

5 Seconds Before The Carnage! Exciting Success ...

In September 2019, Reid Scott was expected to reprise his role as Weying's boyfriend Dan Lewis from the first film.[14] The character Shriek was also expected to appear as the film's secondary villain and a love interest for Carnage. Many different actresses were looked at for the part,[43] before Naomie Harris was cast in the role in mid-October.[11][12] Stephen Graham had also joined the film, as Detective Mulligan, by the end of the year.[9][12] Tolmach said there was a chance the sequel could be rated R following the success of the R-rated *Joker* (2019), as well as previous successful R-rated comic book films such as *Deadpool* (2016) and *Logan* (2017). However, Tolmach cautioned that the PG-13 rating of the first *Venom* had led to box office success and they would not be looking to change the franchise's tone simply because it had worked for others;[44] the sequel ultimately received a PG-13 rating.[45] Tolmach said the biggest lesson learned from the first *Venom* was that fans loved the relationship between Brock and Venom, and the sequel would focus more on the two characters together because of this.[46] Serkis described the relationship as the "central love affair" of the film, and explained that the sequence in the film where Venom goes to a rave and talks about the "cruel treatment of aliens" uses imagery reminiscent of LGBTQIA festivals because the sequence is intended to be Venom's "coming-out party".[18] Chinese production company Tencent Pictures co-financed the sequel after previously doing the same for the first film.[47] [Portion removed.] No one has suggested repealing the 2nd Amendment. The Framers never imagined assault weapons that can kill multitudes of people in seconds, they lived in the era of the musket.

Why would anyone need semi automatic assault weapons that are made for battlefield combat? Their capacity for mayhem and carnage is a direct threat to the survival of this society. One handgun per person is sufficient for protecting one's home. It satisfies the current interpretation of the right to bear arms and it doesn't constitute an unacceptable risk to the society at large. @ "NIR: Is Religious Right PC enough?" - No. Your attitude is part of the problem. How can compromise be reached when you feel that you have the moral high ground -- so much so that you can use slurs to describe a religious group (one that really doesn't have anything directly to do with this issue)? Would you appreciate it if people dealt with your views the same way that you deal with theirs?

I agree with Diana that mass shootings are an important issue. No one wants violent gun crimes or mass shootings to happen. In fact, the overwhelming majority of people who believe in their right to bear arms want to protect themselves and their families from such dangers. They understand that this is their Second Amendment right.

This is they the right can only be ultimately removed by constitutional amendment. Any other attempt is unconstitutional. If liberals were to temporarily stock every court in America with activist judges who interpret the Second Amendment to allow for such restrictions, most people understand that this is the result of fusing political and ideological views into their rulings. When the pendulum swings back, the conservative judges will overturn what they see as bad precedent or poor decisions.

Thus, the constitutional amendment is the only way that this can change. However, a blanket repeal or outright ban would not pass in 30-40 states. There would have to be some sort of compromise for that to happen to achieve enough support to pass a constitutional amendment of arms prohibition.

Thus, this is unlikely. Besides, I don't think that the solution is banning certain weapons. I think that the issue is keeping ALL weapons out of the hands of a select group of people. This would include those who have either forfeited their rights (e.g., felons, violent criminals, etc.), don't have the rights

to begin with (e.g., non-citizens, children, etc.) or should be restricted over mental health issues or individuals with mental development disabilities.

What would the rate of violent gun crime be in this nation if all felons, violent criminals, gang members, non-citizens, the mentally ill and those with mental developmental disorders were prohibited from owning or operating firearms?

I suspect that rates of gun crimes would be vastly lower. Yet, instead of focusing on this as a first step, gun-control activists focus on bans. We already know that the individuals who commit most gun crimes aren't giving up their guns -- even if bans became law.

The grand irony is that most "mass shootings" -- as terrible and, thankfully, few in number as they are -- are NOT committed with military-style assault rifles. We know that Second Amendment advocates (probably including virtually all NRA members) are among the most trustworthy with their ownership of arms anyway.

As for the founding fathers' intent: We can't inject 21st century sociopolitical and ethical views into their intentions. In fact, the founding fathers of the Continental Congress in 1777 commissioned Josephe Belton to build 100 Belton flintlock rapid fire guns -- more than a decade before the Bill of Rights (*and the Second Amendment) was written.

My point is that gun-control should first begin with restrictions from the people who actually commit the violent gun crimes in the first place. Once that is successful, we can consider other subsequent options. Otherwise, it will take a constitutional amendment for gun prohibition to allow the gun-control advocates to successfully have their way.

[CLICK HERE](#)

5 Seconds Before The Carnage! Exciting Success ...

21f597057a

