Gun Control Essay, Research Paper

In addressing new laws of gun control, one has to look at both sides of the argument. How will new guns laws affect violence in schools and on the streets? How do loyal, law-abiding gun owners feel about these new laws. These news laws are set as all sales of firearms must be registered, all purchasers must be licensed, and no individual may purchase more than one gun per month. There will always be arguments on both sides on such controversial laws like these. Pros and Cons can be thrown about every which way from decreasing school violence, to breaking the law of the second amendment. It can be easy to take sides, but one must look to both sides’ arguments before reasoning.

The gun control issue has really blown up since the Columbine High School Shooting incident. This incident has sparked a nationwide debate fueled by Sarah Brady and Bill Clinton to enforce newer gun control laws, and keep these weapons out of the hands of the wrong people (such as juveniles). One way to help keep guns out of the wrong hands is just simply not to make them available to young people. A new CAP law has been set in 16 states already, where the accidental shooting death rate has dropped by 23%. This CAP law in states all handguns to have trigger locks, and for penalties to be set for adults selling guns to juveniles. US shooting deaths are higher now than all of the other 25 industrialized countries combines, the Clinton administration is trying to crack down on this unfortunate face by enacting this CAP law along with others.

Another law of limiting one purchase of a gun per month by the California Assembly by Wally Knox in Los Angeles. The Senate is still expected to approve on upon this law. The purpose of this is to halt the people who buy large amounts of guns, and then go and sell them on the black market. These black market sales flood the streets of everywhere from Maine to Washington, these black market sales also contribute to getting guns into the wrong hands. Three other states have already enacted this law including Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina. A study shown has proved that Virginia’s transferring of firearms was more than cut in half.

The Brady Bill is another strong argument for the Pro – side. This law requires a five – day waiting period for cooling off for purchasing a gun. This law has already expired though, but President Clinton is reimbursing the law by issuing a minimum three day wait period before purchasing a handgun. This law is a prevention for adults who were convicted of serious crimes from ever possessing guns again. It does this by giving the police force two extra days to check records and backgrounds of criminals. The NICS does not have all records available, but this two day extension gives police more time to do checkups. Without such a waiting period, police would have no time to do background checks giving criminals much easier access to guns and easier ways to kill. Gun buyers contemplating heinous crimes or suicide would no longer have time to “cool off” and think over about protecting themselves and future victims if not for this law.

In light of the Columbine incident, gun control was already in full swing, nothing could have probably been done from letting those kids from acquiring guns. If Clinton and Brady just want to continue and enforce this gun control, what will stop guns from still getting into the wrong hands though. Guns have really gotten a bad profile from the criminals using them unlawfully, unlike the true law – abiding gun carriers and owners in the US. Is does not seem fair to limit the sales of guns when the second amendment allows the right to bear arms. Gun control may actually be backfiring, and taking more lives in public schools than they are saving. Juveniles bearing arms in school would be scared to death if teachers and principals could conceal guns in a briefcase or purse. These new ban laws founded are only worsening the problem by having juveniles easily conceal weapons. An assistant principal in Mississippi in 1997 saved the lives of numerous students by opening fire on a rampant gunman who had already killed two students. This man was a hero and was forced to go out of bounds on the law just to save the lives of his students. What if a situation like this had taken place in Columbine? The two students would most likely have been dealt with by a teacher with a gun before going on their rampage, and it’s likely not that many people would have been killed or hospitalized in Columbine had a teacher carried a gun for necessary means like these.

These new issued laws bring about much controversy. The only people who will follow these laws are the ones that bring about no threat any ways. A solution to this problem is not to abuse the rights and privileges of the seven million lawful gun owners, but to punish the criminals. If guns were ever to be outlawed, only outlaws would carry them. Criminals are the main problem, and have to be dealt with accordingly. US criminals are only serving half of their sentences, and being freed due to not enough space. More than half of these criminals freed will go out and commit more violent crimes. Perhaps the only solution for not enough space is more lethal injections. Law following Americans must have the right to bear arms for defense and protection, as stated by the Second Amendment. This is a right, and cannot be taken away, an NRA spokesman even states the Second Amendment is all about defense.

Limiting the sales of firearms and trying to ban them is not even a half decent solution to decrease murder rates. The non – gun murder rate is higher than the entire murder rate of gun – controlled countries of Japan and Canada. Guns are not even as a big of a murder weapon as society thinks. Knives, fists, bats, and etc. are the top killers for most homicides. Guns are falsely criticized by people who do not even look to the facts and stats, if guns were to be entirely banned, people would still be killed in one way or another. Will the government make control laws on everything else that has potential to harm or kill some one? Murders will always occur in America no matter what the scenario. Murder has taken place since before people could actually conceive what was actually even occurring, it is an unfortunate way of human nature, and banishing guns is not a way to stop it.

In reaction to arguments of both sides, it becomes a little harder to decide which arguments is right. In my opinion, I take the side of the US not having gun control laws. The Second Amendment on the Constitution proclaims, “A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.” This amendment has existed since 1791 with gun control hanging around just as long. The NRA is an advocate of the Second Amendment, and will willfully oppose anyone who wants to create regulations on guns. Presidents such as Bush and Reagan were NRA members, so this proves good people can own guns too. I feel people feel a need to own handguns for a reason of heritage. For as long as this guns have been around, people have felt a need to defend themselves and hunt for food. Buying, owning and having a gun does not hurt anyone in any way. It is until a person commits a crime, this criminal is free to choose what they want to do with a gun. Even if guns were banned, criminals would still manage to acquire guns off the black market. Criminals would have their own way, and there is nothing anyone could do about it. Gun control appears to be an unconstitutional regulation and limiting of guns to keep crime rates down in America. Some gun control laws are reasonable, but not the extent as they were intended. The Brady Law is a bit unlogical, it only makes the lawmaking bodies and those who are to naive to see the truth fell better. The Brady Law does not keep guns out of the hands of criminals, they can get their guns illegally in many ways and never even get seized. So how can the Brady law stop criminal activities? Gun control has been around for many years, and none of these laws have helped decrease crime rates drastically.
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