



Free Essay Samples **Should Laws On Gun-Control Be More Strict**

Roughly 30,000 men, women and children are murdered in the United States every year at the barrel of a firearm. Whether it is in educational institutions, cinema theaters, work environments, places of worship or on live TV, the world is confronted by a security crisis of weapon savagery. Uncontrolled possession and utilization of guns, particularly handguns, is a genuine risk to society's wellbeing in light of the fact that weapons are one of the primary catalysts of purposeful and accidental attacks and murders. It is necessary for there to be a period of waiting before acquiring any type of gun, and for people to pass background screenings for them to be allowed to buy guns. Governments should impose mandated sanctions for offenses committed using guns, including being found in unlawful possession of one (Kleck, & Patterson 264)

There is no logical explanation that justifies the ease of acquiring guns, including war firearms, with the number of crime, drug abuse, mental illness, and domestic violence cases, and the growing number of extremists in our homes and away. We have witnessed enough murders of students, colleagues, Christians, - we don't want to hear any more attacks of talented artists like Christina Grimmie or good leaders such as Gabrielle Giffords, so we want stricter firearm legislation (Frank 735). Is it necessary for a regular citizen to be in position of a high-powered rifle or an assault firearm meant for military use? It is an irresponsible lie to claim that society would be safer with more guns. Apparently, history proves otherwise. When people have weapons at the ready, they never have time to weigh their murderous intentions before taking actions that cause loss of lives. It accelerates the translation of their hateful impulses into assault.

Communities, especially those who are prone to prevalent discrimination, are grossly affected every day because there is no law to appropriately save the citizens

from firearm violence. Instances from most parts of the world clearly demonstrate that legislations that restrict acquisitions and utilization of guns dramatically reduce violent offenses. Common sense tells us that we should come up with firearm legislation changes that keep weapons out of the hands of lawbreakers and the socially unstable while upholding capable weapon holders. There is so much at stake, the expenses are too high, and we do not need to be hesitant to continue battling for sound judgment reforms. If you have never been affected by our weak gun laws, then you should at least speak up for those who have been victims of this silly firearm viciousness in this nation. The surest way to see that children and teens are free from the gun-related injuries is to do away with firearms in our homes and communities. Furthermore, we can put an end to the negative effects of firearms in the lives of our young ones by enacting a robust and practical gun ban.

Nevertheless, it is arguable that increasing gun restriction in the law cannot stop those who are evil from doing bad things. Unfortunately, legislation cannot take away human nature. No matter how many laws we can make, it is logical that there will still be some people who will deliberately carry on with their evil acts. Over-restrictive gun laws like the ones in South Carolina make it impossible for innocent civilians to save themselves from people with evil intent. That is very dangerous because it leaves possession of the weapons as a preserve of the criminals only. Some people own weapons to attack, others buy them for defense. It is in the public domain that nine innocent people were murdered this year in gun-restricted area by an insane man who was playing with a gun. We cannot point the finger at firearms for the general population's ineptitude. Firearms don't execute individuals, individuals murder individuals. People who keep firearms in their homes will confirm that you don't see them go off without anyone else's input and murder people. This is on account of they don't have capacity to reason. It is only possible for somebody to be injured by the guns if another person pulls the trigger, or if one decides to commit suicide, which is a decision and not an accident.

I recall the story of an adolescent boy who was attacked in Chicago by a gang of his peers who hit him with a piece of timber. The story just died soon after the incident. You can imagine how big news that would have been if they had used a gun. The media would have most probably focused on illegality of the weapon used (James 13). To be fair, this story should have caused some calls to ban timber too. No logger went into trouble for releasing a dangerous arm. In the past two decades, weapon possession has expanded more than 12 times while in the meantime, firearm murders and gun offenses have diminished nearly 60% over time. Rather than putting forth uninformed arguments on the basis of what they see in news only, people who lobby for more legislation should do research and get some facts.

-
1. Jacobs, James B. *Can gun control work?*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
 2. Kleck, Gary, and E. Britt Patterson. "The impact of gun control and gun ownership levels on violence rates." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 9.3 (1993): 249-287.
 3. Zimring, Frank. "Is gun control likely to reduce violent killings?." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 35.4 (1968): 721-737.