

Gun Control and its Dilemma in the U.S: Balancing Rights and Responsibilities

Baghiani Amira

**¹University of Abbes Laghrour-Khenchela (ALGERIA),
baghiani.amira@univ-khenchela.dz**

( <https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0009-0003-1342-8073>)

Received: 27/09/2025

Accepted: 14/11/2025

Abstract:

Gun Control persists as the most divisive social and political topics of the twenty-first century in the U.S. While the right to bear arms is guaranteed by the Second Amendment, increased gun violence has spurred critical discussions regarding the constraints of this freedom. This article examines the constitutional and historical roots of the gun control issue, analyzes the arguments for and against gun regulations, and assesses the policy obstacles to reform.

Based on existing literature, the paper contends that achieving a balance between rights and responsibilities is both essential and attainable. The article aims at not only promoting total prohibitions or unregulated ownership of guns, but at establishing a framework that prioritizes public safety, honors constitutional rights, and mitigates the catastrophic effects of gun violence. The critical analysis of the literature determines that the most viable strategy for the U.S to reconcile freedom with security would be through modest reforms that are based on policies supported by evidence and encourage civic responsibility.

Keywords: *Gun Control; Gun Violence; Responsibilities; Rights; Second Amendment; United States.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States has experienced unprecedented levels of gun violence, with firearms being responsible for over 48,000 fatalities per year, including mass shootings, suicides and homicides (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2024). Alarming, firearms have already overtaken motor vehicle accidents among American adolescents and children (Goldstick et al., 2022).

Unlike other developed democracies, the U.S has not responded quickly enough to fatal mass shootings to implement laws that drastically cut the number of deaths caused by firearms. In contrast, federal reform has been elusive despite the American public outcry following mass shootings like the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School massacre, the 2017 Las Vegas shooting, and the 2022 Uvalde school shooting. Therefore, it is trapped between public safety concerns and constitutional protections.

However, at the heart of the dilemma is two allegedly incompatible imperatives: U.S right to possess arms, as guaranteed by the constitution, is perceived by many as being at odds with more stringent rules. Therefore, the fundamental issue is the extent to which the U.S government harmonizes the individual right to bear arms that is guaranteed by the Second Amendment, with its responsibility to maintain the citizens' security and welfare. Advocates of broad gun rights claim that any restrictions might endanger individual safety, cultural traditions, and constitutional liberties (Carlson, 2020; Spitzer, 2021). Proponents of more stringent regulations, on the other hand, stress the importance of licensing, background checks, and restrictions on military-style weapons, while underscoring the catastrophic repercussions of pervasive accessibility to firearms (Webster & Vernick, 2013). These opposing opinions reflect the contentious argument, which has shifted from a legal matter to a symbol of political and cultural identity.

The research aims at critically examining these competing demands within existing institutional, cultural, and legal frameworks. It seeks ways to decrease the severe societal repercussions of gun violence while simultaneously safeguarding fundamental liberties. Also, it aims to establish a 'responsibility-based framework' as a compromise between unlimited freedom of ownership and total ban of arms. This framework balances the right to bear arms with public safety, civic duties and regulations.

A qualitative literature-based analysis is used as a basic research methodology. Examining the evolution of gun control arguments in the U.S requires perusing legal cases, historical documents, scholarly publications and public health data. In order to understand the influence of judicial interpretations on the current state of gun rights, legal precedents including *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022), *McDonald v. Chicago* (2010), and *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) are reviewed. To emphasize potential frameworks for harmonizing rights and regulations, comparative analyses from a variety of nations are scrutinized. Also, the study examines case studies of U.S mass shootings in different cities such as in Sandy Hook, Las Vegas, and Uvalde to demonstrate the relationship between policy, public opinion, and violence outcomes. The paper provides a critical analysis on how the U.S may handle its particular gun dilemma without compromising its democratic principle.

Therefore, the main questions addressed in this research are the following:

- In what ways has the gun control debate in the U.S been influenced by historical and constitutional interpretations of the Second Amendment?
- What impact have prominent mass shootings had on legislative actions and U.S public perceptions?
- How far can reforms based on evidence strike a compromise between the right to possess arms and the responsibility to keep people safe?

Hence, the objective of this research is to assess potential frameworks that balance rights and responsibilities by investigating the historical, constitutional, and socio-political aspects of the U.S gun control debate. In doing so, the study seeks realistic ways and practical remedies to protect people's fundamental rights, to lessen the negative effects of guns, and to preserve constitutional freedom.

1. Historical and Constitutional Frameworks

Since its ratification in 1791, the Second Amendment has been a central point of contentious debate. It is stated 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." According to historians, its initial objective was to maintain state militias, rather than to establish an unlimited personal right to possess firearms (Cornell & Kopel, 2019). Justice Joseph Story and other early American legal commentators placed an emphasis on militias and did not view private gun ownership as inherently constitutional (Winkler, 2011).

However, the ruling made by the Supreme Court in *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) represented a pivotal moment by upholding the right to possess arms for the sake of domestic self-defense and apart from militia service. This ruling reversed decades of legal precedent and paved the way for more expansion of gun rights. Furthermore, *McDonald v. Chicago* (2010) further solidified this interpretation by applying the Second Amendment to state legislation. The recent decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022) ruling further strengthened gun rights by invalidating restrictions on carrying firearms in public. These cases illustrate judicial trend toward individual liberty over governmental regulation (Spitzer, 2021; Carlson, 2020).

2. Gun Rights

In addition to their legal status under the Constitution, firearms hold significant symbolic value in the American society. Proponents of broad gun rights cite cultural norms, the right to self-defense, and constitutional liberties as justifications for their stance. Many Americans associate firearms with independence, security, and opposition to government overreach (Carlson, 2020). Politically, gun rights activists like the National Rifle Association (NRA) have successfully used the traditional tale that firearms are fundamental to American culture and identity to argue that any attempt to limit their availability is an attack on individual freedom (Spitzer, 2021). This rhetoric hits close where gun ownership is commonly inherited in rural and conservative communities.

Advocates often portray firearm ownership as a necessity for self-defense and crime prevention. The controversial study conducted by Kleck and Gertz (1995) firearms are used for defensive purposes up to 2.5 million times per year, a statistic that is contested yet remains impactful in policy discussions. Advocates contend that limiting access does little to stop criminals from obtaining weapons and instead punishes law-abiding residents (Lott, 2010). These viewpoints highlight the dangers of excessive governmental intervention and the possible loss of individual liberties due to unbridled expansion of regulations.

3. Gun Control

On the other hand, advocates for more stringent gun control measures highlight the enormous social and personal tolls associated with gun violence. As per the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2024), firearms are currently the most prevalent cause of mortality among adolescents and children in the U.S for more than 48,000 deaths in 2022, most of which were suicides and homicides. The issue was highlighted by research of Goldstick et al. (2022) which revealed that guns killed more American adolescents than automobile accidents.

These worries are heightened by mass shootings, which become hot topics in public discussion. A ban on assault rifles and stricter background checks were hotly debated after the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting that killed 20 students and 6 educators. despite widespread public support, legislative initiatives such as the Manchin-Toomey bill were unable to pass in the Senate (Webster & Vernick, 2013). The 2017 mass shooting in Las Vegas, which killed 60 and injured 400, brought attention to the risks posed by bump stocks and weapons with large magazines. Recent events, such as the 2022 Uvalde incident, sparked discussions about the need to improve school safety, hold law enforcement accountable, and address the accessibility of assault firearms to young offenders (Hammett et al., 2025).

Scholars contend that this situation demands immediate action based on solid scientific data and should be handled as a public health emergency (Webster & Vernick, 2013). Comparative studies reveal that countries like the United Kingdom and Australia, who implemented strict gun control laws following a series of major shootings, have seen notable drops in the number of fatalities caused by firearms (Webster & Vernick, 2013). In the wake of the 1996 Port Arthur massacre, Australia instituted comprehensive reforms, such as a national buyback program and a ban on semi-automatic rifles, which resulted in a significant decrease in gun-related suicides and homicides (Chapman et al., 2006). The UK also instituted stringent gun control measures in the aftermath of the 1996 Dunblane school shooting, which significantly reduced the frequency of such tragedies (Webster & Vernick, 2013). Despite this evidence, the U.S. persists in its opposition to reform. This resistance is fueled by political polarization and cultural commitment to firearms.

4. Policy Obstacles and Challenges

Policy measures like red flag laws, assault weapons prohibitions, and universal background checks have repeatedly received the majority approval among Americans. However, because of party gridlock, institutional limitations, and the influence of pro-gun groups' lobbying, these initiatives frequently fall short in Congress (Spitzer, 2021). The

situation is further complicated by federalism because states have different gun rules, and the more lax-states make it harder for the more stringent jurisdictions to enforce their laws such as New York and California, whereas others, like Texas mitigate restrictions and broaden access. As a result, municipal regulations are less effective and firearms can easily traverse state boundaries in this fragmented regulatory system, making local bans less effective (Webster & Vernick, 2013).

Recent research has also shown that racism and socioeconomic disparity are overlapping causes of gun violence. According to a study published in JAMA Surgery (2022), the prevalence of large scale shooting events in major U.S cities was associated with racism. Additionally, Pyrooz et al. (2025) found that a significant majority of American adults, nearly one-third, have been exposed to mass shootings in some way with marginalized backgrounds. This suggests that gun violence requires legislative and social reforms to address inequality, poverty, and systemic prejudice.

5. Balancing Rights and Responsibilities

The study proposes shifting the discussion from absolute rights vs total restrictions to shared responsibilities for effective transformation. A pragmatic approach that strikes a compromise between constitutional rights and reasonable regulation has the support of academics such as Webster and Vernick (2013). Hence, mandatory safety training, national licensing systems, improved background verification processes, and advanced firearm technology are among the proposed solutions. Several scholars contend that the U.S could ensure both personal liberty and societal security by regulating gun ownership in a manner akin to the privilege of driving, which is subject to regulation and oversight.

II. Conclusion

The gun control debate in the U.S exemplifies the challenge of harmonizing societal obligations with constitutional rights in a divided democracy. The cultural ties, legal interpretations, and historical legacies made the Second Amendment an icon of unconditional freedom; nonetheless, the rising prevalence of gun violence highlights the pressing necessity for regulation. literature illustrates that the issue is not merely a straightforward decision between security and freedom, but instead a complex negotiation involving both facets.

A viable solution entails the implementation of incremental, evidence-based reforms that preserve constitutional rights and emphasize civic responsibility. The establishment of licensing protocols, the adoption of universal background checks, and the promotion of community-focused preventative measures can effectively reduce gun violence, all while upholding the principles enshrined in the Second Amendment. Consequently, the definitive resolution necessitates that Americans acknowledge the imperative for liberty to harmonize with responsibility, and that the genuine power of democracy lies in its ability to reconcile personal rights with the societal welfare.

References

Carlson, J. (2020). Policing the Second Amendment: Guns, law enforcement, and the politics

of race. Princeton University Press.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024, March 15). Firearm violence prevention. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/firearms>

Chapman, S., Alpers, P., Agho, K., & Jones, M. (2006). Australia's 1996 gun law reforms: Faster falls in firearm deaths, firearm suicides, and a decade without mass shootings. *Injury Prevention*, 12(6), 365–372. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ip.2006.013714>

Cornell, S., & Kopel, D. (2019). The Second Amendment and firearm regulation: A historical perspective. *Fordham Law Review*, 73(2), 487–528.

Crifasi, C. K., Merrill-Francis, M., McCourt, A., Vernick, J. S., Wintemute, G. J., & Webster, D. W. (2018). Association between firearm laws and homicide in urban counties. *Journal of Urban Health*, 95(3), 383–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-018-0267-2>

Goldstick, J. E., Cunningham, R. M., & Carter, P. M. (2022). Current causes of death in children and adolescents in the United States. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 386(20), 1955–1963. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMSr1804754>

Hammett, W. H., Bhuwania, P., et al. (2025). The overlooked role of the home in mass shooting fatalities. *Injury Epidemiology*, 12, 44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40621-025-00602-z>

Hemenway, D. (2017). *Private guns, public health* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

Karp, A. (2020). Estimating global civilian-held firearms numbers. *Small Arms Survey*.

Kleck, G., & Gertz, M. (1995). Armed resistance to crime: The prevalence and nature of self-defense with a gun. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 86(1), 150–187.

Lott, J. R. (2010). *More guns, less crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control laws* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Pyrooz, D. C., et al. (2025). Direct exposure to mass shootings among U.S. adults. *JAMA Network Open*, 8(5), e231112. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.1112>

Siegel, M., Pahn, M., Xuan, Z., Ross, C. S., Galea, S., Kalesan, B., Fleegler, E., & Goss, K. A. (2017). Firearm-related laws in all 50 U.S. states, 1991–2016. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(7), 1122–1129. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.303701>

Spitzer, R. J. (2021). *Gun politics in America* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Webster, D. W., & Vernick, J. S. (Eds.). (2013). *Reducing gun violence in America: Informing policy with evidence and analysis*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Winkler, A. (2011). *Gunfight: The battle over the right to bear arms in America*. W. W. Norton.