Gun Control

The issue of gun control is one of the most debating problems of our time. The argue over gun control often concentrates on how laws pointed at restraining the accessibility of guns will produce an effect on the relative encouragements of criminals and law-abiding citizens to get guns. Followers of gun control debate that in the lack of these laws, criminals will obtain guns too easily. At the same time, if citizens are armed, offenders can have an even greater motive to acquire guns, contributing to too many guns in circulation and a greater number of events of violent crime. On the contrary, opponents of gun control utter the concern that these laws will disrupt the ability of citizens to defend themselves, and consequently end up development of crime and gun related violence (Jacobs 4).

The politics of guns ownership is more appropriate to the reality of our time. The statistic data (that will be given further) of different sides of the continent will prove it. However, there are pros and cons of the same notion that cannot be opposed. But when putting yourself on this or that side of the debate it is necessary to consider arguments of both parties. It seems that reputedly after a gun concerned accident collects national attention, there is a warmish try to discuss what one can do to direct gun related violence in the USA. It is a rather difficult task to solve and almost no one has fully formed an opinion about it.
The most important point of the issue is that people have become concentrated on discussing what they do with guns that they have almost absolutely missed what guns may do to them.

Guns, as a conception, predominately fluctuate certain dynamics of violence. For instance, it allows the weaker person to straggle the stronger, it allows violence to be performed from a distance, and of course, it changes people’s view on power and violence. These particular changes stay unrevealed in the process of discussion of gun control. Either people can by mistake assume the gun to be fully responsible for the violence, or to say more, fully innocent.

It is often heard everywhere: “Guns do not kill people, people kill people.” One may say that it is fair enough. But guns change the way a person kill another person, and they change the general people’s view on killing. When a person owns a gun, the question of how to react to situation changes, either for worse or better, because the person gets an option which was absent before. When advocating effectively for or against gun control, it is necessary to take into consideration these changes. It is important to put forward a question: “Do guns make people more or less inclined towards conflict?” One may not be sure that gun control would have helped to avoid these changes, but people should realize that a fear of gun control will prevent from understanding them. (Myers)

The government of different countries has tried to establish gun control laws in order to reduce the rate of crime. The results were shocking. These have showed why control does not work. The restrictive gun control laws in Japan has demonstrated its value in practice only because Japanese nation is absolutely obedient to the government. The situation in the United States is quite different. The United Kingdom in terms of culture and demographic situation resembles the USA and its gun control attempts suffer a wreck: the British rates of attacks and
thievery are twice those of the United States, and since the end of nineties British rates of murders have increased while those in the United States have decreased. The same harmful result received Canada and Australia following British restricting laws. The conclusion of this experiment is clear: Gun control laws give power to criminals and leave ordinary citizens defenceless.

James Torr in his *Gun and Crime* considers that “Gun control advocates are fond of claiming that guns are a major cause of homicide and other violent crimes, but there is no statistical data to support this conclusion. Rates of gun ownership increased at a much greater pace throughout the twentieth century than murder rates did, and from 1973 to 1997 murder rates declined significantly while rates of gun ownership increased” (Torr 12). Later, in a rather short period of time, number of gun owners has increased, as well as crime rates and the expedient explanation of this fact is that people started to buy guns in respond to the increase of crime rates, the gun purchasing has not resulted in increase of crime rates.

In fact, offenders are motivated by self-preservation, and handguns can be, therefore, treated as a deterrent. Thus, John Lott has showed a vivid example of it: “The potential defensive nature of guns is further evidenced by the different rates by so-called “hot burglaries”, when a resident is at home when a criminal strikes. In Canada and Britain, both with tough gun-control laws, almost half of the law burglaries are “hot burglaries”. In contrast, the United States, with fewer restrictions, has a “hot burglary” rate of only 13%” (Lott 36). The given instant has proved that the behavior of criminals is not accidental. The survey of the convicted American criminals confessed that armed victims worry them much more than their running into the police. The survey, which was carried out within criminals, stated that the criminal aiming at burglary has to
prepare his affair for a long time, fearing of the armed house owner, which make it possible for the victim and police to prevent this or that crime.

The fact is that a minor association between rises in gun purchasing and murders does not and cannot prove that guns cause homicide. Supposing that there is any reason and effect correlation, the most obvious one is the contradictory, i.e., that it was the increase in homicides that resulted in increased gun purchasing. Instead, the third factor, that is a great rise in robbery and violent crime, has caused the upgrades in both homicide and sales of gun.

It is not the secret that the level of gun possession in the United States is rather higher than in any other developed country. The protection against the crime is the biggest reason why Americans cite for having a handgun, but still nobody can reject the fact that guns are used in murders, suicides, and unintentional assault more than ten times often than in self-defense. In order to decrease gun crime and violence, citizen of America have to accept rational gun control laws, such as receiving a licence of gun owners and firearms registration, compulsory increase of the legal age for handguns ownership to 21, as well as legislating mandatory periods of waiting for gun buying. (Torr18).

The general number of guns used by law-abiding citizens and offenders will have a negative impact on the social well-being. Gun control supports typically indicate another valuable social cost of easy accessibility of guns that has nothing to do with the rate of crimes. Guns contain some negative exteriorities owing to desirably accidental use or use by any person who is incapable to exercise their judgments (e.g., persons who have mental illnesses, intoxicated with alcohol or drugs people, and children). What is more, easy accessibility of guns may give raise the likelihood that argues between friends will lead to fatal consequences and that attempted suicides will be successful. Accordingly, except for the level of crimes and the
deadweight loss associated with resources spent to carry it out and avoid it, one could state that government also cares about the total amount of guns that circulates in the population for the additional reason that they create some negative externalities for country at large. (Wuest 16.)

There is another reason against free gun possession. It is a great secondary risk of the suicide of youth in homes with firearms. Due to the statistic database, 5% of youngsters at the age from nine till sixteen have a diagnosis of a depression, an about 15% possess light symptoms of depression. The adult persons that are inclined to the suicide are 75 times more likely to commit it when a gun is laying in the table of his home office. The change of view, and as the result of behavior, of a gun owners is vivid. On the unconscious level of human’s mind, there appears impulsiveness, which may play an important role in suicide, and youth suicide in particular. It is common for great part of adolescents to get over suicidal plans.

However, Wheeler disagrees with all these. He debates that the right to obtain arms is essential since guns are the best way to protect our main interest in self-defense. Hence, he considers that guns are not inseparably valuable; it should be valuable only in case of self-defense. One may fail to realize how this fact could make the right to own gun fundamental. Not every means to a essential interest is a fundamental right. That would disputably make most activities secured by essential rights. Others might affirm that gun possession is a fundamental part for the prospering of a proper citizen. A proper citizen, as the Wheeler considers, is one who is able to support and defend his family (Wheeler 435).

Thus, Fred Hiatt stated in his recent article: “It seems obvious that military-style weapons with no hunting or self-defense purpose should not be circulating. It seems obvious that people who hear voices and repeatedly fire guns in anger should be treated before they can buy more guns” (Hiatt).
As a matter of fact, the gun control law has to be established, but it should not abandon gun purchasing in general. Gun-control law policies often contains such points as:

- the rise of the legal age for the possibility to buy a gun from 18 to 21.
- parents have to be aware of the fact immediately, in case their child commit a crime due to their neglect attitude to the gun.
- gun manufacturers have to improve the design of guns including setting child-locks, personalizing a gun and managing all the other safety details on each gun item.
- to raise the level of consumers educating about the risks and rewards of gun ownership.

To the conclusion of the argument, one may state that the Americans are not going to give in their right to possess guns for sport and self-defence. However, laws that focus on decrease of the risks of instant shootings, murders, crimes of passion and robberies over time, with a public health aim, may give a chance for that. Sometimes reform takes years or decades of slogging, seemingly hopeless effort. At an unpredictable moment, public sentiment teeters and then tips. What everyone knew was impossible is seen as having been, all along, inevitable (Hiatt).

The argument about the necessity of gun control policies is still one of the most essential and confusing issues of thousands people around the world.

As it seems to everybody, that if government put forward restricting gun ownership laws, the crime rates reduces at once. But unfortunately, the reality differs from our desires, and the data of surveys and performed experiments proves it. Jacobs considers in his work that “It assumes that firearms regulation is desirable and asks whether specific proposals that have been put forward could be successfully implemented and enforced and, if so, with any likelihood of reducing injuries inflicted by firearms” (Jacobs 65).
The time has come not to abandon law-abiding citizens from gun possession, but to make sure that they have truthful complete data and information so that each person can make an intelligent, expedient choice concerning gun possession and then act with full responsibility after the purchase. Public policy should be elaborated to taking guns out of the youth’s access and to support all necessary tools to follow guns used in murders to the original sources who provides support illigally for the criminals and teens with guns. The continuation of the tough restraining policies will not stop the black illegal market of firearms, or it only can make it worse! It is very important for the government of each country to learn from the experiences and experiments gained for many years of holding gun control politics and do not make the same mistakes, as it may lead to the catastrophe inside of the country or even international assault with armed population. Everybody has a right to own a firearm, but everybody has to be acknowledged with all the responsibilities and risks it contains.
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