

Argumentative essay on restriction on gun ownership paper

[Law](#), [Criminal Justice](#)



When any individual is asked which weapon is the most lethal of all, then most people would automatically say the gun is the most lethal. The gun indeed is one of the most lethal weapons around. A single bullet aimed at any lethal organ may lead to severe damages to the victim. In some cases this bullet may even lead to death. This implies that it comes with a lot of pain (Gregg, 2012).

The sight of an individual carrying a gun is thus more horrific than it is pleasurable. It is common for state defense personnel, for instance the army, navy or airforce or even the police service to carry and walk around with a gun. However for a civilian to carry a gun sends a lot of messages to those around (Johnson, 2002).

Gun ownership by the citizens has become a great debate in many states. Some states have agreed to authorize the ownership of the gun by individuals, however most of the countries have desisted to this idea, unless in very compromising situations. The United States however, believes that gun ownership is a fundamental right to any citizen. Most citizens now feel that they can therefore own any weapon that they wish to possess. (Spitzer, 2009).

It should be known however that not all guns are at the disposal of the citizens for ownership. There are many reasons why some people tend to agree with the need to own a gun. A majority of these people claim that it is for self-defense (Fisanick, C. 2010).

This is to say that the gun may be used in case an individual; has been attacked by a wrong doer. Some also claim that they own guns and walk around with them just to keep the attackers at bay. This implies the goons

tend to be afraid of those who have guns as their source of protection. This is because they may easily lose their lives in case the victim gets a chance to shoot at them. However, there is also a unique group of people who do not wish to be left behind (. Mantel, B. 2013)

They include those people who possess guns for prestige purposes. They have the opinion that in case they have a gun then it sends a message to the whole world that they have some wealth worth protecting. This, they feel makes the world realize they are wealthy. (Fisanick, C. 2010)

The U. s citizens also possess guns because it is part of their history and culture. Their parents and forefathers used to keep the guns with them in the houses, some of them inherited these guns from their parents. They thus do not wish to stop this culture and therefore are forced to own guns (Gregg, 2012).

There are also a group of people who own guns just for leisure. This is because they use it for hunting. Hunting has been a sport carried out in some places in the U. S and thus in such areas, a majority of people would wish to own guns. As a sport, guns could also be used to play shooting games, where friends would come together and prove their prowess to one another testing their accuracy as a way of passing time. Denying such people a chance to own a gun would imply denying someone a right to his leisure (Johnson, 2002).

We cannot nullify these reasons as vague since they make a lot of sense, however we have to acknowledge the fact that ownership of guns have a lot of consequences too that may be detrimental to an individual and to his or her environment.(Fisanick, C. 2010)

Gun ownership is a core aspect of the right to always have a self defense. Every citizen has a right to protect his family at home more so when the police are rendered incapable in dealing with the threats of attack. These people could be burglars or rapist or even just thieves. Gun ownership also improves the national security. This, however, is debatable (Mantel, B. 2013)

As much as gun ownership is every citizen's constitutional right, there should be set a restriction limit for a section of people due to some reasons. The government needs to set these limitations in order to help enforce law and order and also to enhance the protection of the citizens from malice. Some of the reasons are illustrated below (Johnson, 2002).

First and foremost, restrictions should be given to all those who have been adjudged to be legally incapacitated both within and without the state. There are high chances that an insane man would recklessly use his gun in an uncouth way. He will shoot it at any one he feels like without consideration of any manner. This therefore explains why incapacitated and insane citizens should not have access to guns because they may be a threat to the safety of the other citizens (Gregg, 2012).

Likewise, restrictions should be made on any individual who is under an order of uncontrolled obligation in an inpatient or outpatient health facility because of mental illnesses. This is because, this condition may cause them to misuse the gun without conscience thereby causing harm to all those who are around him. This is thus a perfect example of a group of people that should be restricted to ownership of guns(Mantel, B. 2013)).

Subsequently, there are issues with those who have criminal records. It is

believed that once a criminal, always a criminal and it would be so easy for the criminal to repeat the offence he just did. Therefore, those who are having criminal charges pending on them should be restricted in the ownership of a gun (Johnson, 2002).

For instance, when someone is charged with domestic abuse, he should be restricted to the ownership of a gun. This is because there are high chances he could use this gun as a weapon to abuse the partner or child. He may drain all his anger for whatever reason by use of the gun to his victim thereby posing a threat both to the family and even to himself (Gregg, 2012).

Correspondingly, those who are charged with assault and battery need to be restricted in the ownership of the guns. This is because the fear instilled by the presence of a gun may make their targets more prone to assault and battery thereby being a potential threat to the citizens. (Spitzer, 2009).

Another group of people who need to be restricted from owning a gun are those that are facing charges on felony drug distribution. This is because they will tend to use the guns in an unlawful manner, trying to spread their territories and gangs. This will imply the use and distribution of even more drugs that is detrimental to the society. Offering gun ownership to such a person is thus a sign of worse things to follow (Mantel, B. 2013).

Moreover, those facing charges of poaching are supposed to be restricted from getting access to a gun. This is because there are high chances they could use this guns to kill the rare wild animals and thereby causing loss of diversity in the wildlife. Such people thus should not get a chance of owning a gun (Gregg, 2012).

Another set of people who do not deserve to own a gun include those that are facing charges of armed robbery. Robbery with violence involve use of weapons and thus when such an individual gets a chance to possess a gun, he may be tempted to use this gun in ways that are not of positive importance to the society. He may as well use the gun in robbing others just as before. Thus such people should always be restricted from ownership of a gun (Spitzer, 2009).

Furthermore, those who are facing charges of sales of illegal firearms should not be offered a chance to own a gun. This is because they could just sell it or hire it to someone who could later on use it to intimidate other citizens. Such people therefore do not deserve to posses any gun for any purpose (Johnson, 2002).

Another group of people who should not be granted a chance to possess a gun are the pedophiles. These are the adults who get sexually attracted to children. Such people should not posses guns because they may use these weapons to forcefully acquire the fulfillments of their sexual desires. Those facing this charge are thus supposed to be restricted from the ownership of a gun (Spitzer, 2009).

Those facing the charges of rape or sexual abuse should not be left out of this too. When such people get a chance of possessing such a weapon, they may use it to get to their victims. This may lead to increased rate of rapes and sexual abuse both to the minors and older people. Such types of people thus should be restricted from ownership of weapons such as guns(Cook, P. J., Ludwig, J., & Samaha, A. M. 2009).

Kidnappers normally use weapons to take captive its victims. Guns send fear

to the victims making them surrender themselves to the kidnappers. People charged with kidnapping thus when get to access the guns; they may end up perfecting their unearthly deals. They thus have to be restricted from possessing the guns. (Fisanick, C. 2010)

Besides, those that are charged with terrorism should be restricted from ownership of guns. This is because they may tend to use the guns in their terrorism deals and plans and thus cause harm to the society at large. Terrorism has become a challenge to almost every single country and state. Such people hence do not need the freedom to possess a gun as that may have a very bad aftermath (Johnson, 2002).

Lastly, aliens who are illegally and unlawfully in the U. S or any alien that has been admitted to the United States by a nonimmigrant visa is not supposed to be entitled to own a gun. This is to ensure security for the citizens as such kind of a people would just harm with the belief that they will simply be deported back to their homes and nothing much to be done to them thereafter. (Cook, P. J., Ludwig, J., & Samaha, A. M. 2009).

Some people may say that everybody should be given equal chances of owning a gun. This is because they claim laws are made for everyone and thus everyone should have a chance of enjoying the rule of law and the freedom that comes by it. They say there are chances that with these restrictions, the hunter may become the hunted and the above mentioned people may not have a chance to defend themselves in case of any attack (Gregg, 2012).

It is also not right or fair at all to make judgments on anyone based on his past. Some may have changed their ways, however denying them a right

because of their past may not sound like a fair trial to them. None the less, it is impossible to read the mind of any individual. It is absolutely wrong to insinuate that someone is going to turn up to be a danger to the society once given a gun just because he is not a citizen of the country or just because he may have had a very unforgiving past. (Cook, P. J., Ludwig, J., & Samaha, A. M. 2009)

They believe equality should prevail irrespective of who you are or where you are. Based on the above explanations, they claim that just as the possession may lead to someone with charges against him venturing into another unlawful act, so is there a chance for a new individual to venture into such likely acts due to the fact that he possesses a gun which he didn't have prior (Johnson, 2002).

All these claims made above are to some extent true, but we have to realize that life is not a gamble. There are high chances a goon will maintain his actions whereas the good people will as well restrict themselves from venturing into unlawful acts (Gregg, 2012)

It is almost as saying you would be at peace in hurt if you just saw the thug who shot your brother walk in the streets later on with a gun in his hands. Sincerely, that would be a very traumatizing adventure (Spitzer, 2009).

It is for this reason that I have to agree with the plan and rule of restricting these particular set of people from ownership of guns as they may cause a lot of fear to the citizens and their families at large. Other citizens however should be at liberty to own guns; however they have to understand that with liberty comes responsibility (Cook, P. J., Ludwig, J., & Samaha, A. M. 2009).

We have to take care of these guns and use them in the rightful manner. We

should also keep them safe from those who may be tempted to misuse it. We should keep in mind that we will take responsibility for any misuse of a gun registered in our names irrespective of whoever uses it and for what intention (Johnson, 2002).

References

Gregg, (2012). Guns in American Society. ABC-CLIO, LLC.

Johnson,(2002). The second amendment controversy-Explained. iUniverse, Inc.

Spitzer, (2009). Gun control: A documentary and Reference guide.

Greenwood press.

Cook, P. J., Ludwig, J., & Samaha, A. M. (2009). Gun control after Heller litigating against regulation. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Fisanick, C. (2010). Gun control. Detroit, MI: Greenhaven Press.

Mantel, B. (2013). Gun control: should lawmakers tighten firearm restrictions?. Washington, D. C.: CQ Press.