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The word “gun” evokes strong reaction no matter which side of the debate over gun control you are on. The massacre in Sandy Hook Elementary School became a turning point and gave a rise to numerous discussions. Congress continues to make suggestions and vote, while states resorted to act independently. People express their beliefs through rallies and protests. American society has divided into two camps: the supporters and opponents of gun control.

The arguments of supporters of free selling of military weapons mostly narrow down to three main points. These are the following:

1. Military weapons are still massively sold by criminals in circumvention of the law, while the law-abiding citizens do not have the ability to acquire weapons for self-defense.

2. There is a huge illegal weapons market where anything can be bought - TT pistols, Makarov, AK various modifications. The “legalization” of military weapons will bring this huge “black market” out of shadow and put under the proper control of the state.

3. Free arms sales will contribute to a significant reduction in the number of violent crimes (armed robbery, rape, etc.), as potential victims will be able to give a military response to criminals.

Now consider the above argument of the “legalists” of military weapons on the merits. Today, wearing fire-fighting weapons in many countries is a criminal offense. It is easy to define a simple question that the perpetrator would be preferable - to arm for the offense, “black,” illegally acquired the barrel or to acquire weapons to lawfully? As for all sorts of “permits to carry weapons,” “registration of weapons” and other papers, which, in the view of the initiators of the "reform" are able to limit access of criminals and psychopaths to guns, it can be recalled, for example, that only in New York, several hundred commercial structures traded for cash the
full package of documents that turns illegal immigrants (often convicted on criminal charges) in “law-abiding” citizens.

In such a way, a lot of people could quite officially and legally obtain the capital registration. What can stop the selling of all the necessary permits for the possession of a weapon?

The argument about the “legalization” of black market “weapons” is essentially similar to the one for measures already been taken in a number of foreign countries regarding drugs. For example, in Norway, the government program sales of heroin and other “hard” drugs addicts in special pharmacies where one can not only legally purchase a dose, but also go directly into the properly equipped room to take these. In result of this program, heroin is still sold on the streets, and the profits of Kosovo drug mafia did not suffer. It is easy to recall a very similar idea of “fighting the illegal trafficking of alcohol,” the only outcome of which was the co-existence in our country of legal and “black” markets (Leigh, & Neill, 2010). The latter has the advantage that it offers swipes at much lower prices. In this regard, it is easy to note that the legalization lobbyists’ military weapons often float this argument, saying that “legal” guns sold in the stores will be expensive and will simply not be affordable for criminals.

Finally, the most obvious is the absurd idea to overcome crime by providing all the “law-abiding” citizens with military weapons. First of all, for anyone who has dealt with criminals, it is clear that they always attack quickly and suddenly. Now imagine a real picture in a similar situation: in order to fight off the attack, remove the gun from the holster, remove the fuse, cause the trigger to the firing position, move the slide to hand in these round into the chamber, aim and make a shot (Goss, 2010). It is theoretically necessary to keep the gun in the one’s hand. It is understood that this is not possible in real life. In addition, self-defense can be successful or
unsuccessful irrespective of whether the person is defending against a criminal with a gun, knife, etc. Self-defense courses, especially for women, become popular, where instructors teach how usual pin or hair clip can be successfully used for protection from attacks. That is, the issue of self-defense is not in the gun, as it is made by the advocates for free sale of weapons.

It should be noted that those who vote for legalization admit that the bill on the free movement of military weapons has both advantages and disadvantages. Indeed, it is useful to look at the problem from this point of view. Unfortunately, it is easy to come to conclusion that is completely against the argument for the sale of combat pistols to everyone. Let's say that, theoretically, some part of the law-abiding citizens is unable to protect themselves and their loved ones from the attacks of criminals (Taber, Cann, & Kucsova, 2009). This is a pro point, however, there are more cons. The “Denver shooter” that is responsible for a slaughter in the theater was neither tried nor a clinical psychopath. Simply, he watched blockbusters, imagined himself a Joker and wanted to show this to the whole world. Anders Breivik, shoot more than 70 people, also bought guns legally and was neither tried nor mentally ill. The investigation has been withdrawn due to his diary, where Breivik wrote that psychological preparation for mass murder during the year played regularly in popular computer “shooter” World of Warcraft. In simple words, there is no guarantee that military weapons will not fall into the hands of people formally healthy, but mentally or emotionally disturbed. A recent case that was widely discussed is where a twelve year old boy stabbed his mother that has forbidden him playing computer games which were violent. This serious problem was discussed on the health discussion boards: “Who we are offering a weapon? Health care data suggests that one in five sick mental illness. According to the World Health Organization, one in four people are not sick, but suffer from a mental disorder. “
Another significant con of the decrease in the gun control is an extremely high rate of domestic violence across the whole country. Here is what the psychologists think about this: “Now citizens in domestic quarrels traumatic used air guns, and medicine can save the victims of these clashes. And if everyone will have the right to carry a firearm, then it will increase the percentage of deaths.”

It is necessary to mention another important fact. Today the country is overwhelmed by a flood of illegal migrants. The level of inter-ethnic conflict in recent years is steadily increasing and the number of victims also increases.

The arguments of opponents of gun control may be understood; the position of U.S. citizens in light of recent events, is not so difficult to be explained (Patton, 2011). Their arguments narrow down to this: walk the streets armed madmen! This statement is hard to argue about, especially if to refer to the statistics of bloody tragedies that have occurred in the U.S. over the past few years:

- August 1966, University of Texas in Austin, TX: 16 killed, 31 wounded.
- July 1985, a McDonald's restaurant in San Ysidro, California: 21 killed, 19 wounded.
- October 1991, Luby's Cafeteria in Killeen, Texas: 23 killed, 22 wounded.
- April 1999, the school “Columbine,” Colorado: 13 killed, 26 wounded.
- April 2007, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia: 32 killed, 27 wounded.
- February 2008, Northern Illinois University, Illinois: 5 killed, 16 wounded.
- March 2009, Coffee County and Geneva County, Alabama: 10 killed, 6 wounded.
- April 2009, the leisure center neighborhood Binghamton, NY: 13 killed, 4 wounded.
- November 2009, Fort Hood, Texas: 13 killed, 24 wounded.
January 2011, shooting in Tucson, Arizona, during which killed six people and injured 13, including U.S. Representative Gabrielle Giffords.

August 2012, killing 12 people and injuring another 58 people in the cinema “Aurora,” Colorado.

Finally, in December 2012, 28 people were killed in elementary school (Lott, 2013).

It is necessary to mention that this is only a little part of the American statistics. In addition, it is easy to recall the recent events in Scotland, Finland and Norway.

There are too many guns in the world. According to the Swiss research group Small Arms Survey, there were 875 million of these in 2007. And 650 million units, according to it, were in private hands. People often use their weapons for completely unjustified reasons. Any conflict can lead to irreparable consequences, if in the hands of its members there would be a firearm (Guha, 2013). Weapons could end up into the hands of children or criminals. Citizens can lose these, or store these in an accessible place where they children may reach them. People can inadvertently cause harm to themselves or others. Any social protests or riots in the “armed” country will be similar to the real war (Samaha, Cook, & Ludwig, 2009). The culprit may be a law-abiding person and in case of excess of self-defense. There is a possibility of increase in the number of suicides. The right to “bear arms” is wartime archaic term, a relic of the past, long-outdated measure that pushes humanity to its past. The permission to bear arms is pushing a person to its use (Branas, Richmond, Culhane, Ten Have, & Wiebe, 2009).

It is also necessary to mention that gun selling is a profitable business. Those who make the “dirty money” will do everything possible to avoid restrictions. For example, circles, lobbying for the interests of the National Rifle Association, USA (National Rifle Association), have a very strong position, both in Congress and in the U.S. Senate.
Surveys conducted by ABC News and the Washington Post, showed that 52% of the American population supports a stricter gun law. A total of more than 200,000 people has signed under numerous petitions demanding the authorities to take the most effective measures to control firearms in the United States. Petition for consideration by the government has collected only 25 thousand signatures.

The initiative to limit the sales of arms and support policies was taken. The representative of the Democratic Party in the Senate, Charles Schumer said in an interview: “I think we're now at a tipping point... When something can be done.” Michael Bloomberg, the Mayor of New York City, is a well-known advocate for stricter weapons laws, and one of the founders of the coalition Mayors against Illegal Weapons, which demanded immediate action from lawmakers: “We need immediate action. We've heard all this rhetoric before.” Democratic senator Diane Feynstin stated that next week, the Senate is going to pass a bill to ban the carrying of assault weapons.

The same document was sent to the House of Representatives. The idea of a ban on the sale and carrying of weapons is also supported by the independent Senator Joseph Lieberman. The representative of the State of New York in Congress Carolyn McCarthy (her husband was the victim of a random street shooting in 1993) suggested a specific action program: a ban on the sale of automatic weapons; withdrawal of the outlets multiply weapons; the introduction of checks on criminal convictions for buyers of weapons at exhibitions and shows; involvement of medical institutions to compile psychological assessments of those wishing to get the license for weapons.

A cautious call to limit the free sale of weapons was given by the President Barack Obama. But the official position of his administration remained quite vague. “At the moment we do not have any special offers (to address violence)... But I think it (the restriction on the sale of
arms) is a part of the solution, but it is too early to say," stated White House spokesman Jay Carney.

Thus, according to the all arguments mentioned above, there is enough evidence in support of the stricter gun control and discourages gun legalization.
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