

The United States is one of the most dangerous places on the planet when it comes to murder. Firearms are involved in more than 10,000 murders in the US every year. Firearms kill more than 3 people an hour in this country. There is over 250,000,000 guns with one being made every ten seconds. When all you do is list these numbers it's no wonder people want strict gun control. Although firearms attribute to most murders in the United States, strict gun control will not stop or help reduce homicides by gun.

People who want stricter gun control often bring up that guns at home are more likely to cause an accident than shoot an intruder, having no attainable guns would make the society safer, and holding a concealed carry would make someone more likely to use it without good cause. It's true that self-defence weapons in the home are 43 times more likely to shoot a loved one or a family member than an intruder. (New England Journal of Medicine). As well as having a society with no attainable firearms would cause less people to be inclined to attempt mass murder like the two students in Columbine, or the two Beltway snipers in Washington D.C., or Larry Phillips and Emil Mățăsăreanu in the North Hollywood shootout. It's also true that people carrying a concealed carry would make him/her more inclined to use the weapon without real reason like Michael Dunn from Florida firing eight rounds into a van full of teens playing their stereo loudly simply because he thought he saw a shotgun being pointed at him. *Eight* rounds into the van killing one-- and the teens didn't even have a weapon. Despite all of these points none of them are a valid reason to increase gun control. It's simply not the right decision.

The New England Journal of Medicine's study on self-defence weapons is true, but what the study doesn't count for is how many intruders the weapon wards off. Not knowing which house is carrying is a large deterrent of would-be intruders. There are "gun-free" areas in the United States, one of which is a school named Columbine. Laws in the state disallow selling and obtaining firearms as well. All the gun control laws did is increase the difficulty of obtaining a firearm for law-abiding citizens. It didn't keep the two students of Columbine from getting firearms, and it certainly won't keep others from doing so either. A survivor of a gun massacre had both of her parents killed in one of these "gun-free" zones in Texas. She seems as if she'd want more gun laws, but that would be wrong. She believes "I'm not a victim of guns, but of lawmakers who 'legislated me out of the right to protect myself and my family'". While entering the gun-free zone she decided to leave her concealed carry inside of her car. In which she was in dire need of when a man with a firearm began methodically executing everyone within the restaurant. Restricting people of guns is restricting them of their right to protect themselves. Placing laws to restrict guns won't keep law-breakers from using guns! <Find reasons to deflect last argument>