

Name

Tutor

Course

Date

### Right to Bear Arms

The controversy encompassing gun control has attracted much debate in the United States. Latest reports addressing the horrific mass shooting in Virginia Tech's campus, the assassination in Connecticut's elementary learning institution as well as mass killings in a Colorado theater have encouraged many state officials to intervene and support gun control decrees in the US. However, quite a good number of state leaders approve the second Amendment to the Constitution, which provides that the people's right to bear firearms shall not be violated. This bears substantial credibility given that it is a section of the constitution. However, the government's scheme to control the guns does not auger well with many citizens. The government should not adopt extreme gun control and restrictions as this deprives citizens their fundamental civic rights as provided for in the constitution. In line with the above, the focus is to argue whether the government should legalize or illegalize ownership of firearms by citizens for personal protection.

It is evident that, adopting strict gun laws will instigate an upward trend in crime rates since there would be a higher number of vulnerable citizens that would easily become a target to the crime masterminds. According to recently conducted surveys, many people believe that gun control by the government is a violation of the constitution. This is the main reason most

Americans do not concur with the recent Supreme Court ruling concerning whether the right to have guns should be restricted (Frank X Walker 46). Well, it is essential to have some laws in place so that people may not have freedoms to use their guns inappropriately.

The rule to acquire firearms is a constitutional right bestowed on every American citizen and it is not subject to any infringement whatsoever. Several vulnerable groups of people need protection and pioneers of US believed that the community would have gained more if firearms would be in people's possession (Glantz 89). In this sense, people would defend themselves from both foreign aggressors and crime masterminds within the country. The gun only terminates life when a corrupted mind schemes to undertake such an action. Therefore, a gun will forever remain a passive object until used wrongly.

Based on the theme of natural rights, founders of American independence established a framework in which they envisioned a society in which citizen would forever be governed for and by the people. Their sentiments captured by historians about British barbarism against Americans emphasized the importance of Constitution's amendments to uphold American civil rights (Glantz 85). Samuel Adams explains the intention of this amendment, states that "The Constitution shall never be interpreted to approve Congress to prevent the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens, from possession their arms."

Statistics have indicated that most people who have been attacked by criminals and have a weapon managed to survive the attack compared to those who were attacked and had no any weapon at all. Among those that have been attacked, those defend themselves with a gun were less injured than those who used less operative weapons like a knife. Combating your opponent does not translate to the trigger of the firearm. That would mean the last option to a cop, but a

predicament in the case of a citizen (Glantz, 89). Just a mere presence and show of a gun is enough to scare to a criminal and hence to shoot does not mean bombarding the crime in any sense.

In addition, it would cause more havoc than anticipated having more arms in the country without having established rules to govern their possession and usage. It translates to mean nature corrupts society. It does not mean that someone would buy a gun with an intention to kill others. Higher animals have proved to be inhuman and respond to situations in different ways as dictated by the surrounding (Glantz 89). Therefore, it will become even messier if anyone can wake up one day and claim to have been in demand for a gun. It may turn to be a killing society. If anyone will have the right to own a gun irrespective of the intention to kill innocent lives, it may turn to be a scheme and a massacre in any one morning. Even though people would be given an okay that to have firearms and the firearm recorded in any given database and that firearm found that it was involved in committing the crime, it will still be hard to tell specifically who was involved in the said crime (Glantz 89). You cannot crucify the one whose name is registered under because it would be likely mean that the firearm might have been stolen, or the bearer of that weapon forced to do it under somebody's masking. The evidence that might be left over may not be substantive to convict clearly or even show out the one who committed the crime.

According to statistics, the US has enough guns to arm every citizen and still have more left idle. However, this is not a healthy game for any state. At one point, citizens may be happy to commit any crime since the régime government may not be able to control them. It would lead to losing and destruction of property that had taken centuries to build. It is difficult to fathom why people have a chance to destroy property worth centuries. It would be better if the amount

of crime would be controlled (Glantz 89). Besides, the so many numbers of weapons given to the public would put criminals in a better position to avoid being followed because it would be hard to track who committed what and who did not (Frank X Walker 45). Therefore, this would mean crime is paramount.

Failure to implement gun control in US would cause chaos. It would make citizens rebels and angry with their government when they see bloodshed and lack of control in the country. It would be therefore better to moderate the number of guns and know whom and why should that person be in possession of such firearms. The moderation would make everyone safe in the country. In addition, there is no need of law-abiding citizens to possess guns and firearms used by military people. Regulation of firearms by the government will reduce violence and crimes within the society as well straightening laws on the ownership of firearms. Most Americans object regulation of guns from citizens basing their argument under the second amendment law, however, they fail to understand that the second amendment law does not apply to the regular citizens, but people in militaries or special positions such as police and law enforcers. Therefore, to ensure there is a peaceful and harmonious society, government should regulate and take guns away from criminals.

Possession of firearms by the citizens is one of the major causes of social injustices within any society. For the ruling government to exercise a full control of the citizens as well as protecting the safety of every citizen there should be regulation of firearms (Federal Gun Laws 8). If everyone has the right of acquiring firearms for self-defense, what will be the purpose and role of the government and police officers? Firearms should be left in the hands of few people who have sworn an oath of protecting the rights and security of others. For instance, without

regulation of firearms cases like car-jacking, armed robbery, gang related violence, rape, and street smuggling will never cease.

In conclusion, citizens should be given the chance to keep firearms for their own protection. Reasons in support of legalizing private ownership of weapons outweigh those in support of illegalization. It is evident that the government cannot protect all the citizens from illegal crimes and local robbery fully. The government's main aim should be to spread justice rather than ruining it, therefore, the citizens have the right not only to defend their right to bear arms, but also to protect their liberty, which defines their identity as Americans. In addition, mass shooters aim at soft target meaning that they tend to attack people with no weapons. Therefore, arming citizens would reduce mass shootings.

Works Cited

Frank X Walker, "The Right to Bear Arms." *Appalachian Heritage* 38.2 (2010): 46-46. Web.

"Federal Gun Laws." 2008. National Rifle Association of America. 2 October 2008

Glantz, Leonard H. "The American Right to Bear Arms." *JAMA* 305.3 (2011): 255. Web.

"The Founders' Second Amendment: Origins of the Right to Bear Arms". *Choice Reviews*

Online 46.03 (2008): 46-1672-46-1672. Web.

