

Jacob Longhurst

Mr. Illario

CJ 1010

November 24, 2016

Gun Rights vs. Gun Control

“No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms.” Thomas Jefferson believed in the inalienable human right to defend themselves from oppression, tyranny, and other man. He was probably one of the greatest proponents of the right to bear arms. His belief was if a countries people are armed and disciplined they wouldn’t fall easily to the tyranny of government dictators. Many have questioned just what exactly does this right entail? Does it cover sniper rifles, or anti aircraft weapons capable of hitting a target from a mile away, or does it include everything except for hand guns. There are a million reports from people on both sides of this issue stating that their belief is correct. While we discuss this keep in mind some of these questions. What exactly are humanities inalienable rights to bear weapons? Where do we draw the line between gun control and those rights? Which weapons should we allow our citizens to carry? How can we possibly seem to please both sides on this issue? How do we cut through all the bureaucracy of governments to provide the American people with the best law possible? One of the most pertinent questions we should be asking ourselves is “What is right and what is wrong? How much of this is the written law and how much of this is our interpretation of law?” Providing answers to these common questions are at the heart of providing reasonable and morally right laws, while always keeping in mind our justice system, the law, and what is morally right.

Let's start with our first question "What exactly are humanities inalienable rights to bear arms?" For this we need to ask the question, "what does our constitution say?" According to our constitution and the Amendments, specifically the second amendment, states, "...the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." Now clearly this states that the rights of the people extend to owning and bearing arms. Regardless of state boundaries this is a Federal law and applies to every state in the nation, and any other law cannot infringe this right. The debate has long been, not about "IF" we have the right to bear arms, but specifically what types of guns and what type of weapons we are allowed to own and carry. There is a hot debate regarding this question, "what types of weapons do we allow our citizens to own and operate". In order to answer that question we have to weigh freedom and security against one another. Where does security step into the reign of freedom, and how much of this security is necessary? The NRA and those who are pro-gun would say that the government has no right to infringe upon which type of small weapons we can own, provided we follow the law in owning and operating one. While others who are against it state we shouldn't be able to own automatic rifles that are capable of firing 30 rounds in less than seven seconds. Many of the arguments for this restriction of automatic rifles are that they can be used in the mass murder of American citizens. However, if we take a step back and look at the statistics we will see that the murder rate for handguns is much higher than that of assault rifles. It would seem to me then, that the best course of action if we wanted to secure our American people would be to limit the availability of hand guns or ban them altogether yet this is rarely if ever discussed. To some it may seem that those wanting to take guns away are doing so mainly to usurp more control over the American people. It could be that they feel eliminating the use of handguns to be purely impossible while banning assault rifles from American citizens is more approachable and accomplishable.

Pleasing both groups of Americans seems to be impossible when it comes to gun control. The trouble with pleasing both sides is that they want completely different things. One side wants the complete freedom to own and bear arms however they see fit and the other wants to ban guns where they see fit in the name of security. However, there may be just the solution but it won't come from laws and bills, it will come from the ability to see the others point of view. We have to view the issue through the others eyes. That means understanding why they want to restrict gun control and why they want to allow complete freedom of gun rights. After we have come to understand our "enemy", as some may call another who disagrees with them, we can work together to come to a "happy median". I believe we must judge our view and our bearing on what the law actually is, then evaluate if that law is acceptable or not, after that we can pass judgment and enact new laws to further advance the human condition. Our law clearly states that the American people have the right to bear arms, and this law came from our founding fathers deep desire to preserve this new land (America) from tyranny. That is the single greatest defense in a pro gun debate, that we have the right, that can never be taken from us, to protect ourselves from others and to protect our freedom from a tyrannical government. Our founding fathers that created this government knew just how easily a monarch or aristocracy could take over a nation and enact laws that burden or imprison its citizens. To this end was our second amendment written and adopted into law, so that no government could ever do to its citizens what England did to our founding fathers. From this view, to me there seems no argument for the restriction of weapons from a governments citizens. In fact, according to the Small Arms Survey, which measured gun ownership to homicide rates, they've concluded, "that more guns equals fewer homicides." In America there is roughly 1 firearm to every 1 person, and the homicide rate is the

lowest in all “developed countries”. A correlation of this magnitude may mean nothing, or it could mean everything. Despite Switzerland and Israel having very high gun possession rates, their “firearm homicide rates are extremely low... Switzerland had a firearms homicide rate of .77 per 100,000 people and Israel has a rate of just .09 per 100,000.” Now that may seem like circumstantial evidence or irrelevant, however, to me it seems like a very good explanation why gun control would hurt the safety of the American people. There are no clear studies or reports to support the idea that restricting gun access to citizens prevents criminals from finding, owning, and operating weapons in a malicious fashion. For myself, I would be much less likely to attack someone who is armed than someone who is not. Therefore restricting weapons only hurts the citizens, not the criminals, as a person who is determined to hurt someone else will find a way to make that happen.

Through all of this there is one answer that trumps all others, “What is right and what is wrong? What is law and what is not?” First, let's look at what's morally right? Morally right would be to protect American lives as long as it does not infringe on the freedoms of those American lives. There is a delicate balance between security and freedom. We have to ensure that we keep the rights of our American people while also securing their lives. This can't be done if we have our own agenda's such as preying on the grieving hearts of our citizens in order to remove automatic weapons. If we truly want to protect our citizens we need to follow the data we have received and use that as our guide to enact laws that protect our citizens to provide a better life for them and for their children. That will be our guide to answer the next question of what is law and what is not. It is not acceptable to determine which laws in our constitution we will follow; rather it is only acceptable to say how we follow them. That how, means all the difference from gun control and gun restriction. Restricting the types of weapons we are allowed

to own and operate is something, to me, that is neither allowed nor acceptable. The only course that is acceptable is how we can use these weapons not if we can use them. What laws we enact and how we enact them will speak volumes for our beliefs in the laws our founding fathers made to preserve and protect our inalienable human rights.

Work Cited

"Second Amendment." *LII / Legal Information Institute*. Cornell University, n.d. Web. 20 Nov. 2016.

Howerton, Jason. "Gun Experts: Limits on Magazine Size Will Only Slow Determined Killer Down by a Few Seconds." *TheBlaze*. The Blaze, 13 Jan. 2013. Web. 21 Nov. 2016.

Denniston, Lyle. "Constitution Check: What Does It Mean That There Is a Right to." *Constitution Daily*. National Constitution Center, 06 Feb. 2014. Web. 21 Nov. 2016.

"Gun Quotations of the Founding Fathers." *Gun Quotations of the Founding Fathers | Buckeye Firearms Association*. Midnet Media, n.d. Web. 20 Nov. 2016.

"Comparing Murder Rates and Gun Ownership across Countries - Crime Prevention Research Center." *Crime Prevention Research Center*. N.p., 31 Mar. 2014. Web. 12 Dec. 2016.