

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Jimmy Kimmel on Mass Shooting in Las Vegas \(Is he wrong?\)](#)

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 2:18 am

Hello HF.

I thought we could start a chat around this video, Jimmy Kimmel's speech.

I have seen multiple videos and read many many comments about people who don't agree with him. Apparently, there's people who disagree with his speech and especially when he points out the ban of firearms.

What are your thought HF on this matter?

My personal opinion is that I agree with him.

Should this continue to happen or should the american people take a stance and vote against this?

Here is the video if you haven't seen it.

Goods - October 6, 2017, 2:21 am

Banning firearms would literally only make things worse.

Idk why people dont understand that. Criminals are still going to acquire weapons regardless if there is a ban on them.

MeIT3d - October 6, 2017, 2:24 am

I do not support the ban on guns. The people who need to hunt for there food rely on weapons. As the first comment said, banning guns wouldn't do shit. It wouldn't make all the guns disappear. People will still get them illegally, just like drugs, no?

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 2:30 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:21 AM)Goods Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Banning firearms would literally only make things worse.

Idk why people dont understand that. Criminals are still going to acquire weapons regardless if there is a ban on them.

I understand your argument. People would definitely still be able to acquire them.

I happen to be from a country where firearms are banned and we've never had this happen? Same goes with a lot of other countries.

Like you said, we can't ever get away with people getting their hands on drugs/weapons illegally but I think banning it would make it harder and thus lowering the number of mass shooting events that will take place.

I don't know, just a thought.

(Oct 6, 2017 02:24 AM)MeIT3d Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I do not support the ban on guns. The people who need to hunt for there food rely on weapons. As the first comment said, banning guns wouldn't do shit. It wouldn't make all the guns disappear. People will still get them illegally, just like drugs, no? You're right. People will definitely get their hands on guns. But wouldn't banning them make it harder?

At least I think so.

test - October 6, 2017, 2:32 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:24 AM)MeIT3d Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I do not support the ban on guns. The people who need to hunt for there food rely on weapons. As the first comment said, banning guns wouldn't do shit. It wouldn't make all the guns disappear. People will still get them illegally, just like drugs, no?So we shouldn't have laws banning drugs because people are just going to get them illegally then?

A total ban is too far of a stretch consider their role in American history. It seems like society over there is so accustomed to guns being a part of everyday life that it would be nearly impossible to ban them entirely and be effective. I think there needs to be some form of stricter gun control though, especially in terms of full automatic weapons like assault rifles. No-one needs a weapon specifically designed to kill the fastest most efficient way possible in their homes. I understand people love guns. The people that do right and are passionate and careful about their guns and use them safely with them are fine but society moves as slow as its slowest person.

CheGuevara? - October 6, 2017, 2:48 am

If you are for gun control, then you are not against guns, because the guns will be needed to disarm people.

So it's not that you are anti-gun. You'll need the police's guns to take away other people's guns. So you're very Pro-Gun, you just believe that only the Government (which is, of course, so reliable, honest, moral and virtuous...) should be allowed to have guns.

There is no such thing as gun control.

There is only centralizing gun ownership in the hands of a small, political elite and their minions.

- Stefan Molyneux

FNF3TD - October 6, 2017, 3:02 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:48 AM)CheGuevara? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you are for gun control, then you are not against guns, because the guns will be needed to disarm people.

So it's not that you are anti-gun. You'll need the police's guns to take away other people's guns. So you're very Pro-Gun, you just believe that only the Government (which is, of course, so reliable, honest, moral and virtuous...) should be allowed to have guns.

There is no such thing as gun control.

There is only centralizing gun ownership in the hands of a small, political elite and their minions.

- Stefan Molyneux

This is really good Sir!!! Thank you for this though!!!

Sokar - October 6, 2017, 3:04 am

I'm afraid that it would impossible to take away peoples' guns in the first place as many people would only surrender their guns when they're dead.

agoraz - October 6, 2017, 3:05 am

Banning guns will not stop criminals DUH

R3gulate - October 6, 2017, 3:20 am

No matter what happens the wolves will always get their hands on weapons. Taking firearms from the sheepdogs just leaves wolves and sheep. Resulting in allot of dead sheep.

CheGuevara? - October 6, 2017, 3:46 am

(Oct 6, 2017 03:02 AM)FNF3TD Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) (Oct 6, 2017 02:48 AM)CheGuevara? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you are for gun control, then you are not against guns, because the guns will be needed to disarm people.

So it's not that you are anti-gun. You'll need the police's guns to take away other people's guns. So you're very Pro-Gun, you just believe that only the Government (which is, of course, so reliable, honest, moral and virtuous...) should be allowed to have guns.

There is no such thing as gun control.

There is only centralizing gun ownership in the hands of a small, political elite and their minions.

- Stefan Molyneux

This is really good Sir!!! Thank you for this though!!!

I agree! Have a great day! ?

FNF3TD - October 6, 2017, 3:48 am

(Oct 6, 2017 03:46 AM)CheGuevara? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I agree! Have a great day! ?

I was really half and half about this, but the concise explanation really cemented my thought on this one!

Neal Caffrey - October 6, 2017, 3:49 am

Anyone who says banning guns isn't the solution, find me a developed country that has banned guns and has a higher percentage of mass shootings per million people than America.

Hint: You can't, just admit your 'right to bear arms' has killed thousands of people from mass shootings and other gun related violence.

I'm down to have a debate about whether banning guns will result in less mass casualty shootings.

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 3:53 am

(Oct 6, 2017 03:49 AM)Neal Caffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Anyone who says banning guns isn't the solution, find me a developed country that has banned guns and has a higher percentage of mass shootings per million people than America.

Hint: You can't, just admit your 'right to bear arms' has killed thousands of people from mass shootings and other gun related violence.

I'm down to have a debate about whether banning guns will result in less mass casualty shootings.

This is pretty much my argument. My country has banned fire arms and we've never had a mass shooting. Too me it seems like it works banning it but I don't know.

Neal Caffrey - October 6, 2017, 3:57 am

(Oct 6, 2017 03:53 AM)Carrot. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is pretty much my argument. My country has banned fire arms and we've never had a mass shooting. Too me it seems like it works banning it but I don't know.

Australia had one mass shooting in a university or something back in the 1990's, which led to action being taken and guns banned.

Tbh another Las Vegas will happen, it's a statistical fact with the way gun laws are in America. The best chance you had was Sandy Hook, when innocent children were slaughtered, but people are too ignorant to see what's right in front of them.

?Screamo - October 6, 2017, 4:00 am

Banning doesn't work. Banning only creates a secondary market for guns, which always will be the case. Harder, stricter and more regulation might work instead.

DevSquad - October 6, 2017, 4:01 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:21 AM)Goods Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Banning firearms would literally only make things worse.

Idk why people dont understand that. Criminals are still going to acquire weapons regardless if there is a ban on them.

Holy fuck, are you retarded?

Typical dumbass response.

Why don't you take a look at other countries, or well CONTINENTS, where shootings like this do NOT occur because firearms are banned?!

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 4:01 am

(Oct 6, 2017 03:57 AM)Neal Caffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Australia had one mass shooting in a university or something back in the 1990's, which led to action being taken and guns banned.

Tbh another Las Vegas will happen, it's a statistical fact with the way gun laws are in America. The best chance you had was Sandy Hook, when innocent children were slaughtered, but people are too ignorant to see what's right in front of them.

I agree with you. Like he says in the video. This is a matter of public safety. It needs to be dealt with.

Reeces - October 6, 2017, 4:02 am

Everyone just assumes it won't help, but let me hit you with some facts.

Australia used to have legal firearms. They then had a mass shooting, and banned the use of firearms. They never had a mass shooting again. Simple.

Then, go and have a look at the amount of mass shooting in he last 20 years in America. I'm sure there are literally hundreds. The UK on the other hand have had one.

It will make things better. Don't assume it'll make things worse. If you can be arrested and out in jail for years for simply having one on you in the street, not even gang members would want to carry one around, you can simply get pulled over for a simple check and end up in jail for possessing a firearm.

Also, you'd no longer be able to purchase them anywhere as selling them would be illegal too and all legal online stores that sell firearms would also be shut down.

It might not completely rectify the situation but if you don't think that it'll at least make things better then I'm not sure what angle you're seeing this from.

Neal Caffrey - October 6, 2017, 4:04 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:00 AM)?Screamo Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Banning doesn't work. Banning only creates a secondary market for guns, which always will be the case. Harder, stricter and more regulation might work instead.

Well statistically you're wrong.

(Oct 6, 2017 04:01 AM)DevSquad Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Holy fuck, are you retarded?

Most gun lobbyists are retarded, and you'll just lose brain cells trying to argue with them.

Reeces - October 6, 2017, 4:05 am

Just to note, the UK police don't even carry firearms on them because there is this little risk of coming into contact with someone who has a gun. Certain officers have guns in a lock box in the trunk which takes a long time to access and they need permission to get them. Then they also have to call in other officers who are allowed to use weapons. That's how little chance there is of seeing someone with a weapon in other first world countries with firearms banned.

DevSquad - October 6, 2017, 4:06 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:04 AM) Neal Caffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well statistically you're wrong.

Most gun lobbyists are retarded, and you'll just lose brain cells trying to argue with them. Exactly.

I saw his post and my IQ immediately dropped. Luckily only temporarily or else I would be on the same level as the guy I responded to.

CheGuevara? - October 6, 2017, 4:14 am

I still believe this message says it all.

If you are for gun control, then you are not against guns, because the guns will be needed to disarm people.

So it's not that you are anti-gun. You'll need the police's guns to take away other people's guns. So you're very Pro-Gun, you just believe that only the Government (which is, of course, so reliable, honest, moral and virtuous...) should be allowed to have guns.

There is no such thing as gun control.

There is only centralizing gun ownership in the hands of a small, political elite and their minions.

- Stefan Molyneux

OP any thoughts on this?

Also, if someone wanted to do a mass shooting, do you think he would stop because firearms are illegal?

"Oh no, I can't go kill people, because guns are illegal."

Outlaw guns and only outlaws will have guns.

P.S - I'm in a country where guns are illegal, if you don't get a license and whatnot but the rules are VERY strict.

However I can make a phone call and I'll have whatever I want. And I believe it would be even easier in the US.

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 4:17 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:02 AM) Reeces Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Everyone just assumes it won't help, but let me hit you with some facts.

Australia used to have legal firearms. They then had a mass shooting, and banned the use of firearms. They never had a mass shooting again. Simple.

Then, go and have a look at the amount of mass shooting in the last 20 years in America. I'm sure there are literally hundreds. The UK on the other hand have had one.

It will make things better. Don't assume it'll make things worse. If you can be arrested and out in jail

for years for simply having one on you in the street, not even gang members would want to carry one around, you can simply get pulled over for a simple check and end up in jail for possessing a firearm.

Also, you'd no longer be able to purchase them anywhere as selling them would be illegal too and all legal online stores that sell firearms would also be shut down.

It might not completely rectify the situation but if you don't think that it'll at least make things better then I'm not sure what angle you're seeing this from.

Exactly. This is my point. Well written. I 100% believe it'll make things better.

Neal Caffrey - October 6, 2017, 4:18 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:14 AM)CheGuevara? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Also, if someone wanted to do a mass shooting, do you think he would stop because firearms are illegal?

"Oh no, I can't go kill people, because guns are illegal."

Outlaw guns and only outlaws will have guns.

If we have 200 million people in a country, with 1% (2 million) people who are prone to executing mass shootings, and there are gun controls that allow 90% of people to have guns, that will be 1.8million people who have both a inclination to commit mass shootings and access to guns.

If there were tighter gun regulations that only allowed 20% of people to obtain guns (still disgustingly high), that number would drop to 400,000 people. Hence, stricter gun controls will deter lone wolfs like the Vegas shooter from committing attacks like the one he did.

Tell me where my logic is flawed with this.

Description - October 6, 2017, 4:23 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:01 AM)DevSquad Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Holy fuck, are you retarded?

Typical dumbass response.

Why don't you take a look at other countries, or well CONTINENTS, where shootings like this do NOT occur because firearms are banned?!

I don't know where you live but it won't go well if they tried taking our guns

CheGuevara? - October 6, 2017, 4:23 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:18 AM)Neal Caffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If we have 200 million people in a country, with 1% (2 million) people who are prone to executing mass shootings, and there are gun controls that allow 90% of people to have guns, that will be 1.8million people who have both a inclination to commit mass shootings and access to guns.

If there were tighter gun regulations that only allowed 20% of people to obtain guns (still disgustingly high), that number would drop to 400,000 people. Hence, stricter gun controls will deter lone wolfs like the Vegas shooter from committing attacks like the one he did.

Tell me where my logic is flawed with this.

If one wants to do a mass shooting, so he will. No matter the rules.

And these mass shootings happening are not randomly done by wicked sick individuals, they have been brainwashed, it's happening for a reason.

The reasons are many, to name a few: to make you all give up your freedom. To put fear in you, to accept the upcoming laws, just another step towards a police state.

Just my thoughts, not saying that's the way it is.

But that's how it works, you believe it was a lone wolf who was sick, I don't.
Anyways whatever happens, I hope for the best for you and your family and everyone in the US. I want all to be safe and happy.
But things are changing, things are coming. Keep your heads up, stay safe & enjoy life.

Neal Caffrey - October 6, 2017, 4:24 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:23 AM)Description Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't know where you live but it won't go well if they tried taking our guns
I guess that's why you have Trump as a president. ?

(Oct 6, 2017 04:23 AM)CheGuevara? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If one wants to do a mass shooting, so he will. No matter the rules.
And these mass shootings happening are not randomly done by wicked sick individuals, they have been brainwashed, it's happening for a reason.
The reasons are many, to name a few: to make you all give up your freedom. To put fear in you, to accept the upcoming laws, just another step towards a police state.
Just my thoughts, not saying that's the way it is.

But that's how it works, you believe it was a lone wolf who was sick, I don't.
Anyways whatever happens, I hope for the best for you and your family and everyone in the US. I want all to be safe and happy.
But things are changing, things are coming. Keep your heads up, stay safe & enjoy life.
This is not a discussion of rules, this is a purely statistical interpretation. Tell me why America has such a high level of mass shootings relative to all the other developed countries that have banned guns? To say that banning guns won't decrease gun violence is a gross injustice to everyone who has been killed in gun-related violence in America.

I'm not in America, I don't need to fear being shot when I go to large events because statistically, it's highly improbable.

Deany - October 6, 2017, 4:27 am

Here's why it will always be flawed...

Remove guns from citizens = more kills for actual bad guys/criminals

One citizen happens to be strapped and kills the bad guy saving the day and ending up saving lots more

It's basically a double-edged sword. No one is allowed to win.

Neal Caffrey - October 6, 2017, 4:28 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:27 AM)Japanese Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Here's why it will always be flawed...

Remove guns from citizens = more kills for actual bad guys/criminals

One citizen happens to be strapped and kills the bad guy saving the day and ending up saving lots more

It's basically a double-edged sword. No one is allowed to win.
you are forgetting that they will just drop a nuke and kill everyone, and the guns, in the process ?

Deany - October 6, 2017, 4:29 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:28 AM)Neal Caffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) you are forgetting that they will just drop a nuke

and kill everyone, and the guns, in the process ?

We would all be better off if humanity didn't exist you're right about that

Korvo - October 6, 2017, 4:34 am

I personally think that banning firearms would either make shit a lot worse, or it would do nothing. Criminals or people who want to have guns to defend themselves aren't going to stop getting them just because the law says they are illegal. Look at pot for example, people love it & need it, others think it's a horrible gateway drug and it's illegal in pretty much the entire US, but yet people still get it all the time.

People will do as they please, those who aren't the mindless sheep. I mean I think most of these mass shootings are just events to try and scare people into supporting gun bans and new laws.

Another thing I wanted to mention, look at all these school shootings such as Sandy Hook, Columbine...Had there been ARMED security guards at those schools, they're most likely wouldn't have been as many casualties.

You don't fight people who have weapons with pillows & kind words, you fight back with what they have..You defend yourself with guns. I just think it's silly that trying to make them illegal will accomplish anything, it will just make everyone defenseless.

And these are just my opinions..I don't think I'm right or wrong.

YERANUK - October 6, 2017, 4:41 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:21 AM)Goods Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Banning firearms would literally only make things worse.

Idk why people don't understand that. Criminals are still going to acquire weapons regardless if there is a ban on them.

In what way would things be worse? You do realize that even the Mexican cartels get their guns from the US market right? It's literally Billy Joe supplying the guns to real criminals.

Now, of course guns are ubiquitous, and all the Mikes and Bills who have them will still be able to sell them discreetly, so it won't really help much, but they will now actually be criminals instead of private citizens doing private trades.

We can't stop crime yes, but we can mitigate it, and make civilians hesitate.

I don't want to impose any retroactive gun laws, but I hate how people don't understand the way the black market is actually just Bills and Joes buying guns legally and selling them discreetly.

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 6:03 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:18 AM)Neal Caffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If we have 200 million people in a country, with 1% (2 million) people who are prone to executing mass shootings, and there are gun controls that allow 90% of people to have guns, that will be 1.8million people who have both a inclination to commit mass shootings and access to guns.

If there were tighter gun regulations that only allowed 20% of people to obtain guns (still disgustingly high), that number would drop to 400,000 people. Hence, stricter gun controls will deter lone wolves like the Vegas shooter from committing attacks like the one he did.

Tell me where my logic is flawed with this.

You are right. These are facts and you simply can't argue against facts.

LastSession - October 6, 2017, 6:06 am

Just fyi, Kimmel is a hypocrite and not actually crying, he is nervous because he doesn't want to laugh and that explains his shivering voice

SORRIE - October 6, 2017, 6:08 am

(Oct 6, 2017 06:03 AM)Carrot. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You are right. These are facts and you simply can't argue against facts.

It's not facts at all, it's a hypothetical situation that ignores an excessive amount of information regarding firearms.

La Quica - October 6, 2017, 6:21 am

I don't support a ban on guns. If police can carry guns, then we should be allowed as well, if not - we're handing all our powers over to them!

Either way, just like they banned drugs, doesn't make anything but a negative difference as people will have no other ways than to get included in illegal / bad societies to acquire them..

King of Clubs - October 6, 2017, 7:00 am

(Oct 6, 2017 06:08 AM)?Sorry Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's not facts at all, it's a hypothetical situation that ignores an excessive amount of information regarding firearms.

It's facts in the sense that, that is what happens when you ban firearms. Like users have mentioned previously, just look at every other country who have firearms banned. No mass shooting, ever.

Yeah. The numbers in the post might not be 100% exact fact but the concept is there and the concept is the point of the post.

CyberStrike - October 6, 2017, 7:09 am

3:24 semi auto/full auto is not something you use in self defense? I dunno but in a gun fight you want to use suppression fire to advance on an target. In a self defense situation if I could call air strikes I would!

Banning guns would do two things:

1. Criminals will own all the guns because it is illegal. Taking/confiscation of guns will be that start of a totalitarian govt. Initially the Federal Govt didn't have an army it was the states who had their own respective militias. Hitler took guns away from the average German, or a German who was Jewish

Quote:"German citizens were disarmed by their government in the late 1930s," which allowed the Nazis to "carry out their evil intentions with relatively little resistance."

— Ben Carson on Friday, October 9th, 2015 in his book "A More Perfect Union"

Fact-checking Ben Carson's claim that gun control laws allowed the Nazis to carry out Holocaust

By Jon Greenberg on Monday, October 26th, 2015 at 12:39 p.m.

Republican presidential candidate Ben Carson discussed his thoughts about Nazi era gun policies during a National Press Club speech. (Screengrab)

A member of the Sturmabteilung guards Communists arrested in Berlin following a key parliamentary Nazi victory March 5, 1933. (German Federal Archives via Wikicommons)

Republican Ben Carson has been criticized for suggesting that gun control enabled the rise of the Nazis and led to the extermination of 6 million Jews during the Holocaust.

But does he have a point?

In his book, *A More Perfect Union*, Carson wrote that "German citizens were disarmed by their government in the late 1930s, and by the mid-1940s Hitler's regime had mercilessly slaughtered six million Jews and numerous others whom they considered inferior.

"Through a combination of removing guns and disseminating deceitful propaganda, the Nazis were able to carry out their evil intentions with relatively little resistance," he wrote.

Carson reiterated that argument at least twice -- in an Oct. 8, 2015, interview with CNN host Wolf Blitzer, and then again in a speech at the National Press Club.

"You know, mid- to late-30s, they started a program to disarm the people and by mid- to late 40's, look what had happened," he said at the Press Club.

PolitiFact decided to analyze Carson's claim on its Truth-O-Meter.

German gun laws

As the Nazi Party rose to power in Germany, it inherited a 1928 gun registration law that had replaced a total ban on gun ownership imposed on a defeated Germany after World War I. The 1928 law created a permit system to own and sell firearms and ammunition.

"But this order was followed quite rarely, so that largely, only newly bought weapons became registered," said Dagmar Ellerbrock, an expert on German gun policies at the Dresden Technical University. "At that time, most men, and many women, still owned the weapons they acquired before or during the first World War."

When they came to power, the Nazis used whatever gun records they had to seize weapons from their enemies, but Ellerbrock told us the files included very few of the firearms in circulation.

It goes on to say that later Germany allowed some Germans to own guns easier, but still the fact that this is what can happen is a warning.

2. A foreign or domestic enemy now no longer will place the average citizen as a possible combatant if America was ever invaded. You know I can recall reading *The Prince* by Machiavelli he implies that an armed populous is more apt to take up arms against an invader. Honestly if someone invaded the USA and all I had was a rock, a stick, bare hands well I guess we are fighting then.

I don't own guns, I did but gave that up but I hate the idea that we trample upon the rights of others in a whim of emotion.

Edit: This is a fact check of Carson on his remarks about Hitler taking away guns, what I was interested in was showing that guns were taken away from Germans by their government at the time.

oRequiem - October 6, 2017, 7:14 am

Well this shouldn't even have to do with banning guns anyways.

Didn't the shooter have guns that weren't even legal? I feel like it would just make it worse to ban

guns, every criminal will find ways to get them no matter what.

Cloudy - October 6, 2017, 7:20 am

so do you remember the 70s when they banned a lot of drugs? look at how that turned out.

oh also to add to this, he's telling me I can't own 10 of the things I like because they're dangerous. I guess he can't own 10 of the cars he does because they're dangerous too. It's a free county and I'll own anything I want so long as I legally can. Doesn't matter if there is no reason, there doesn't have to be one.

Lauren Southern - October 6, 2017, 7:28 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:30 AM)Carrot. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I understand your argument. People would definitely still be able to acquire them.

I happen to be from a country where firearms are banned and we've never had this happen? Same goes with a lot of other countries.

Like you said, we can't ever get away with people getting their hands on drugs/weapons illegally but I think banning it would make it harder and thus lowering the number of mass shooting events that will take place.

I don't know, just a thought.

You're right. People will definitely get their hands on guns. But wouldn't banning them make it harder?

At least I think so.

But what you're failing to understand is, America has more guns per person than anywhere in the world. If you ban guns, you think people are going to give their guns up? Nope.

SORRIE - October 6, 2017, 7:29 am

(Oct 6, 2017 07:00 AM)Carrot. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's facts in the sense that, that is what happens when you ban firearms. Like users have mentioned previously, just look at every other country who have firearms banned. No mass shooting, ever.

Yeah. The numbers in the post might not be 100% exact fact but the concept is there and the concept is the point of the post.

That only works in countries that don't have a crazy amount of firearms already. There are more guns in America than people, and a very large percentage of them are illegal and unregistered. You will ALWAYS be able to get a gun in the US if you want one banned or not. Taking them out of shops and making it harder for normal people to acquire them will do nothing for the general safety of the American people except be a negative. That man that did this shooting, had a very decent amount of money and he would have gotten guns either way no problem at all.

Wings of Redemption - October 6, 2017, 7:29 am

I can understand why he was so emotional about this. Vegas is his hometown and when something this drastic happens in your hometown, it gets to you

oRequiem - October 6, 2017, 7:31 am

(Oct 6, 2017 07:29 AM)?Sorry Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That only works in countries that don't have a crazy amount of firearms already. There are more guns in America than people, and a very large percentage of them are illegal and unregistered. You will ALWAYS be able to get a gun in the US if

you want one banned or not. Taking them out of shops and making it harder for normal people to acquire them will do nothing for the general safety of the American people except be a negative. That man that did this shooting, had a very decent amount of money and he would have gotten guns either way no problem at all.

He was a multi-millionaire though right? He spent \$100,000 for all of the weapons he had with him.

vercenta - October 6, 2017, 7:31 am

Wth is he a robot programmed to say this?

SORRIE - October 6, 2017, 7:37 am

(Oct 6, 2017 07:31 AM)oRequiem Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He was a multi-millionaire though right? He spent \$100,000 for all of the weapons he had with him.

I'm not sure how much money he had but I know he was well off. Are you agreeing with me or disagreeing?

TexT24 - October 6, 2017, 7:54 am

(Oct 6, 2017 02:48 AM)CheGuevara? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you are for gun control, then you are not against guns, because the guns will be needed to disarm people.

So it's not that you are anti-gun. You'll need the police's guns to take away other people's guns. So you're very Pro-Gun, you just believe that only the Government (which is, of course, so reliable, honest, moral and virtuous...) should be allowed to have guns.

There is no such thing as gun control.

There is only centralizing gun ownership in the hands of a small, political elite and their minions.

- Stefan Molyneux

Quite possibly the most idiotic and unintelligent response in this thread. I'm not even going to reason with you, because seeing this and the theories you posted about the shooting, it's definitely not worth my time.

Anyway, I don't think people are calling for a ban on guns. Nobody is sitting here saying guns should be banned except for government officials. Obviously hunting is a thing and something they would have a hard time outlawing. The issue is that there needs to be gun CONTROL. You hear those two words put together a lot, but do you ever realize the meaning behind it? Does "gun CONTROL" sound like "gun BAN?" Not even slightly.

We need to control who is getting guns and where they are getting them from. The use of weaponry needs to be limited to certain areas, the extent of what type of guns needs to be limited (we don't need automatics for hunting or "self-defense"), and we need to limit guns to people who are actually good citizens. Background checks are a huge mess, and the current system will continue to allow people like Paddock access guns easily. Loopholes exist in wide bunches, and without adding more gun CONTROL, we can continue to get used to the fact that mass shootings will continue to happen at any time and any place far more often than other countries.

SawCyanic - October 6, 2017, 8:06 am

Jimmy Kimmel is a cuck and is using emotion to push an agenda.

Nayborhood - October 6, 2017, 8:06 am

(Oct 6, 2017 04:05 AM)Reeces Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Justvto note, the UK police don't even carry firearms on them because there is thstvkittle risk of coming into contact with someone who has a gun. Certain officers have guns in a lock box in the trunk which takes a long time to access and they need permission to get them. Then hey also have to call in other officers who are allowed to use weapons. That's how little chance there is of seeing someone with a weapon in other first world countries with firearms banned.This is such a lie, there are many many guns in UK especially in

London and trident catches people with guns weekly

CheGuevara? - *October 6, 2017, 8:20 am*

(Oct 6, 2017 08:06 AM)Republique Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Jimmy Kimmel is a cuck and is using emotion to push an agenda.

Exactly, he and most of the "known comedians" follows the agenda, pushing the same scripts on television. It's hilarious but sad.

The_Salesman - *October 6, 2017, 9:16 am*

It's in my opinion that guns are not the real issue, the US has a military budget over \$600,000,000,000 (SIX-HUNDRED BILLION), and there is no chance we as a country would agree to a scenario where we have nothing in terms of firearms, and the government has armed drones, nukes, M16s, and the money to invent new weapons. Maybe, we could agree that the use of guns is what needs to be addressed. Back when we banned armor piercing bullets for handguns, there were still plenty of people that had them, and like CheGuevara said, you will need the police's weapons to take away the people's weapons. Even then, there will be people with guns and AP rounds!

I watched the whole video, and I cannot believe that they are working to pass the use of silencers. Anyone know more about that?

Loses - *October 6, 2017, 9:19 am*

Banning guns will only prevent good people from protecting themselves.

Neal Caffrey - *October 6, 2017, 2:47 pm*

The amount of ignorance and stupidity ere makes me wish guns were legal here so I could shoot myself and 4 local schools, but alas they are not.