

Gun Control Argumentative Article

Posted on September 19, 2019

Gun Ownership, Public Safety, and the Case for Regulation

Despite the fact and arguments that gun possession by many individuals can be a threat to human life and well-being, there are groups which advocate and campaign against gun possession, putting forth logical points as to why they oppose gun control policy. These arguments, as contrasted with those agreeing with gun control, have rendered the issue some controversy. With the case being taken to court, they have shown their firm grounds and decision on [the issue of gun control](#). This essay will explore the key reasons why these people and groups oppose the [gun policy](#) program and why this has resulted in a duel.

The individuals and groups reason that the formation of gun control, as well as gun ownership restrictions and laws, will not deter crimes. They argue that in research studies done, the banning of assault weapons does not significantly impact or reduce the rate of murder or other crimes such as robbery. They also argue that with increased ownership of firearms in the 20th century, there have been reduced murder rates as well as violent crimes. The banning of weapons may result in an overly powerful government that can turn into tyranny against its people (North, 2013). This argument has been supported using the past eras of dictatorship, which took place mainly because the king or ruler had all sorts of weapons at their disposal and under their control.

The regulation and formation of gun control rules and laws will not limit criminals and thugs from obtaining illegal firearms. In some instances of the shooting spree and mass killings, most of the guns used by the killers are found to have been legally acquired and owned. The law, according to opposes, would take away firearms from law-abiding citizens who do not have ill motives. However, criminals are likely to ignore the rules and go ahead to acquire guns through illegal means from the black market (Hsiao, 2015). This has been the case with many cartels and radical groups which use unlawful methods to acquire powerful and lethal assault weapons.

Privacy, Government Authority, and the Limits of Firearm Control

People are entitled to a right to privacy. The government may conduct surveillance on its citizens, but there would be some limits. The passing of the law on gun control or banning lethal assault weapons would require the government to conduct surveillance programs as well as background checks. They

can also execute the application of micro-stamping. This has been termed as the infringement of people's rights to privacy. There would be databases by the government that would preserve the personal information and individual data of the gun holders, which includes names, addresses, phone numbers, residential places, mental health history, and crime records, among others ("People for and against gun control: a biographical reference", 2000). This would profoundly invade the privacy of citizens.

Some people have termed the regulation and control of guns as unnecessary. They support their argument by stating that there are relatively few people who die by a gun. This is in comparison to other causes of death, especially diseases such as Malaria, heart disease, diabetes, hypertension, and tumours, among others. They also argue that accidents also cause more deaths as compared to guns. This, therefore, validates the gun control requirement would be unnecessary since it would not help solve fatalities nor reduce the number of deaths that occur due to other reasons, as named above (Eller, 2016). The number of suicides is also not significantly reduced due to the regulation of guns.

It has also been argued that the government should focus more on educating people and children on guns, safety handling measures as well as proper uses such as sporting activities. This should be done with the aim of reducing and preventing incidental and accidental accidents among people and families. It would also help reduce cases of homicide since people, through the programs, will be able to keep the arsenal from the wrong hands safely. It has also been observed that the law has not been found and has been subject to breaking in countries that have put the code in place (Woldoff, Litchfield & Sycafoose Matthews, 2016). These include Mexico, which still records high death rates brought about by guns during drug cartel wars as they fight to maintain or expand their territories.

Terrorism, False Analogies, and Arguments Against Gun Regulation

Other absurd arguments that have been raised against gun control are in regard to terror attacks done using bombs. Some of the individuals have raised concerns that, despite bombs being illegal, they are still used against the human race. Such an attack happened in Manchester, claiming the lives of over 22 people in May during a concert. They remarked that it would be worthless to have laws that would not prevent any eventualities or disasters. The truth and facts that bombs are illegal do not prevent tragedies, and so will the gun control policy.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the duels and debates on gun control are likely to continue persistently among the two sides. One argument brought by one group will trigger a counterargument point from the other team. However, in truism, possession of guns is likely to trigger more vulnerabilities and risks to the lives of people. This, in my opinion, therefore, calls for gun regulation and control. However, even though the two groups do not agree on specific significant points such as safety and the welfare of people, the topic remains subject to debate.

References

- Eller, W. (2016). Review of: The War on Guns: Arming Yourself Against Gun Control Lies by John R. Lott. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis In Public Policy*, 7(4), 209-212. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.12107>
- Hsiao, T. (2015). Against Gun Bans and Restrictive Licensing. *Essays In Philosophy*, 16(2), 180-203. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7710/1526-0569.1531>
- People for and against gun control: a biographical reference. (2000). *Choice Reviews Online*, 37(08), 37-4233-37-4233. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5860/choice.37-4233>
- Woldoff, R., Litchfield, R., & Sycamore Matthews, A. (2016). Unpacking Heat: Dueling Identities and Complex Views on Gun Control among Rural Police. *Rural Sociology*, 82(3), 444-472. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12142>