

Gun control: Five reasons why it won't work

Opinion Friday, February 1st, 2013

Follow

Share

Over one month after the Newtown massacre, people are still talking about tightening gun control in America. Here's why that may not be a good idea.

After the horrific Dec. 14 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Conn., a sense of fear gripped the nation. Stores pulled guns from their shelves. Cities organized gun buyback events. Lawmakers pledged to tighten gun laws. Bulletproof backpack sales spiked, and some kids even took guns to school for protection.

Through it all, the national debate turned once again to gun control: Should citizens even have guns? And what can we do to prevent future shooting tragedies? The Democrat party responded with clamor for more gun control. On Jan. 16, President Barack Obama signed three memorandums and announced 23 executive actions to help "reduce gun violence."

His plan emphasizes stronger background checks, bans on "assault weapons," and more emergency resources in schools. Last Thursday, Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) introduced the "Assault Weapons Ban of 2013" that would ban the sale, transfer, manufacturing and importation of more than 150 types of firearms, including rifles, pistols and shotguns. Feinstein is known for her anti-gun stance. She championed the 1994 Assault Weapons Ban, which expired in 2004 and only banned 18 specific firearms.

Although, gun violence did drop in the 1990's, a University of Pennsylvania study shows that the 1994 ban had too many loopholes and had no statistical effect on the number of mass shootings. Murder and violent crime rates continued to fall even after the ban expired. In addition to pressing for useless gun regulations, many Democrats also engage in political doublespeak. They talk about banning "assault weapons;" however, there is no set definition of an "assault weapon." It is whatever a given individual wants it to be.

They are against "military-style weapons," but these guns bear a purely cosmetic resemblance to military weapons and would never be used by the military. They speak of the dangers of "semi-automatic weapons," which sounds scary until you realize that "semi-automatic" refers to any gun that can shoot more than once without reloading (nearly every gun that shoots is semi-automatic).

They talk about "reducing gun violence" and promoting "gun safety" (can you really argue against reducing violence or promoting safety?) instead of what they're really doing, which is attacking our Constitutionally-guaranteed right to bear arms by tightening gun control laws. But no matter what terminology they use, gun control is not going to work, and here's why:

Reason #1: There are already 300 million privately-owned guns in the U.S. In theory, a more strict gun law could work. In 1996, Australia implemented a strict assault weapons ban with few loopholes. The country banned all semi-automatic rifles and shotguns and spent \$500 million buying approximately 600,000 guns from private citizens. But this isn't Australia.

There are almost 300 million privately-owned guns in America, or about nine guns for every 10 people, which eliminates the possibility of a mass gun-buyback movement. Also, stringent gun control laws have long been politically unpopular in the U.S., especially among Second Amendment advocates. Gun sales soared, and over 100,000 Americans joined the National Rifle Association in wake of a possible gun crackdown.

Reason #2: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." The Second Amendment guarantees the people a way to defend themselves, should the need arise. In past times, arming the population was a safeguard against possible government tyranny