

# Why There is No Need for Gun Control in the US

The United States has the largest number of people that own guns, with an average of eight individuals in every ten having guns, an approximate 270 million guns in the hands of citizens — which is the largest ratio of guns per capita in the world. Of the population, 22 out of 100 Americans have more than one gun, with women in this category holding 12 percent, while men hold 35 percent (DeGrazia, p. 56-76). Over time, there have been attempts to impose regulations to limit gun ownership in the country, something that does not only violate Americans' rights, but is something that is also unjustifiable.

One of the strongest cases for the legalization of guns is in the second amendment that was done on the United States' constitution, which explicitly mentions that the rights for citizens to own guns should not be infringed. It should be noted that Americans owning guns is something that is even older than the country itself. This was recognized by the US Supreme Court during its ruling on the District of Columbia et al. vs. Heller's case where the court ruled that the second amendment sought to protect the rights of private citizens, who are not connected to the military, to own arms and to use them for traditional uses that are deemed lawful — like defending themselves in their homes (Rostron). From the traditional use of arms in America, read together with the constitution and the Supreme Court ruling, it is understood that Americans have a right to own and bear arms, which is an essential aspect of their liberties and freedom— similar to other liberties like right to worship and free speech, among others that are protected by the government. Essentially, the government needs to protect this right, meaning that introducing gun control laws would be violating this expressed freedom.

Another reason not to control the ownership of guns, is that despite the arguments that suggest controlling them would help reduce crime rates, this is not backed up by statistics, and is misleading. According to an investigation that was carried out from 1980 to 2009, it was noted that the bans on assault weapons that were imposed in the United States did not have a significant impact on the number of murders in the states the bans were imposed. Actually, the states where there were restrictions on carrying concealed weapons ended up having higher rates of murder. Furthermore, it is noted that in the twentieth century, the number of guns in the United States was more than two times that of the previous century — which is something that may have led to the considerable reduction in the number of murders. Considering that criminals do not obey legislations that are in place, coming up with laws to regulate the use of guns would only contribute to increase the amount of gun usage by criminals who will terrorize the civilians that do not have guns to protect themselves (Blocher, p.

813).

Another reason not to control gun ownership is that this would violate the right of citizens to defend themselves, and in turn, denies them a chance to feel safe. Data from the National Rifle Association reveals that people use guns 2.5 million times annually to protect themselves. Considering that police are not in a position to protect every single citizen, instituting strict gun laws would create a situation where civilians have a tough time protecting themselves. The right to self-defense is a natural right that is borrowed from the right to life, where one would be required to defend themselves from people who intend to end others' lives. Regulating the ownership and use of guns would mean that people would

have limited means to self-defense, and a subsequent hindrance to the right to life, especially when the police are not in a position to offer personalized security to all citizens (Ayres, Ian, and Fredrick)

Through gun control laws, the government and government institutions would infringe on the privacy of citizens. Conducting background checks, as a prerequisite to own a gun would require that the government establish databases to store personal information in relation to people that own guns, such as their names, address, psychological health history, and other potentially private information. Establishing these databases for an indefinite period would create a leeway for their usage in unprecedented motifs, different from that it was originally collected. Besides, the Constitution allows American civilians to own guns and firearms without surveillance from the government, meaning that the establishment of such database and the collection of private information is an infringement of their privacy by the government and its institutions.

There is no need to control the ownership and use of guns, but the government needs to enhance education for the safe usage of guns. There is a consensus that guns do not kill, rather guns are used by people to kill, or to harm others. This means people need to be taught and educated on the need for the safe and responsible use of guns, rather than imposing a bracket ban on the use and ownership of guns. Firearm accidents are also common in different parts of America; an aspect that demonstrates that people that have guns, or those that access these guns, do not have a sufficient education on their usage. This education should be conducted for all people in society, including the children that are growing up, to make sure that they get to understand the need for the responsible use of firearms. Ideally, there are several things in society that are harmful when used for the wrong reasons, but useful when used for the right reasons. Guns should be treated like one of these items.

Lastly, these potential gun control laws are discriminatory to certain people in society — which would serve to violate their rights and liberties to fair treatment. Most of these guns control laws demand people to pay certain amounts of money to be allowed to own guns. This would inhibit the right of poor citizens who cannot afford the fees required to own guns, while according to this liberty, the rich would still be able to afford the fees required. Other forms of discrimination could be derived from personal records that are collected and used to determine whether an individual will be allowed to own guns, especially in relation to their health and criminal records, where certain groups of people could be hindered from owning guns since they have previous psychological health issues or criminal records, despite these instances likely having no impact on their predictability to cause harm.

On the contrary, there are some pieces of evidence that could be used to regulate the use of guns in America. While regulating the ownership and use of these guns could violate the rights of citizens, some of these issues need to be critically analyzed, with more research being conducted to ascertain their credibility and contribution towards effective use of guns. Nonetheless, these should not be used to violate the rights of ownership that are expressed in the constitution. One of these is the argument that while the constitution provides the right to own guns, this is not an unlimited right, meaning it could be infringed under certain circumstances. Besides, this right does not prohibit the need for other laws that would contribute toward the effective use of these guns. This means that there is a need to consider making legislations that would promote the effective and safe use of guns, without infringing on the right to ownership. Another reason to impose regulations on gun control is to reduce the chances of criminals stealing these guns from their owners. There is a need for legislation that would make sure the

guns that are in circulation, or in the hands of civilians, are monitored, to make sure that they are not in the reach of criminals (DeGrazia, p. 1-25.).

The second amendment gives the right to ownership and use of arms to American citizens. This means that the government needs to make sure that this right is not infringed upon though gun laws, most of which have been found to lead to the infringement of the right to privacy and have been found to be not effective, discriminatory, and to deprive the sense of safety of the people. However, there are arguments that these gun control laws could enhance the safe and effective use of guns, and arguments that the second amendment does not expressly abolish any legislation that would enhance the use of guns. These are valid concerns, which could be considered to make sure that the guns people own are used in a safe manner (DeGrazia, and Lester).