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**Should United States put more restriction on gun ownership** **and use?**

The dispute over arms control laws is considered worldwide as something exclusively American. But the story that underlies it is of global importance as well as its solution is. Weapons are a big, topical and sometimes worrying issue in the US where, according to the Gun Violence Archive, there is a mass shooting on five out of six days, defined as a shootout with four or more casualties, not including the shooter. According to data from the Gun Violence Archive, nine out of ten days of the year witness mass shooting. As such, events are counted in which four or more people suffer gunshot wounds. However, unlike the recent attacks in Las Vegas or Orlando, for example, parts of American society seem to be rethinking, at least among young people. But where does this obsession with weapons come from in America and how has the right to do so developed? In addition to the individual right to abortion, the right to possess firearms is the most controversial law in the United States. While the abortion right on Roe v. Wade, based on a 1973 Supreme Court ruling, the gun ownership right goes back to the 2nd Amendment to the United States Constitution. This was adopted on December 15, 1791 and is part of the "Bill of Rights", i.e. the absolute fundamental rights of every US citizen.

With constant regularity, brutal firearms events are haunting societies around the globe. Whether Port Arthur in Australia, the rampage of Erfurt in Germany or the infamous assassination attempt at Columbine High School in the US, almost every major nation has one or even multiple firearms traumas. Of course, with the return of these events, the corresponding discussion about the consequences is always connected. While some still pray, others are already calling for a modification of arms legislation. Even before the context of the terrible bloodbath of Las Vegas, this serves as an opportunity to provide a commented overview of the most important and common arguments in this discussion. Of course, this article cannot provide a final resolution to such a complex topic and cannot represent every aspect in its full depth, yet it may invite for one or the other reader to form opinions and further discussion. In the following, I will argue from the point of view of the "pro-regulation" page, as this is my conviction.

**1. "Guns do not kill people, people kill people"**

The weapon isn't the reason for the conflict, however just a device, the genuine issue is man. In the discourse one is consequently normally requested to restrict likewise knives, vehicles and baseball, since this could be utilized "similarly as" to murder a person. This contention speaks to a prohibited shortening of the certainties. In spite of the fact that the seed of the contention is without a doubt right the outcome drawn overlooks the likelihood of reviewing. Though people are the genuine issue, the firearm is an acceleration tool. The nearness of a firearm encourages the murdering itself just as its degree impressively. Although human beings are the real problem, the firearm is an escalation tool.

**2. "I want to defend myself!"**

In almost all cases, the gun carrier is put in the role of the defender, just to be able to defend against the above aggression, it is better, I have a gun, because I'm the "good guy" right? Unfortunately it's not that easy. This attitude is based on a simplified world view, according to which there are good, respectable citizens and bad, reprehensible criminals. The former group now has to defend itself against the second, preferably as effectively as possible. But in reality, the boundaries between these categories are often fluid. People often make the leap from righteousness to crime fluently and unplanned because the perception of "right" and "wrong" can be highly subjective. There are disputes on the garden fence that end in a tangible confrontation in which, of course, both parties sincerely swear to the judge that the other one is to blame.

**3. "Wearing weapons is my right: it means freedom!"**

Of course, any interference with the freedom of action of the citizen must be justified. This is a normal process of weighing goods. One considers how great the risk of a given situation is, and what the price for reducing this risk ultimately is. In this case, a general prohibition of war weapons and a strong regulation of hunting and sporting weapons seem appropriate. As with the use of other potentially dangerous equipment, careful training and testing is useful, common and necessary.

**4. "Why do not we just ban cars? There are many more people dying! "**

At first glance, this argument also carries a strong core, because its content is very close to the "Guns do not kill people". But here the weighing up of goods is important: The mobility of society is a central part of prosperity and brings many advantages. The approximately 3,000 traffic fatalities per year are accepted, insofar as probably more victims can be expected if the benefits of this mobility disappear. Can the advocates of freedom of arms claim similar benefits? What is the advantage of the weapon for us, rather than justifying the disadvantages of weapon abuse?

**5. "A society without weapons cannot defend itself against tyrants"**

This argument aims at the defense of the citizens and can be arbitrarily inflated. It occurs in mild forms (e.g. colonial war of independence against Great Britain) as well as in extreme (e.g. Nazi Germany). This idea is also the main cause of the infamous second constitutional amendment in the US Constitution, because the citizen should always be able to defend himself against state oppression. In the matter, however, it is not very timely. The second amendment dates back to a time when a collection of musket-wielding citizens was a serious and difficult-to-counter threat to an authority figure. However, in the age of armored infantry vehicles, helicopters, autonomous weapon systems, etc., the individual increasingly degenerates into a military-technical extras. Here, a person can certainly oppose with an assault rifle or a handgun of "state power". However, this at most benefits one's own pride, and there is no actual potential for revolution, not even in smaller groups. From this perspective, I would rather rely on other mechanisms, such as a civilian-educated army.

**6. "Criminals do not stick to prohibitions anyway!"**

This is clear at first sight if criminals somehow happened to comply with the law, they would not be criminal. Thus disallows a weapons boycott just the "legit" individuals who at that point can never again defend against the lawbreakers. Aside from the way that this refinement isn't generally so natural, this contention frequently goes past the real reasons for the prohibition on arms: Illegality implies more "barriers to detection". Obviously I can even now get hold of an illicit weapon on the off chance that I need to yet it is normally progressively costly and conveys the danger of being gotten. Assume that ten rough guilty parties plan a ridiculous demonstration and need to get a weapon for it. If these people, as in the US possible, just walk into the next arms shop and get a weapon under minimal conditions, so the probability that one of them is prevented of course equal to zero. A few words on paper have certainly not stop anyone. So here it remains to be stated that a weapons ban must actually be imposed with proper measures. The second aspect rarely appears in discussions: the normative nature of laws. Laws are not only as described in practical action or "barriers". They are also an expression of a social declaration of intent. Through laws, we learn what is "common" and what is "normal."

**7. "When all are armed, a criminal thinks twice if he ever attacks"**

The notorious "balance of terror", the logic of atomic armament at the interpersonal level. However, in my opinion, this argument is based on a false premise: use of arms is rarely rational. If it happens in the affect not anyway, but not otherwise. People who use firearms have usually already crossed a certain threshold of despair and determination.

**Conclusion**

Whenever a cruel shooting incident happen, the United States will be shocked and uplifted. It will also generate a round of discussions about whether or not to ban the gun. However, it is often after a slobber, and the reflection on the shooting case is more of a suspect. Motivation and other issues. Private gun control has always been a complex issue in American society, but there is little controversy about whether the fundamental citizen can hold guns or whether the government has the right to ban guns. The law governing the proper control of firearms is also constantly being introduced.

Although the United States does not ban guns, it has strict control over firearms. The laws governing guns are numerous and complicated. There are federal gun laws, state gun laws, cities, county and town gun regulations, and even shops and individuals can formulate response rules. Under the ever-improving law of gun control, the guns used by criminals for crimes are more illegally acquired or held. Many people support the ban on guns and give examples of gun support and crime rates. In fact, since 1976, Washington has imposed a 32-year ban on guns, and the murder rate has not decreased but has increased significantly. What is even more puzzling is that the more severe the ban on guns, the higher the crime rate seems. In 2008, the US Supreme Court ruled that the Washington City ban on guns was unconstitutional, providing an important precedent for the "anti-forbidden" in other parts of the United States to solve the ban, and declared that the ban on guns is impossible; in 2010, the Supreme Court voted to ban Chicago. The gun order was unconstitutional and expanded the scope of the constitutional provisions guaranteeing citizens’ freedom of guns, which means that American citizens have the right to hold guns in all states.
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