

# Gun control argumentative paper against gun control

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



## **Gun Control/ Argumentative paper against Gun Control**

of the of the of the Gun Control Introduction Thesis ment: Gun control laws cannot prevent or reduce the crime rate. These laws infringe upon the constitutional right of an individual, with respect to the bearing of arms, which is provided for by the Second Amendment to the US Constitution. The various interventions made in the US to implement gun control measures, in order to reduce crime have proved to be unsuccessful. Some important instances are given in the following. First, a ban on handgun sales was imposed in Washington, D. C. in 1977. However, by the 1990s, the homicide rate in the city had trebled. During this period, most of the murders were committed with handguns. Second, since 1911, New York had imposed a handgun licensing law, which proved unequal to the task of reducing violent crime in this city. Third, the federal Gun Control Act of 1968 imposed stringent restrictions on the possession and bearing of firearms, throughout the US (Preface to "Deterring Gun Violence"). However, this measure was ineffective, as is borne out by the fact that in comparison to the five years preceding the enactment of this act, the murder rate of the US, after the enactment of this act, showed a 50% increase. In the five years following this period, the murder rate showed a 75% increase, and in the 5 year period after that the increase was 81% (Preface to "Deterring Gun Violence"). As such, in the US crime rate was enhanced much, when gun control laws were in operation. Gun control laws were unsuccessful in controlling the crime in the US.

The case of District of Columbia v Heller, dealt with the right to own firearms in the US. In this case, a special policeman attempted to register a handgun

in the District of Columbia. However, his application was rejected on the grounds that handguns could not be possessed in the home. The case was brought before the Supreme Court, which ruled that individuals had the right to own firearms. In addition, the Court clarified as to who could own a firearm, namely whether a state supported militia or individuals (District of Columbia v Heller ).

The Supreme Court ruled that the individual was entitled to own a firearm. While providing this ruling, the Court detached the practice of individual gun ownership from the service of that individual in a state militia. The ban on handguns by the District of Columbia was held to be in violation of the Second Amendment to the US Constitution (District of Columbia v Heller ). With this decision, it became very clear as to who was entitled to bear firearms. The Court stressed that the Second Amendment's stipulation that there should be no violation of the right of individuals to keep and bear arms, as a well - regulated militia was indispensable for the security of a free state, was to be construed as the right of individuals to possess and bear arms.

#### Conclusion

After examining the state of control on guns in the US, it can be surmised that gun control laws cannot prevent or reduce the crime rate. Moreover, it infringes upon the individual's right to bear arms, as provided in the Second Amendment to the US constitution.

#### Works Cited

Bearing Arms Second Amendment. n. d. Web. 10 November 2011 .

District of Columbia v Heller . No. 554 U. S. 570 . 2008.

District of Columbia v Heller . n. d. Web. 10 November 2011 .

<https://assignbuster.com/gun-control-argumentative-paper-against-gun-control/>

" Preface to " Deterring Gun Violence"." GALE Opposing Viewpoints. 24 May 2006. Web. 9 November 2011 .