

# Ruling reflects America's ambivalence on guns

---

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

**Author(s)** USA Today editorial board

**Source** USA Today

**Date** June 27, 2008

**URL** <http://blogs.usatoday.com/oped/2008/06/our-view-on-t-2.html>

**Quote**

“ Fortunately, the 5-4 decision to strike down the District of Columbia's tough ban on handgun possession didn't go as far as gun-control advocates had feared or the gun lobby had hoped. The justices agreed that a right to individual ownership doesn't mean that anyone can own any weapon. That leaves in place reasonable restrictions or outright bans on firearms such as machine guns and sawed-off shotguns, and exotic weapons such as surface-to-air missiles.”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues for the position Supreme Court was correct in its ruling on the topic District of Columbia v. Heller.

---

Retrieved from

"[https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Ruling\\_reflects\\_America%27s\\_ambivalence\\_on\\_guns&oldid=7819](https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Ruling_reflects_America%27s_ambivalence_on_guns&oldid=7819)"

---

**This page was last edited on June 27, 2008, at 15:45.**

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.