

Free gun control debate term paper example

[Education](#), [Discipline](#)



The idea of gun ownership in America might be said to originate to the second amendment of the United States constitution. The second amendment reads that “ a well regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free state, and the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed”. The argument here is that while the people have a right to bear arms, the state also has a right for regulation. Unlawful uses of guns, psychos that go on shooting sprees with licensed guns, and hunters that use the gun for the sake of it, are clearly breaching what the constitution clearly outlines in the second amendment. Without regulation, gun ownership secedes into the argument of masculinity as sociologist would put it. The premise of this belief is on the idea of supremacy. An ideal man has to be in charge of other men and other women, As such a man has to exercise control over other men by manipulating them, beating them up and humiliating them. The supremacy of men over other men and women is best demonstrated in the classic American Western movies. The hero is the man who beat up the bad guy with his gun or physical prowess. This man is also a darling of many women. Without regulations, gun ownership could easily come down to this understanding.

Advocates of gun control make the argument that unregulated buying and selling of guns increase gun crimes. The anti- gun group offer scathing attacks to the National Rifle Association use loopholes found in the United States law to allow gun lovers to purchase guns at will. However, the anti gun advocates reason that forty-percent of all gun sales occur at gun shows, internet or through informal sales. Under such circumstances, gun buyers are not subjected to stringent background checks. Most of the gun control

activities evoke the rampant shootings that have occurred in the United States particularly the Colorado shootings, the Arizona shootings and others (David, 2007).

Hepburn et al (2004) argued on the article US Gun-Stock: Results from 2004 National Firearms Survey that based on analysis of about 2750 households adults in the United States, 38 percent of which 45 percent were males and 11 percent were females, reported a owning atleast one firearm. Amongst the gun owners, 48 percent own more than four guns, 64 percent of the gun owners have at least one hand gun. Because of this report, it was understood that gun ownership in the United States is pervasive and is increasing every year. As such, allowing the masses to make decisions based on the information from the media is for the most part, a step in the wrong direction.

Research conducted by Hemenway, Solnick & Deborah (1995) Firearms and Community Feeling of Safety, argued that data from national random digit surveys that were conducted courtesy of HICRC argued Americans would feel less safe if members of the community increasingly acquire guns. Most women would feel less safe if they have a history of violence, particularly if a gun was used. Americans in the range of 3 to 1 feel less safe, according to this study with increasing gun ownership. Using epidemiological theory, the gun survey shows an increasing trend where there is a "false positive" that heightens the use of guns for self defense. Particularly prevalent, is the perception that events of gun usage for robbery, homicide, or events of that nature are commonplace and that the use of guns for self-defense thus becomes mandatory. However, research shows that such explanation is null

and void as the argument on self defense is both illogical and exploits the premise of bandwagon effect. Data conducted by the national random digital-dial surveys conducted by the Harvard Injury Control Research Center indicated that judges from criminal cases who read self reported self defense cases rated majority of the cases as illegal because they assumed that the respondent had a permit to own a gun and the action was the event was reported honestly from the perspective of the user.

The opponents of gun control in the United States argue on the basis of individualistic tradition of the United States as well as the nation's political philosophy. According to this principle, the individual has a right for protection of his belief, values and property. The primary right of the individual is at the center of the reluctance of the United States to completely argue for regulation. In recent years, mass shootings in Colorado, Boston, Arizona, St. Louis as well as other cities has regenerated the debate on gun control. Grass root organizations, civil right activists are putting increasing pressure on the need for more regulation. Although the issue of gun control is predominantly policy oriented, both democrats and Republicans have used the gun control debate as publicity stints to win elections. According to the center for responsive politics, opponents of gun control contributed more than \$43 million between the years 1999-2000 (Valdez, 2009).

According to existing laws, the United States federal government attempt to reduce gun violence by restricting civilians from owning certain high risk military weapons and semi-automatic rifles. Similarly, certain groups are prohibited from owning guns such. These groups include felons, children, and

humans and individuals with mental problems. The law also requires intensive background checks on people that own firearms. Advocates of gun control posit that the debate on gun control will be saved if the government makes it super difficult for people to own guns. They also argue for waiting periods on gun purchases for the function of background checks, and psychological tests. The advocate's presents statistics that demonstrate the increasing number of people dying from gun related violence.

Work Cited

Hepburn, Lisa; Miller, Matthew; Azrael, Deborah; Hemenway, David. The US gun stock: Results from the 2004 national firearms survey. *Injury Prevention*. 2007 13: 15-19.

Hemenway, David; Solnick, Sara J; Azrael, Deborah R. Firearms and community feelings of safety. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 1995; 86: 121-132.

Trend David. *The Myth of Media Violence: A Critical Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007. Print.