streets. I would do the same thing. I wouldn't want to do either, but I would serve jail time and pay retribution to that old lady if it meant that I could remain alive.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2007 15:54:40 GMT

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

---

I know the lawful side of this, its just i'm think about the moral side of it. Do you think it is wrong? Do you think they should be punished for something like this? If you go past robbery and go to murder for example. Should you be punished if you're forced to kill an old lady? should you be punished for killing a little child? I mean, with a gun to your head. So either kill, or be killed. I myself wouldn't have the guts to kill someone.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

---

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2007 16:02:33 GMT

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

---

Speaking for myself, I think I'd rather eat a bullet than pull the trigger on someone who's done me no wrong. I don't know for sure, though- I've never been placed in such a situation but I'd like to think I have the courage.

---

Subject: Re: Jack's Back!

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2007 16:04:02 GMT

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

---

You do realize that there are consequences for every decision you make, right?

You don't get off from serving time if you kill someone because you were "forced" to at gunpoint. There are two victims (murdered and murderer) in this, and two people should be convicted. The murderer should be convicted, and so should be the one who threatened him. The fact is that the murderer ultimately chose his life over the child's and the old lady's. That's a selfish act, and it deserves to be punished. I don't know what I'd do in that position, but if I chose my life over theirs, I'd have a guilty conscience, and I'd know I did it for selfish reasons. I hope I'd sacrifice my life for theirs.

---