

NAME: _____ HOUR: _____

ARTICLE ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

CONSIDERING ALL SIDES OF THE GUN CONTROL ARGUMENT

DIRECTIONS:

Read each article & summarize the arguments made & the information contained in the article supporting the author's stand on the issue of gun control. (60 points)

When you have completed the summary and analysis of each article on a separate paper, in a well-defined essay take a stand on the issue of gun control. Remember to use evidence from the texts (articles) you read to support your claim. (100 points)

Sample outline:

Paragraph 1: Introduction

- Explain the topic
- Thesis: your view on the issue

Paragraph 2: Body Paragraph

- Give one supporting reason for your thesis and explain in a well develop paragraph

Paragraph 3: Body Paragraph

- Give one supporting reason for your thesis and explain in a well develop paragraph

Paragraph 4: Body Paragraph

- Give one supporting reason for your thesis and explain in a well develop paragraph

Paragraph 5: Conclusion

- Summarize your main points and thesis

THIS IS A TEST GRADE, TAKE IT SERIOUSLY, THIS SHOULD BE SOME OF YOUR BEST WORK

ARTICLE ANALYSIS & SUMMARY:

ARTICLE TITLE/ AUTHOR: _____

What is the author's stand on the issue of gun control (pro/con/neutral)? _____

What are at least 4 arguments the author gives that supports his/her claim? _____

ARTICLE TITLE/ AUTHOR: _____

What is the author's stand on the issue of gun control (pro/con/neutral)? _____

What are at least 4 arguments the author gives that supports his/her claim? _____

ARTICLE TITLE/ AUTHOR: _____

What is the author's stand on the issue of gun control (pro/con/neutral)? _____

What are at least 4 arguments the author gives that supports his/her claim? _____

EDITION
US

INFORM • INSPIRE • ENTERTAIN • EMPOWER


[NEWS](#) [POLITICS](#) [ENTERTAINMENT](#) [WELLNESS](#) [WHAT'S WORKING](#) [VOICES](#) [VIDEO](#) [ALL SECTIONS](#) [Q](#)

THE BLOG

Did the Wild West Have More Gun Control Than We Do Today?

09/09/2011 03:42 pm ET | Updated Nov 09, 2011

1k

Like 5.9K


 Adam Winkler
 Professor of Law, UCLA

After a decision by the Supreme Court affirming the right of individuals to own guns, then-Chicago Mayor Richard Daley sarcastically said, "Then why don't we do away with the court system and go back to the Old West, you have a gun and I have a gun and we'll settle it in the streets?" This is a common refrain heard in the gun debate. Gun control advocates fear — and gun rights proponents sometimes hope — the Second Amendment will transform our cities into modern-day versions of Dodge.

Yet this is all based on a widely shared misunderstanding of the Wild West. Frontier towns — places like Tombstone, Deadwood, and Dodge — actually had the most restrictive gun control laws in the nation.

In fact, many of those same cities have far less burdensome gun control today than they did back in the 1800s.

Guns were obviously widespread on the frontier. Out in the untamed wilderness, you needed a gun to be safe from bandits, natives, and wildlife. In the cities and towns of the West, however, the law often prohibited people from toting their guns around. A visitor arriving in Wichita, Kansas in 1873, the heart of the Wild West era, would have seen signs declaring, "Leave Your Revolvers At Police Headquarters, and Get a Check."

A check? That's right. When you entered a frontier town, you were legally required to leave your guns at the stables on the outskirts of town or drop them off with the sheriff, who would give you a token in exchange. You checked your guns then like you'd check your overcoat today at a Boston restaurant in winter. Visitors were welcome, but their guns were not.

In my new book, *Gunfight: The Battle over the Right to Bear Arms in America*, there's a photograph taken in Dodge City in 1879. Everything looks exactly as you'd imagine: wide, dusty road; clapboard and brick buildings; horse ties in front of the saloon. Yet right in the middle of the street is something you'd never expect. There's a huge wooden billboard announcing, "The Carrying of Firearms Strictly Prohibited."

TRENDING

**Sad New Poll Shows
Trump And Clinton
Basically Tied In
Missouri**

**Todd Marinovich, Ex-
NFL Player, Found
Naked In A Yard,
Arrested For Drugs**

**The Killing Of Khalid
Jabara Is An American
Tragedy**

**Why The Clinton
Campaign Isn't
Attacking Trump As A
Flip-Flopper**

**Maisie Williams Freaks
Out Over 'Game Of
Thrones' Season 7**

While people were allowed to have guns at home for self-protection, frontier towns usually barred anyone but law enforcement from carrying guns in public.

When Dodge City residents organized their municipal government, do you know what the very first law they passed was? A gun control law. They declared that "any person or persons found carrying concealed weapons in the city of Dodge or violating the laws of the State shall be dealt with according to law." Many frontier towns, including Tombstone, Arizona—the site of the infamous "Shootout at the OK Corral"—also barred the carrying of guns openly.

Today in Tombstone, you don't even need a permit to carry around a firearm. Gun rights advocates are pushing lawmakers in state after state to do away with nearly all limits on the ability of people to have guns in public.

Like any law regulating things that are small and easy to conceal, the gun control of the Wild West wasn't always perfectly enforced. But statistics show that, next to drunk and disorderly conduct, the most common cause of arrest was illegally carrying a firearm. Sheriffs and marshals took gun control seriously.

Although some in the gun community insist that more guns equals less crime, in the Wild West they discovered that gun control can work. Gun violence in these towns was far more rare than we commonly imagine. Historians who've studied the numbers have determined that frontier towns averaged less than two murders a year. Granted, the population of these towns was small. Nevertheless, these were not places where duels at high noon were commonplace. In fact, they almost never occurred.

Why is our image of the Wild West so wrong? Largely for the same reason these towns adopted gun control laws in the first place: economic development. Residents wanted limits on guns in public because they wanted to attract businesspeople and civilized folk. What prospective storeowner was going to move to Deadwood if he was likely to be robbed when he brought his daily earnings to the bank?

Once the frontier was closed, those same towns glorified a supposedly violent past in order to attract tourists and the businesses to serve them. Gunfights were extremely rare in frontier towns, but these days you can see a reenactment of the one at the OK Corral several times a day. Don't forget to buy a souvenir!

The story of guns in America is far more complex and surprising than we've often been led to believe. We've always had a right to bear arms, but we've also always had gun control. Even in the Wild West, Americans balanced these two and enacted laws restricting guns in order to promote public safety. Why should it be so hard to do the same today?

Follow Adam Winkler on Twitter: www.twitter.com/adamwinkler

Hillary believes we are stronger together.

I'm with her

PARADE WITH US TODAY AND BE A PART OF THE MOVEMENT


More: [Politics](#) [Supreme Court](#) [Gun Control](#) [Second Amendment](#) [Guns](#)


SUBSCRIBE AND FOLLOW


Get top stories and blog posts emailed to me each day. Newsletters may offer personalized content or advertisements. [Learn more](#)


[address@email.com](#)

Subscribe Now →

 1.83 M

 877 K

 411 K

 Podcast



Add us on Snapchat

It's Time to Ban Guns. Yes, All of Them.

BY PHOEBE MALTZ BOVY

December 10, 2015

Ban guns. All guns. Get rid of guns in homes, and on the streets, and, as much as possible, on police. Not just because of San Bernardino, or whichever mass shooting may pop up next, but also not *not* because of those. Don't sort the population into those who might do something evil or foolish or self-destructive with a gun and those who surely will not. As if this could be known—as if it could be assessed without massively violating civil liberties and stigmatizing the mentally ill. Ban guns! Not just gun violence. Not just certain guns. Not just already-technically-illegal guns. All of them.

I used to refer to my position on this issue as being in favor of gun control. Which is true, except that “gun control” at its most radical still tends to refer to bans on *certain* weapons and closing loopholes. The recent *New York Times* front-page editorial, as much as it infuriated some, was still too tentative. “Certain kinds of weapons, like the slightly modified combat rifles used in California, and certain kinds of ammunition, must be outlawed for civilian ownership,” the paper argued, making the case for “reasonable regulation,” nothing more. Even the rare ban-guns arguments involve prefacing and hedging and disclaimers. “We shouldn't ‘take them away’ from people who currently own them, necessarily,” writes Hollis Phelps in *Salon*. Oh, but we should.

I say this not to win some sort of ideological purity contest, but because *banning guns* urgently needs to become a rhetorical and conceptual possibility. The national conversation needs to shift from one extreme—an acceptance, ranging from complacent to enthusiastic, of an individual right to own guns—to another, which requires people who are not politicians to speak their minds. And this will only happen if the Americans who are quietly convinced that guns are terrible speak out.

Their wariness, as far as I can tell, comes from two issues: a readiness to accept the Second Amendment as a refutation, and a reluctance to impose “elite” culture on parts of the country where guns are popular. (There are other reasons as well, not least a fear of getting shot.) And there's the extent to which it's just so *ingrained* that banning guns is impossible, legislatively and pragmatically, which dramatically weakens the anti-gun position.

The first issue shouldn't be so complicated. It doesn't take specialized expertise in constitutional law to understand that current U.S. gun law gets its parameters from Supreme Court interpretations of the Second Amendment. But it's right there in the First Amendment that we don't have to simply nod along with what follows. That the Second Amendment has been liberally interpreted doesn't prevent any of us from saying it's been misinterpreted, or that it should be repealed.

When you find yourself assuming that everyone who has a more nuanced (or just pro-gun) argument is simply better read on the topic, remember that opponents of abortion aren't wondering whether they should have a more nuanced view of abortion because of *Roe v. Wade*. They're not keeping their opinions to themselves until they've got a term paper's worth of material proving that they've studied the relevant case law.

Then there is the privilege argument. If you grew up somewhere in America where gun culture wasn't a thing (as is my situation; I'm an American living in Canada), or even just in a family that would have never considered gun ownership, you'll probably be accused of looking down your nose at gun culture. As if gun ownership were simply a cultural tradition to be respected, and not, you know, about *owning guns*. Guns... I mean, must it really be spelled out what's different? It's absurd to reduce an anti-gun position to a snooty aesthetic preference.

There's also a more progressive version of this argument, and a more contrarian one, which involves suggesting that an anti-gun position is racist, because crackdowns on guns are criminal-justice interventions. Progressives who might have been able to brush off accusations of anti-rural-white classism may have a tougher time confronting arguments about the disparate impact gun control policies can have on marginalized communities.

These, however, are criticisms of certain tentative, insufficient gun control measures—the ones that would leave small-town white families with legally-acquired guns well enough alone, allowing them to shoot themselves or one another and to let their guns enter the general population.

Ban Guns, meanwhile, is not discriminatory in this way. It's not about dividing society into "good" and "bad" gun owners. It's about placing gun ownership *itself* in the "bad" category. It's worth adding that the anti-gun position is ultimately about police not carrying guns, either. That could never happen, right? Well, certainly not if we keep on insisting on its impossibility.

Ask yourself this: Is the pro-gun side concerned with how *it* comes across? More to the point: Does the fact that someone opposes gun control demonstrate that they're culturally sensitive to the concerns of small-town whites, as well as deeply committed to fighting police brutality against blacks nationwide? I'm going to go with *no* and *no* on these. (The NRA exists!)

On the pro-gun-control side of things, there's far too much timidity. What's needed to stop all gun violence is a vocal *ban guns* contingent. Getting bogged down in discussions of what's feasible keeps what needs to happen—*no more guns*—from entering the realm of possibility. Public opinion needs to shift. The no-guns stance needs to be an identifiable place on the spectrum, embraced unapologetically, if it's to be reckoned with.

Phoebe Maltz Bovy is a writer living in Toronto. She is writing a book with St. Martin's Press about the idea of privilege (2017).

@tweeteration

Gun control is not the answer: Opposing view

Robert Farago 3:59 p.m. EST December 4, 2015

There will always be people who fall through the cracks.



(Photo: James Quigg, The (Victorville, Calif.) Daily Press, via AP)

Even before the bodies were cold in the San Bernardino mass shooting, President Obama called for more gun control. He urged Congress (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/obama-responds-to-san-bernardino-shooting/>) to pass a law banning firearms purchases for people on the Transportation Security Administration's unaccountable, unconstitutional no-fly list.

Wait. What? What would that have done to prevent the slaughter? By the same token, what would any gun control law do to prevent evil people from enacting their homicidal plans, be they Chicago gang-bangers or a religious zealot attacking a Planned Parenthood clinic? Nothing.

No assault weapons ban, no gun violence restraining order, no ammunition magazine capacity law would have prevented the San Bernardino slaughter. No gun control law has stopped Robert L. Dear Jr. from allegedly killing three people in Colorado.

There's only one way to stop killers from killing: Put them where they can't get access to a gun, knife, explosives, car or any other lethal weapon. Put them in jail or a secure mental institution.

How do we know whom to incarcerate, when and for how long? That's a question worthy of debate — and due process. Certainly, criminals who commit violent offenses shouldn't enjoy "revolving door" justice. And there are numerous examples of obviously and dangerously psychotic individuals, such as Newtown killer Adam Lanza and Aurora shooter James Holmes, who should have been institutionalized.



USA TODAY

Another (mass shooting) day in the USA: Our view

(<http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2015/12/02/mass-shootings-colorado-springs-san-bernardino-editorials-debates/76698044/>)

But there will always be people who fall through the cracks. There will always be evil men among us. Truth be told, they view gun control laws with the same contempt that they view laws against murder.

The incrementalist argument — that more or better gun control will derail some killers — ignores the fact that these measures make it harder for law-abiding Americans to exercise their natural, civil and constitutionally protected right to keep and bear arms. A right that protects them against those who would do them harm.

As the French terrorist attacks proved, gun control doesn't work. Worse, civilian disarmament leaves innocent people defenseless against killers. Gun control enables — rather than prevents — homicide.

Robert Farago is the publisher of [thetruthaboutguns.com](http://www.thetruthaboutguns.com) (<http://www.thetruthaboutguns.com/>).

Read or Share this story: <http://usat.ly/1QfXSyp>