Gun violence : guns are not the problem

Every time America has to face the horrors of a mass shooting, calls for gun control arise nationwide. However, three American opinion pieces, two dated 2018 in National Review and The Colby Echo and one from 2019 in The Federalist, vehemently argue against this idea while two charts/graphs from 2016 to 2018 published on the BBC website provide statistics about gun-related deaths in the US. Why should gun control be regarded as a false solution to gun violence when laws already exist to prevent terrible tragedies ?

All articles, written in the wake of mass shootings, agree such killings are an issue ; however their authors fiercely object to any kind of gun control as a potentially relevant solution - despite the figures showing in the first graph that the US is by far the country with the highest percentage of gun-related killings (73% against 38% to 3% elsewhere).

To begin with, documents 1&2 debunk the anti-gun lobbyists’ specific vilifying of assault weapons, insisting that those guns are the most commonly used by Americans and represent only 2% of the guns involved in violent crimes – thereby blaming/accusing anti-gun lobbyists for/of using spurious arguments to promote their ideas. Indeed both the NR and R.Parson in doc2 claim that gun control advocates deliberately conflate statistics on all kinds of gun violence, including suicides or accidents for instance, in order to dishonestly justify their stance – a viewpoint actually supported by the second graph showing that on the 38,658 gun deaths in 2016, “only” 71 occurred in a mass shooting.

For all three authors the issue is not guns but the failure of public authorities to properly enforce existing laws. Indeed they argue that both gunmen of Parkland and Dayton mass shootings had repeatedly been signaled to the police and the FBI as potentially dangerous – warnings that these authorities failed to take into consideration, thus doing nothing to stop them before they could act.

They maintain that rather than introducing new and redundant laws like the Red Flag laws intended to remove firearms from someone deemed potentially dangerous or confiscating people’s guns, which according to the Federalist would be unconstitutional and hardly feasible , the solution lies first and foremost in a strict enforcement of the existing system which is reliable if rigorously applied by the institutions whose job is to enforce laws. They claim that the right the Constitution gives people to defend themselves with guns is needed and that contrary to what gun control advocates pretend, undiscerning restrictive gun laws applicable to all citizens will not solve the issue of gun violence in the US.

*440 words*

Qq remarques pour tirer au maximum profit de cette correction au-delà d’un corrigé lié à un dossier précis :

- Vous noterez la construction générale qui fait en sorte que chaque paragraphe du corps de la synthèse débute par l’idée principale qui le sous-tend ; puis viennent les explications et précisions.

- Je n’ai pas fait de véritable conclusion séparée mais une phrase conclusive à la fin de ma deuxième et dernière partie. Cette phrase conclusive s’inspire là aussi du dossier.

- Vous noterez également les différentes façons d’amener les idées pour bien montrer de qui / de quelle source proviennent ces idées et arguments sans utiliser toujours le même type de formulation.

- Notez les différents verbes introducteurs que je propose ici pour donner une charge sémantique à ces verbes (debunk, argue, object to, vilify, maintain, claim, …).

- Notez enfin que plus riche et précis sera le vocabulaire que vous utilisez, plus clair, limpide et efficace sera votre propos.