Gun Ownership Laws Should Be Changed

Posted on October 4, 2018

Introduction

Gun ownership law in the United States should be revised through targeted, constitutionally defensible measures that address the distinct pathways of firearm harm. The original essay was written in response to the 2017 Las Vegas mass shooting and correctly emphasizes homicide, youth access, and suicide. It inaccurately implies that American gun owners generally possess unregistered automatic weapons, treats mental distress as a simple reason to deny ownership, and proposes worldwide restrictions without accounting for different constitutions and legal systems. Federal law already regulates licensed dealers, requires background checks for most dealer transfers, prohibits possession by specified people, and tightly controls machine guns and other National Firearms Act weapons. State laws vary considerably. Reform should therefore begin with the present legal framework and identify gaps: unsafe storage, incomplete coverage of private transfers, domestic-violence risk, trafficking, crisis access, and inconsistent enforcement. The strongest changes would respect the individual right recognized by the Supreme Court while reducing preventable suicide, interpersonal violence, accidental shootings, and illegal diversion.

Policy Question

The relevant question is not whether every gun should be banned or whether every regulation violates liberty. It is which rules can reduce identifiable risks while remaining clear, fairly administered, and consistent with constitutional rights. Firearms are owned for self-defense, hunting, sport, collection, work, and culture. They also increase the lethality of suicide attempts, domestic assaults, accidental access, and some public attacks. Effective policy should distinguish lawful possession from dangerous access and evaluate each proposal according to evidence, burden, due process, and enforcement equity.

Current Federal Framework

The Gun Control Act regulates interstate commerce, federal firearms licensees, and possession by prohibited persons. Licensed dealers must obtain a completed ATF Form 4473 and generally initiate a National Instant Criminal Background Check System check before transferring a firearm to an unlicensed person. Federal law prohibits possession by categories including many people convicted of serious crimes, fugitives, qualifying domestic-violence offenders, and people subject to certain restraining orders. The National Firearms Act imposes additional controls on machine guns, short-barreled weapons, suppressors, and other defined items. Reform debates should not begin from the false premise that no regulation or background-check system exists (Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, 2026).

Constitutional Framework

In *District of Columbia v. Heller*, the Supreme Court recognized an individual right to possess a handgun in the home for self-defense while stating that the right is not unlimited. *McDonald v. Chicago* applied that right to state and local governments. *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* recognized a right to public carry and instructed courts to evaluate regulations through constitutional text and historical tradition. *United States v. Rahimi* upheld a federal restriction for a person subject to a qualifying domestic-violence restraining order. Any new law must therefore be carefully defined and supported rather than justified only by general interest balancing (District of Columbia v. Heller, 2008; McDonald v. City of Chicago, 2010).

Mass Shootings and Ordinary Firearm Death

Mass shootings receive intense attention because one event harms many people and creates widespread fear. They represent only one part of firearm mortality. Suicide accounts for a large share of U.S. firearm deaths, and community and domestic homicides occur far more regularly than nationally publicized attacks. Policy designed only around an unusual mass-shooting weapon or location will leave major pathways untouched. Reform should combine measures for crisis access, intimate-partner danger, community violence, trafficking, and public attacks rather than expect one law to solve every problem (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2026).

Correcting the Automatic-Weapons Claim

The original essay suggests that new automatic and semiautomatic firearms are widely used without registration. Fully automatic firearms are heavily regulated under federal law, and civilian possession of newly manufactured machine guns has been prohibited since 1986, subject to limited exceptions. Semiautomatic firearms are far more common and fire one round per trigger action. Most ordinary firearms are not registered in one comprehensive federal ownership database. These facts should not be confused. A sound proposal must define the weapon or transaction precisely instead of treating “automatic,” “semiautomatic,” and “unregistered” as interchangeable.

Universal or Expanded Background Checks

Federal dealer transfers generally require background checks, but many private transfers are governed primarily by state law unless federal prohibitions or dealer requirements apply. An expanded-background-check policy could require most sales to pass through a licensed dealer or state system while creating clear exceptions for temporary loans, emergencies, inheritance, and close family transfers. The process should be affordable and accessible in rural areas. Background checks cannot predict every future offense, but they can enforce existing disqualifications more consistently and create accountability around transfers.

Record Completeness

A background-check system is only as accurate as its records. Courts, military authorities, states, and agencies must transmit disqualifying convictions, protective orders, and other qualifying records promptly and correct errors. Delayed or inaccurate data can permit a prohibited transfer or wrongly deny a lawful buyer. Reform should include funding, audit, notice, and appeal. Due process is not an obstacle to safety; it makes the system more credible and precise.

Permit-to-Purchase Systems

Some states require a purchaser to obtain a permit or license before acquisition. A well-designed system can verify identity, run a background check, support safety education, and create a deliberate transaction process. Poorly designed licensing can impose excessive fees, delays, subjective discretion, or unequal access. After *Bruen*, objective and timely criteria are more defensible than open-ended “special need” judgments. A permit system should have published standards, reasonable processing time, accommodation for disability, privacy protection, and a meaningful appeal.

Waiting Periods

A waiting period creates time between purchase and possession. Its strongest rationale concerns impulsive suicide and rapidly escalating interpersonal crises. It may also delay access for a person facing an immediate threat. An emergency exception or expedited process can address selected situations while preserving safeguards. The policy should be evaluated through suicide, homicide, and circumvention outcomes rather than symbolic delay. A short waiting period is not a substitute for background checks or safe storage.

Safe Storage

Children and unauthorized household members often gain access to firearms that adults believe are hidden. Safe storage means using an appropriate locked device, controlling keys or codes, and adapting the method to household risk and defensive needs. Laws can require reasonable storage when a child or prohibited person is likely to gain access, while public programs can distribute safes and lockboxes. Policy should distinguish negligent access from theft despite reasonable precautions. Education alone is insufficient, but criminal punishment after a tragedy is also an incomplete prevention strategy.

Child-Access Prevention

Child-access prevention laws assign responsibility when an adult leaves a firearm accessible under defined circumstances. They can reinforce the principle that children are not responsible for adult storage decisions. The law should state the required mental state, age, exceptions, and relationship to lawful use. Schools can teach children not to touch an unfamiliar firearm and to tell an adult, but such education never replaces secure adult control. Families should discuss storage before children visit another home without treating lawful owners as presumed irresponsible.

Suicide Prevention

Firearms are highly lethal, and many suicidal crises are brief or fluctuate. Creating time and distance can save life. Clinicians and families can discuss temporary off-site storage, secure in-home storage, or transfer during a crisis. Laws should facilitate voluntary temporary transfer to a trusted eligible person or dealer without making return unnecessarily difficult. Crisis services, mental-health care, pain treatment, economic support, and substance-use care remain essential. Suicide prevention should not stigmatize all people with mental illness, most of whom are not violent.

Extreme-Risk Protection Orders

Extreme-risk laws allow courts to issue temporary orders restricting firearm access when evidence shows a significant danger to self or others. They are intended for urgent situations not covered by another prohibition. Safeguards should include sworn evidence, defined standards, prompt hearing, time limits, safe surrender, appeal, and penalties for knowingly false petitions. Orders should connect people with crisis care and should be evaluated for equitable use. A court process is preferable to broad administrative discretion because it creates evidence and review.

Domestic Violence

Firearm access can make intimate-partner threats more lethal. Federal and state restrictions apply to some convictions and protective orders, but coverage, record entry, surrender, and enforcement vary. Reform should ensure rapid transmission of qualifying orders, clear notice, safe surrender procedures, and return when the legal prohibition ends. Dating relationships and stalking should be addressed according to constitutional and statutory standards. Victim safety planning is necessary because service of an order or firearm removal can itself increase danger (United States v. Rahimi, 2024).

Trafficking and Straw Purchasing

Many firearms used in crime originate through theft, unlawful resale, false statements, or straw purchasing by someone buying for a prohibited person. Enforcement should focus on deliberate diversion, corrupt dealers, serial traffickers, and organized theft rather than low-risk paperwork errors. Trace data, multiple-sale reporting where lawful, inspections, and cooperation across jurisdictions can identify patterns. Dealers need clear rules and protection when they report suspicious conduct. Strong enforcement of existing transfer laws is compatible with lawful commerce.

Dealer Accountability

Federal firearms licensees are required to conduct background checks, maintain records, verify identity, and avoid transfers to prohibited persons. ATF identifies failures involving Form 4473, NICS checks, prohibited persons, residency, and acquisition records as important public-safety violations. Most dealers seek to comply. Inspection and enforcement should distinguish clerical mistakes from repeated or willful conduct that facilitates diversion. Regulators should provide usable guidance while acting firmly against deliberate violations.

Community Violence

Firearm homicide is concentrated in particular networks and neighborhoods shaped by segregation, poverty, retaliation, trauma, and illegal markets. Broad ownership restrictions alone may not address these conditions. Focused deterrence, hospital-based intervention, credible messengers, youth employment, environmental improvement, witness protection, and fair investigation can reduce risk. Programs should be evaluated and funded consistently rather than only after a highly visible incident. Enforcement that produces many low-level arrests while failing to solve shootings can damage trust.

Mass-Shooting Prevention

Prevention can include behavioral threat assessment, reporting systems, domestic-violence intervention, secure storage, crisis orders, and control of access by people making credible threats. Threat assessment should focus on behavior, capability, communication, grievance, and access rather than stereotypes or psychiatric diagnosis. Schools and workplaces need multidisciplinary teams and clear pathways for help. Security measures should not turn public spaces into environments of constant fear or disproportionately target marginalized students.

Assault-Weapon and Magazine Restrictions

Some jurisdictions restrict semiautomatic firearms defined by features and limit magazine capacity. Supporters argue that reducing rapid sustained fire can limit casualties in public attacks. Opponents argue that definitions cover commonly owned firearms, burden self-defense, and are not closely connected to most gun deaths. Courts continue to evaluate these laws after *Bruen*. A policy memorandum should state the exact technical definition, grandfathering, transfer rules, and expected mechanism rather than use “assault weapon” as a rhetorical label.

Registration

Registration can assist ownership accountability, return of stolen guns, and enforcement of transfer requirements. Critics raise privacy, confiscation, data security, and administrative-burden concerns. The United States does not have a comprehensive ordinary-firearm registry under federal law, and some federal records are restricted by statute. Any registration proposal would require a clear purpose, access limits, correction process, cybersecurity, and strong protection against misuse. It should not be confused with the transaction records dealers currently maintain.

Training

Safety training can cover storage, handling, legal use of force, suicide prevention, conflict avoidance, and emergency response. Training requirements should be affordable, accessible, objective, and available to people with disabilities or limited transportation. A course cannot guarantee judgment, and a requirement designed mainly to delay lawful ownership is vulnerable to challenge. Voluntary programs through ranges, hunting organizations, community groups, and health systems can complement legal standards.

Self-Defense

Many owners reasonably view a firearm as protection. Policy analysis should not dismiss that concern. Defensive-use estimates vary because definitions and survey methods differ. Ownership may increase perceived security while introducing risks involving suicide, domestic conflict, theft, accident, or mistaken use. People should receive accurate information and choose storage and training accordingly. Reform is more likely to gain legitimacy when lawful owners are treated as partners in safety rather than as a homogeneous threat.

Enforcement Equity

Firearm laws can be enforced unequally through stops, searches, charging, and sentencing. Communities already subject to intensive policing may bear disproportionate burdens from technical possession offenses. Every proposal should include data on who is investigated and punished, clear elements, and protection against discriminatory enforcement. Diversion may be appropriate for low-risk violations, while trafficking and violence require focused accountability. Constitutional safety includes equal treatment.

Australia as a Comparison

Australia changed firearm law after the 1996 Port Arthur massacre through a national agreement involving licensing, registration, restrictions, storage, and a buyback. The United States differs in constitutional law, existing firearm prevalence, federalism, politics, and culture. Australia can illustrate that policy packages matter more than one isolated rule, but it cannot be copied without adaptation. Comparative evidence should inform rather than replace analysis of American institutions.

Recommended Reform Package

A practical package would expand background checks to most transfers with reasonable exceptions; improve records and appeals; require safe storage where unauthorized access is foreseeable; support child-access prevention; establish due-process crisis orders; strengthen domestic-violence surrender; enforce laws against trafficking and willful dealer violations; and invest in community violence and suicide prevention. States can test permit and waiting-period models within constitutional limits. Research should evaluate each component rather than credit or blame the entire package for every trend.

Conclusion

American gun laws should be changed, but reform must be precise. Federal law already regulates licensed sales, background checks, prohibited persons, and specially controlled weapons, while states add varied rules. The largest opportunities involve gaps in private transfers, unsafe household access, crisis situations, domestic violence, trafficking, and inconsistent records and enforcement. A constitutionally responsible strategy can protect lawful self-defense while reducing suicide, homicide, accidental injury, and public attacks. It should rely on objective standards, due process, accessible compliance, and transparent evaluation. The goal is not to declare ownership immoral or to promise a violence-free society. It is to design a system in which the decision to own a lethal instrument carries enforceable responsibilities proportionate to the harm that careless or dangerous access can cause (New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen, 2022).

References

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008).

McDonald v. City of Chicago, 561 U.S. 742 (2010).

New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022).

United States v. Rahimi, 602 U.S. 680 (2024).

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. (2026). *Federal Firearms Licensee Quick Reference and Best Practices Guide*.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2026). *Firearm Injury and Violence Prevention*.