

Khaled Shaban

Prof. Kane

ENGL 113A-SI

November 18 2013

Delete extra spacing!!!

title?

Boring Debate

Gun control debate has been the current topical issues pondering both politicians and the citizens of American in general because it has roped many families of their loved ones. Like the case of 16th of September, whereby a navy yard staff member by the name Aaron Alexis killed 12 innocent people in the workplace with a gun in the nation's capital. This streamed in to the news headlines and sparked the congressmen to revisit the whole debate on gun control. Gun control is no longer a thing to wish away but it is a reality here with us that must be given attention it deserves and issues that should be treated with the urgency it deserves because it is a matter that touches on our lives.

Shootings like this one have been happening almost every month, why should this case have more impact than the others?

Vague. What specifically do you think should be done (what's your thesis)?

Who is she?

Hyacinth Mascarenhas wrote that we have become desensitized on the gun control debate not with regard to the victims of the massacres but with regard to Americans lose of energy to believe that there can be any solution to gun control.

Who is he?

LZ Granderson however thinks that gun control is not the answer. Said that Alexis had several gun-related arrests and other related misconduct in the navy but was honorably discharged. He argued that in Chicago gun shops are illegal and high capacity magazines but people still die from the gun related violence.

Work these paragraphs into your introduction

What's the connection?

There should actually much deeper concern on the topic than just mere rhetoric's by the politicians and streams in the media houses. They should be focusing on those people who kill

rather than focusing on the gun itself. Yes the gun facilitate killing but it is the person who pull the trigger. The record speaks for themselves as Alexis past record speaks. He has had several gun-arrests but still legally own a gun.

The question is why was he allowed to own a gun considering his record.

redundant

It is not the gun that kills but somebody holding the gun plus the people the top of the society who have influence but can do much other than debating one after another incident, politicians and law makers should walk their talks.

Then why don't they?

My aim in this conversation is that not just Americans should have a right to own a gun but an American of certified character. The past incidence and records should licenses one to hold a gun. There should also be no free work to a public or movie theatres with a gun as there should be security forces outside to protect such places.

How can that be determined? Many times a person of "good character" cracks and commits murder.

Who is he?

Scott Heller had issue with the constitutional phrase second amendment which states that

A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed". He question who is a militia and how should it be regulated. The second amendment is however okay in its form and should be enforced in that form

extra delete space

At the time the 2nd Amendment was written people had muskets. Today they have AK47s and 44 Magnums, is that the same thing?

Argument

Hyacinth Marcaren has been very right in discersitization of the matter. It is true that many think that nothing can be done on gun control and they have just sit back to wait for another incidence so that they start off the debate again.

Are people in denial that they could become a victim of a random shooting?

The president will be speaking out on new wake of massacre and politicians will be passing condolences to the bereaved families and not expressing outrage and talking about gun control. Those who express stronger views on gun control sometimes are thrown out of offices (Andrew, David, Brannon 45). Hyacinth argues that advocates of gun owners claim that guns

Give examples

don't kill people but people kill people. But despite lobbying for gun control and huge support by majority of Americans for the control the congress will do nothing about it. We respond swiftly and emotionally to such incidence then forget it very fast and move on with life until the next shooting is streamed for our screens.

redundant

Is this true? If so, why does congress not follow what the voters want?

good point, why is that?

According to Bloomberg gun fatalities are expected to exceed traffic fatalities by 2015 (Andrew, David, Brannon 45). The shooting is more than any other mass killings in USA because despite the massacre we still argue that guns don't kill people but people but the truth is the guns facilitate the killings. According to a survey conducted by *Slate* and the Twitter feed, as

The Alexis's murders or shootings in general? More than 9/11 or the Oklahoma bombing?

Do you have any current statistics showing this trend?

of today, an estimated 28,676 people have died from guns in the U.S. since the Newtown shooting. The only thing shielding people from a bad guy with a gun is not a good guy with it because they were also once good people the only falls ting was to be with a gun (Andrew, David, Brannon 45).

Is this the Alexis shooting? When did that happen?

Many people have accepted that gun violence has become part of American life and there is nothing that can be done to impose stronger regulations. It is evident that it is difficult to argue

why?

against the second amendments. There is also inability by the congress to pass regulations on gun control. The people of America should therefore not only let empathy and short term outrages be the response to this tragedies. There is a dire need for real talks and actions to stop this vice.

What kind of actions?

Meaning what?

LZ Granderson thinks otherwise that gun control cannot be the solution. To him, what should be dug in to the past history of the mass murderers and their motive behind the shooting (Ferrall 162). The cities that have banned gun shops still have people dying from gun-related violence. The deaths from different gun incidents are not the same and therefore addressing it

What good would that do? People are already dead.

from the same point of view is wrong. Some have legal guns and still end up using for mass shooting. The incident in the movie theatres are different from those committed in the street and politician trying to argue them interchangeable render the whole argument futile (Ferrall 162).

You're going all over the place. Each paragraph should contain one main idea.

Factors leading to gun violence should be addressed such as poverty mental illness and failing schools. It is time not to discuss gun control but the cuts to mental illness, health and its impact on services. Public debates and attacks on the National Rifle Association have proven ineffective way to tackle gun violence. Guys spraying the cities with the bullets believe it or not are not the members of NRA (Ferrall 162). As much as we want to tie it to NRA it has nothing to do with Adam Lanzas.

What about the many other shootings that have happened over the past 10 years?

People should actually not be allowed in to public places with guns. Mc Donald's did well by not allowing somebody in to restaurant with a gun for the safety of customers.

Explain what happened. I'm surprised the gunman didn't shoot through the glass.

Preventing people from going on to movie theatres with guns should be a thing of the past as it exposes the audience to great dangers. There should be storage places outside the theatres for guns for people entering inside and one can always pick it after the cinemas (Ferrall 162).

Schools should also be well protected and it should be a place that is out of bounce for anybody

You got to be kidding! This isn't the Old West. No one should bring a gun into the cinema. If people do, I'm sure they would have no intention of putting them into storage.

What's the connection?

unclear

Is it always possible to keep people who have guns out?

Do people always know when a person has a gun?

possessing guns. Mental illness and any other related health abnormalities' should be well addressed. People shooting with guns have history of mental dysfunctions. Such people should be given special attentions and not be allowed in to public places with guns.

In what way?

Should anybody other than the police & security guards be allowed in public places with guns?

Poverty should also be addressed. A very poor man is frustrated and fed up with life and has little if anything to life if commit such atrocities. Frustration and deep sense of disrespect to oneself often trigger such massacres. One feels that the world is unfair to them and become jealous with those who have everything by their side.

How do we know who is crazy before the shooting starts?

Scott Heller had issues with the second amendments. Until recently scholars have had little to say about the second amendment. Sanford levinson a law professor at the University of Texas said that "It's a scandal, the extent to which the legal academy has dodged this issue" He wrote an article on the subject in 1989. The whole talk according to him has been dominated by advocacy groups who fight it out in talk shows, and court briefs.

The number of recent activities by the scholars clearly points in a single direction that academicians all legal are referring to a standard model emanating from second amendment interpretations. An associate professor at the university of Tennessee Reynolds As part of a set of articles on the Second Amendment and gun control in the next issue of the Tennessee Law Review, he publishes a detailed critical guide to scholarship on the amendment.

The scholarship has not had much effect in the courts. However it cannot be brushed aside, says Cass Sunstein, a constitutional scholar. "This was a frivolous crazy position and it no longer is anymore", says Mr. Sunstein, a law professor at the University of Chicago (Smith and Ross 98). "The historical research has shown there is some complexity there" he exclaimed.

Vague - unhelpful

So what?

How does this support your thesis?

So what? What is his opinion on the matter?

What is "this"?

It's obvious
what a "well-regulated
militia" is.

However much research is being done it is just but a revisit of the historical records to find out what the founding fathers meant by a "well regulated militia," and how they intended to strike a balance between government and citizens' rights (Smith and Ross 98).

Chise
vague

Gun violence is a reality with us and it should be given attentions it deserves, it entails more than just talking but walking the talk. Individuals who perpetrate these atrocities should be screened to find their motives behind the shootings and the records of their past incidence. As much as guns don't cause the violence the individuals do action should be taken through the political will and support from the citizens in general.

Then what?

You have many good ideas, but you ^{need to} explain them and go into more depth. Each paragraph should be about 1 specific topic, which in turn supports your thesis statement. What is your thesis? It should be clearly written at the end of the introduction. Also, put your paragraphs once you have fixed them into a logical order.

Works cited

Spitzer, Robert J. *The politics of gun control*. New York: CQ Press, 2008

Patricia Smith and Brooke Ross. *THE GUN DEBATE. Junior Scholastic*, Scholastic Inc, 2013
v. 115(14)

Bard R Ferrall. Gun control--United States. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*,
Northwestern University School of Law, 1999, v. 89(3)

McClurg, Andrew J, Kopel, David B, Denning, Brannon P. Gun control and gun rights: a reader
and guide. New York: New York University Press, 2002

→
indent

Alphalotree