

---

## Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by Tony\_S - 2008/03/29 16:19

---

This thread discusses the Content article: Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

I don't think the Founding Fathers thought it was OK for everyone to walk around with a gun so their neighbor would be afraid to mess with them. This provision was meant to ensure that we as a people could defend our rights from institutions, foreign and domestic, that looked to deprive us for their benefit.

Should we have an armed militia to prevent King George from sweeping through - yes. Should we have a side arm to intimidate the tax man, frighten our neighbor, or resist arrest - no.

Count me in for "collective right".

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by Miami LS - 2008/03/29 16:31

---

The Bill of Rights was drafted to provide fundamental rights to all American Citizens. The Bill of Rights does not establish rights for non-residents or for government officials. Therefore, I think it was the intent of the drafters that the 2nd Amendment applies to American Citizens and provides the right of its citizens to bear arms.

Will crime increase if everyone can carry a weapon? Maybe or maybe not. But, an absolute ban on weapons is not what the 2nd provides for either. The Supr Ct will probably find a middle ground to satisfy both sides of this debate.

Post edited by: Miami LS, at: 2008/03/29 16:32

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by Jackie - 2008/03/30 02:49

---

In states like Texas which have liberal gun laws, the crime rate is actually lower than NY, Detroit, and FL. Liberal gin laws may actually deter crime if would-be criminals worry about their victims carrying guns.

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by ai1829 - 2008/04/01 02:06

---

The problem with the gun laws is that there is no written exam to determine mental competency so any weirdo would have access to a killing machine

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by great1 - 2008/04/01 13:03

---

GUNS FOR EVERYONE! Can you image the mess\*\*\*?\*\*\*

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by LK311 - 2008/04/01 21:57

---

You know, I don't understand why people have this fear about letting law abiding citizens own hand guns. What exactly is the problem? A law abiding citizens will remain one with or without a gun. What we need to fear are the criminals, who get the guns with no background checks, clearances or anything else. Those are the people we should be

---

discussing on how to get the guns away from them, not more control for the people that follow the rules. This whole issue has never made any sense to me

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Rig

Posted by Tim46 - 2008/04/24 19:40

---

The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the 3 cocktail method of lethal injection.

Supreme Court justice Roberts stated that challenges must show that the state's method of lethal injection "creates a demonstrated risk of severe pain" and that there were "feasible" and readily implementable" alternatives that would significantly reduce the risk of severe pain.

The Court also stated that a slightly or marginally safer alternative is not good enough.

Lets see if the states perform mass executions to make up for lost time!:evil:

=====

## Re:Gun Law in the Supreme Court's Sights - The Right to Keep and Bear Arms

Posted by Mevadás - 2008/06/25 09:17

---

I am going to have to disagree with Jackie. Crime is lower in states such as Texas, but I don't believe it is because citizens are toting guns around with them every where they go. Crime in New York is most likely high because of opportunity. There is more money and more mindless people wandering the streets of New York. You must also take into consideration the fact that in Texas most people drive where they go, where as in New York or Chicago, most people take the subway and walk. I have not done the research yet, but I bet you that if you look at the ratio of persons to the percentage of crime for New York and then Houston, it will be similar. There are 8.5 million people who live within the 5 boroughs of the City of New York. What is the population of Houston? That 8.5 million does not include all the people who come from Long Island, Jersey, and many other places around the world to visit.

All that being said; I firmly believe that if an individual desires to own a weapon to protect their family and themselves then they should be afforded the right. Gun laws exist for a reason and give those who are eligible the right to possess arms. Not all persons are mentally capable of being responsible enough to possess a weapon, and I don't think crime would increase or even necessarily decrease if all persons were afforded the right to bear arms with no restrictions. It would make for an interesting case study though.

=====