

Gun control ethics assignment

[Art & Culture](#)



After the recent Sandy Hook Elementary shooting up in Connecticut, where twenty children and six adults were shot, the issue of gun control has been a much debated topic. Should we increase gun control? Should we allow teachers to carry firearms? What side effects will this have on our country? These are all questions that are raised when we think about gun control. There are pros and cons to both sides of gun control.

Throughout this paper I will focus on gun control in schools and whether or not it would be beneficial to allow school staff to carry firearms throughout the schools and what robbers are potentially going to be brought to the table. The National Rifle Association (NEAR) would probably be named the biggest supporters of allowing teachers to carry firearms. One question the president of the NEAR, Wayne La Pierre, proposed was “ Why is the idea of a gun good when it is used to protect the president of our country or our police, but bad when it is used to protect our children in our schools?

That gun being carried by that teacher may be the only means of protection a child has from another gunmen in the building. But the facts tell us the more guns in society the higher the rate of violence in a country. The United States has some of the least strict gun laws of developed countries today and has some of the highest rates of crime related to guns. The U. S. Has a murder rate that is six times higher than the average developed nation. The key to having a positive culture is not to increase the amount of guns in circulation, but to limit the amount of guns says reports from the university of Delaware.

Some of the more cost effective and peaceful routes to having safe school environment would be to hire more school counselors, increase parental involvement, provide gun safety programs for students, Gold Star Programs (reaching out to kids who have fallen through the cracks), and implement a district led threat teams. The more the school has a well- established relationship with the students the more they will be able to detect if a student is going to act out in violence. To keep outside gunmen from entering the building and shooting anyone inside schools should increase security to the highest levels.

There should be a law enforcement officer at any unlocked door and all visitors should have to check in and given the okay past the officer. The idea of arming teachers with firearms comes with all kinds of uniqueness. Some of these consequences include expensive training, liability, resistance of staff and public to firearms. One alternative weapon of protection is a new pepper spray gun made by Kimberly, a known firearm manufacturer. This pepper spray gun has the ability to shoot up to fifteen feet, which would be pretty close to shooting across a classroom.

It cannot be shot accidentally and is a gel like consistency not to affect those around the suspect. This is a non-lethal alternative to firearms. There is hardly any training involved to this method of protection and is able to be used by all. Even those who are very afraid of guns are not afraid of this squirt gun cousin. Teachers with firearms make it hard for police on the scene to determine who the actual suspect. Carrying weapons around is also intimidating to children and may also have parents worried about the safety of their children.

<https://assignbuster.com/gun-control-ethics-assignment/>

Kids are very curious and knowing a gun is present in the classroom could be very distracting to the students. Police are often called from frightened citizens in communities when they see people with handguns. The more firearms that are available to citizens, the more the rate of unintended hooting increases. In *Accident Analysis and Prevention* by Matthew Miller, PhD, Deborah Israel, PhD, and David Hemingway, PhD write about how approximately 50 people each day are unintentionally shot. They also found that a child under 15 years old is shot every other day from unintended gunfire.

From these facts, we can see that firearms increase accidents and unfortunate deaths. Someone may argue that gun-free zones would make a criminal brave and would give them that confidence that they might be able to get away with the crime. They may also say that guns do not always kill, there are safeties on rearms and trait Ned individuals are not going to mistakenly shoot innocent citizens. There is also proof that those who are concealed permit carry holders are not involved as those who are not carriers.

The next question would be how do you say that someone who goes through a quick training program of 80 hours and doesn't regularly shoot be able to operate a firearm after a couple of months of no shooting. To operate firearms and be precise you have to have regular practice. The question becomes who will fund this practice, training, guns, ammunition, etc. What if the nearest shooting range is an hour away from the district? Would the district pay for the gas for teachers to get there as well? Everything will always have two sides to it. The liberals will be arguing something should be <https://assignbuster.com/gun-control-ethics-assignment/>

done about what kids see on t. . And video games. They will argue that we need less guns and stricter laws on the guns. The conservatives will argue that God needs to be back in schools, children need better family upbringing, and that we need more guns. And somewhere in the middle is where we have to compromise and figure out what is the best scenario. The biggest issue is that people make decisions after an incident like Sandy Hook based on emotions. The key is to looking at the heart of the matter and not turning directly to the gun laws. What about everything else that went wrong in-between?

After Sandy Hook people are trying to get everyone on an emotional bandwagon to get stricter gun laws passed. The media is disguising what is really happening and if you look at the facts and look at history shootings like this are at an all-time low. Shootings have decreased over the years. “ There hasn’t been a massacre like Sandy Hook since 25). The number of homicides in this country is also declining. The media today falsely misrepresents the facts of the matter. This entry is making decisions based only on emotion and what the media tells them. Not by the facts.

The pro gun control side may argue that we just need more officers in the schools. But that may not be the answer. Recent studies have shown that officers are causing more harm than good in schools. There are reports out from New York schools showing that officers are abusing students physically, and sexually. Now this brings up a whole new topic of police and their duties but will more officers stop the crime. Not always. But there is a long list of benefits that a school resource officer can offer. The officers main job is to rotate, serve, and mentor the students.

<https://assignbuster.com/gun-control-ethics-assignment/>

Schools that have resource officers that have good relationships with students are less likely to have a high crime rate. Those cases of officers that are abusing students are not the majority and there is always an issue somewhere. Not all officers are perfect. The heart of this matter is will gun control save student's lives or not? The key is to not act out in fear or based on emotions. Someone once wrote ' ' Whenever people's fearful expectations are greater than their hopeful expectations; they will choose solutions that will ultimately cause even greater harm, and it will always make them even more afraid".

Both sides of this argument has stories to support their side. Evil and insanity will always exist. Those who aim to harm will always find a way, just as those who use illegal drugs will always find a way. It doesn't matter how strict the gun laws or if we have guns in schools there will always be those who get around the laws. It is how an individual will handle an unforeseen circumstance that will save lives, the pro control side would argue. The current gun legislation will not protect people from being shot. The only thing it will do is limit what kind of guns the American people will be allowed to own.

The government is going after high caliber weapons. A caliber does not determine if a firearm has the ability to kill or not. A small caliber firearm can take a life just the same. Sandy Hook has brought a debate that is not even related to the issue of what happened. The government should focus more on the issue of what should happen in schools and not about what kind of guns the people are allowed to have. After my findings throughout this paper on the topic of gun control in schools, believe that there should be guns in

<https://assignbuster.com/gun-control-ethics-assignment/>

schools. Before doing this paper I was unaware of all of the con side to having guns in schools.

The counter argument is a very good one and I almost switched sides, but I still believe that guns in schools could be a very beneficial asset to protecting children. Now, I do believe that it is important that the weapon stay hidden and not made known to children that there are weapons in the school. Also believe that not all teachers should be forced to have a gun but rather volunteer to be teachers with guns. Those who volunteer should choose to because they want to protect children and will sign a contract saying they will reactive at their own expense to keep costs down.

Then I believe there should be surprise test to prove that they have been practicing and can still operate the firearm well. Outsiders will be less likely to come in and take over a school if there is a gun on the premises where an intruder believes there is no gun. A child who brings a gun into a school to shoot is more likely to drop his gun if another person has a gun pointed back at him. A child will break more by force. They are raged and are not going to listen to “ Johnny, please put the gun down, and everything will be okay”. Believe guns in schools loud be better than not having guns in schools.