

Howard Shaobo Li

17 December 2009

ECON 439

Dr. Dagobert Brito

***The Right to Bear Arms:
Examining the Consequences of the Second Amendment in Terms of Law &
Economics***

Abstract

The right to bear arms is an issue that is often disputed. In fact, there is more disagreement about this right than any other ones in the Constitution.¹ Advocates believe the Second Amendment provides the citizens of the United States with an unchallengeable privilege to own firearms. Meanwhile, those who oppose the right believe the Second Amendment is outdated and stricter gun control should be imposed. Even court cases cannot seem to agree on the matter with verdicts constantly contradicting each other. With so many different arguments about the consequences of the Second Amendment, it is no surprise it is such a hot topic. This paper will address the right to bear arms and provide reasons why it is in society's best interest to support the Second Amendment. Specifically, this paper will provide an economic analysis of the costs and benefits of gun control and legal issues surrounding the debate. In addition, this paper will examine the opinions from persons opposed to the Second Amendment and provide counterarguments to these claims. Finally, this paper will look at previous court cases to further support the argument that the right to bear arms should be protected.

¹ .American Bar Association

Historical Background about the Second Amendment

The Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights states the following:²

“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.”

The concept of a widespread militia originated in England when the citizens of England were required to bear arms to protect the king. The right of English subjects to bear arms was recognized under English common law. This thought process was in the minds of early American settlers and they wanted to set up militias for the purposes of repelling invasion, suppressing rebellions, deterring undemocratic governments, and facilitating a natural right of self defense.^{3,4,5} Thus, during the construction of the Bill of Rights, the Constitutional Convention was adamant about including a clause addressing the right to bear arms.

Since the adoption of the Constitution, guns have been embedded into the American culture. Generally, people in the United States tend to like firearms. This is especially true today, as there is evidence of some kind of weaponry in a variety of media, where it is movies, the news, or gun shows. Recent polls show that public support for a ban on handguns has fallen to 28%, the lowest level in nearly 50 years. Moreover, citizens are less supportive of laws banning the sale of firearms, falling 30% in the past

² Cornell University Law School

³ Hardy, David

⁴ Malcolm, Joyce Lee

⁵ Cornell, Saul

20 years.⁶ Despite the receding attitudes towards gun control, many are still strongly in favor of restricting access to firearms. However, when looking at the issue in solely an economic and logical point of view, the facts are clear that the right to bear arms should not be restricted.

Economic Discussion: Pareto Efficiency

Consider a society with two individuals and a fixed level of goods to be split between them. Pareto efficiency occurs if, given an initial allocation of the goods, there exists no other allocation that is Pareto superior to it. If a utility possibility frontier was drawn, we would see that Pareto efficient points are non-comparable; the criterion of Pareto efficiency has no way of ranking different Pareto efficient points. This concept is significant because most questions of legal policy concern changes that help one group of individuals but hurt others. If the government were to pass more restrictive gun laws, they would hurt legal gun owners but help victims of gun violence.⁷ Pareto efficiency is not a workable criterion to evaluate proposed changes to laws.

Economic Reasoning: Substitutes

One reason that gun-control advocates call for tighter restrictions or bans on firearms is that they are concerned about the safety of the general public. This is especially apparent during violent incidents involving firearms that result in the death of many innocent bystanders. Cases such as the 1999 Columbine High School shooting or the 2007 Virginia Tech shooting are prime examples of when gun-control advocates experience a knee-jerk reaction to fight for limitations on gun availability. They fail to apply basic economics to the issue.

⁶ The Economist

⁷ Miceli, Thomas

In these cases, the murderers all have an end goal of killing people and making an extravagant public display. Thus, they buy different types of firearms and ammo necessary to accomplish their goals. This is when gun-control supporters argue that had there been a tighter restriction on guns, then the incident would not have occurred in the first place.

However, in a mass killing situation, the murders do not need to have access to guns to accomplish their goals. A wide array of substitutes is available to them, such as blades, poison, or car bombs. All of these goods are easy to acquire or make and will help the murderer to achieve his or her end goal.

Upon further inspection, car bombings are in the news almost every day, while mass shootings are incredibly rare. We only remember them *because* of the fact that they do not happen very often. The mass shootings that occur on the news trigger a switch in our minds to increase gun control, when in fact; there are other means of destruction that are far more powerful than firearms.

The restriction of guns is a classic example of means and ends. When the government restricts one market, consumers will shift into another market. If further restrictions occur, the consumers will simply keep changing markets to find substitutes to achieve their goals. The simple fact is that the lack of a gun will not deter a shooter from mass mayhem. In the 1927 Bath Township School bombing, 45 people were killed by a school board member, showing that guns are not necessary to commit mass murder.⁸ Gun-control advocates have good intentions, but they need to look past the short-term effects on the public and instead focus on the long term effects on society.

⁸ Ludwig von Mises Institute

Economic Reasoning: Costs and Utility

Like all other economic goods, guns are part of individual preferences. Different people may like guns for different reasons. One person may like to hunt, another person may like to own guns to feel secure, and yet another person may simply like to collect guns. If the government were to create a gun-control law for safety purposes, two opposite effects will occur. The law will make it more costly for criminals to obtain guns, thus raising the expected cost of crime. But, by making it more costly for crime victims to obtain, the law will lower the expected cost of committing a crime.⁹ In the case of criminals, their preferences do not count since violence is economically inefficient because the victim loses more utility than the aggressor gains.¹⁰ Society has good economic reasons to want to keep guns away from criminals simply for utility maximization.

However, there is no way to keep guns away from criminals without restricting nonviolent individuals' access to guns. Society has more honest citizens than criminals, so as a whole, gun control inflicts a higher cost to ordinary people than to law breakers. There is a substantial amount of evidence that gun control lessens self-defense and its disincentive affects more than it reduces the criminals' ability to commit crimes.¹¹ For example, the United Kingdom has tightened gun control for nearly a century, and now is facing increases in gun crimes. In fact, in just the past year, gun violence has increased by 35 percent!¹² Meanwhile, many regions in the United States have "gun-show loopholes" that allow people to purchase firearms at gun shows without a

⁹ Posner, pg. 239

¹⁰ Friedman, David

¹¹ Lott, John

¹² BBC News

background check. In these instances, even though no restrictions on purchasing firearms existed, gun-related violence did not increase.¹³ It is only logical that to maximize overall utility and minimize overall cost, no gun restrictions should be enforced in the United States.

Gun ownership saves the public money because when a target of a bombardment shoots the criminal in self-defense, the target avoids suffering death or injuries. His or her family can also continue on with their lives and not worry about the costs of hospital care, funeral arrangements, or the grievance associated with the loss of a loved one. Meanwhile, if the criminal is fatally shot, he or she will never again harm another victim. Society then is spared the expense of bring the criminal to trial and putting him or her in prison. From an economic standpoint, society's welfare will be increased if gun ownership is authorized because of minimized costs.

Economic Discussion: The Hand Rule

The Learned Hand Rule can be a useful tool when making legal decisions such as this. The negligence formula defined by this rule is that a potential injurer is negligent only if $B < PL$, where B is the cost of the precaution, P is the probability of the accident, and L is dollar magnitude of the loss.¹⁴ The key point of this formula is that the application depends of the interaction of the three elements rather than only considering each of them individually.

In the case of *Adams v. Bullock*, a boy crossed a bridge over some trolley tracks while swinging a long wire over the bridge. The wire touched the trolley's electric wire, electrocuting the boy. The court ruled in favor of the defendant because P was low

¹³ Rampell, Catherine

¹⁴ Posner, Richard

and B was very high. There was very little chance that a person crossing the bridge would get shocked from a wire far below, and the cost of preventing the accident is too high because the trolley wires would have to be assembled underground. This is an example of a situation in which the Hand Rule favors the defendant and it is more efficient to take no precaution against accidents that may occur.

In another case titled *Hendricks v. Peabody coal Co.*, the Hand Rule was used towards the plaintiff's advantage.¹⁵ A teenage boy was wounded while swimming in the defendant's abandoned strip mine, which has been naturally filled with spring water. Peabody Coal Co. was aware that many people were using the mine as a swimming hole and there is a concealed ledge beneath the surface. Because the entire mine could have been enclosed by a steel fence to deter children who wanted to swim (low B), the judge ruled in favor of the plaintiff. This is a situation in which cost was small compared to the risk to the parties involved.

The Hand rule is usually utilized in tort cases, but can still be logically used to analyze the right to bear arms. B is the cost of the government to restrict access to firearms, P is the probability that criminal activity involving guns will occur, and L is the magnitude of the loss. There may not be enough information to determine whether B is indeed less than PL in this case, but consider the alternative. Use the formula $B < PL$ where P and L are the same as the previous case, but B is the cost of the government to *allow* gun access. In this case, B may indeed be zero or very close to zero. Even if the former case stated that B is less than PL, the degree in which the latter case shows that B is less than PL overshadows that fact. It is much more cost efficient to promote the ownership of firearms than to restrict it.

¹⁵ Posner, Richard

Economic Reasoning: Moral Hazard and Information Asymmetry

Many schools, including Rice University, have rules stating that no firearms are allowed on campus. At first glance, the intentions are to increase the safety of the students, faculty, and staff. However, the policymakers are displaying the economic concept of moral hazard because they are not the ones who must suffer the negative consequences. If a murderer arrives at a school to cause mass mayhem, he or she will find out that no one else is armed. The people on campus are facing enormous danger, but the policymakers are not on the front lines next to the murderer.

Schools across the United States often post signs that their campuses are gun-free environments. This is meant to express the message that the people on campus have less fear of being injured by firearms. Simultaneously, the signs also convey the same message to the murderers. They know that being on a gun-free campus will mean there will be no resistance by armed students and faculty. In this instance of information asymmetry, the murderers had the opportunity to be much more harmful than they could have been otherwise.

Assume that Virginia Tech was a pro-gun campus. The killer, Seung-hui Cho, would have known that he would possibly face armed opponents instead of unarmed victims. In this case, Cho would have been less likely to engage in a shooting rampage because the risks involved would outweigh the potential rewards. This is a case where information asymmetry does not exist, saving the lives of many innocent casualties.

The concept of information asymmetry could also be applied to 9/11. The hijackers of the planes had an end goal of creating panic and terror throughout the United

States. If the passengers of the planes were allowed to bring firearms onto the plane, then the end results of the tragedy may not have even occurred.

The economic principle of substitutes can be applied to the September 11th attacks. The hijacking of the planes was actually a substitute terrorist attack. Back in 1993, terrorists detonated a bomb in the underground parking lots of the World Trade Centers, hoping the buildings would fall. However, this plan failed and the terrorists had to use an alternative means of achieving their end means. This goes to prove yet again that restricting gun access for the safety of society causes more harm than good because killers would find a substitute way to cause terror while everyday people remain defenseless.

Economic Reasoning: Taxes and Black Markets

Many guns are owned in the United States, probably well over 100 million.¹⁶ A large amount of them were probably obtained in the black market. Sellers in the black market are generally criminals since they can function more effectively than honest sellers in situations where contracts and other attributes of legal transactions are difficult to enforce. Sellers in black markets are willing to risk imprisonment of performing illegal transactions because the higher price in the underground market offsets the risk of punishment. The stricter a firearm restriction becomes, the higher the costs of goods in the black market. Estimates show value the arms trafficking market at billions of dollars.¹⁷ There is little surprise that some are willing to turn to illegal markets to gain profits.

¹⁶ Becker, Gary

¹⁷ Havocscope Black Markets

Some argue that certain steps can be taken to increase the effectiveness of gun control. One possible solution is to increase the taxes on firearms. If a high tax were imposed on legal gun transactions, then buyers with less strong demands for guns will be discouraged from buying them. Consumers who still want to purchase guns for legitimate reasons will still buy them legally since they still avoid the penalties associated with buying guns from the black market.

Another possible resolution is severely punishing traffickers in the illegal gun market. The prices of guns in the illegal market would consequently increase to balance out the costs' expected value. Thus, the demand curve for guns will shift to the left. The elasticity for guns will determine the degree of the decrease the amount of guns bought. One can assume that an individual's demand for guns is increased when other people own guns, due to the need for self-defense. A higher gun price in the black market may lower the demand for some individuals, causing a chain reaction and reducing the demand by other individuals.

A third idea to increase the effectiveness of gun control is to increase the severity of punishments to criminals who use guns to commit crimes. Because a large portion of transactions done in the black market are performed by criminals, knowing that the sentences of committing a crime are very harsh can dissuade someone from purchasing a gun in the first place.

However, upon further review of the three possible steps, one can argue that they are flawed. A high tax would probably not daunt individuals from getting a gun, especially in the case of mass killings. If an individual such as Seung-hui Cho was planning on commit suicide following the crime, he would probably be willing to spend

extra money to purchase firearms. If money is indeed an issue, then the individuals who truly want to obtain a gun can use other methods, such as stealing money to purchase the guns, so just stealing the guns themselves. Also, raising the cost of firearms is a regressive tax on the safety of the poor. They are in more need of firearms than wealthier people because rich neighborhoods have better police protection, and thus lower crime rates. In addition, the marginal impact of crime tends to be less on wealthier individuals with more disposable income. A high tax on firearms may seem beneficial at first, but actually, it is detrimental to all of society.

Increasing the sentences of people who illegally purchase firearms and commit crimes can also be ineffective because the people who are involved in the transactions usually already have a criminal record. They have little to lose if they get another misdemeanor on their records and will not be heavily deterred from buying guns in the underground market. If they were already planning on breaking the law, changing the punishments of the crime would most likely not change their attitudes towards illegal purchases and crimes.

One alternative solution could be that instead of charging a tax on the gun or having the government control firearms, a law that requires the owners of firearms to buy third party liability insurance could be ratified. This will ensure that victims of gunfire or their family members will be compensated with the injuries inflicted. Insurance companies are better than the government at determining who would be risky to insure. If the company determines that a particular person will cause them financial loss, that person will not be able to buy insurance, and thus will not be able to obtain firearms.

Gun Ownership: A Cultural Desire?

So far, this paper discusses America's gun policies economically. However, more cultural analysis is also necessary if we want to deduce methods of reducing the demands for guns. The United States was born during a time when hunting was popular. Colonists also used guns for defense against Native Americans in frontier settlements, and of course, hostility to standing armies was also a factor. The Second Amendment of the Constitution was adopted and private ownership of firearms was common across the expanding country. The birth of this nation started a trend of firearms being popular and this trend is still applicable today.

Let us assume that the demand for guns today is entirely cultural. Higher prices would not be very effective because the good would be highly inelastic. The government will also be unlikely to make rules that make guns more expensive because of the cultural desires. Measures to keep guns away from criminals are bound to reach a limit, so it is better to simply maintain *ceteris paribus* and stop focusing on gun control.

Linguists argue that the phrase "to keep and bear arms" is defined as serving as a soldier and fighting in the military.¹⁸ They argue that the purpose of the Second Amendment is indeed to own firearms for purposes of serving in the Armed Forces. However, delving into 18th century documents for application in the 21st century is not sensible. Presently, the United States is not fighting for its freedom from another country and does not need to worry about maintaining a militia for fear of attacks from a mother country. We should not take the outdated values from the original 13 colonies and apply them to the 50 states that exist today.

¹⁸ Oxford English Dictionary

Interpretations of the Right to Bear Arms: An Overview

There are different models of interpreting the right to bear arms in the United States. Some focus on the “purpose” clause of the Amendment, directing their attention to the words “well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a Free State.” In a collective model, the right to bear arms belongs to a group of people rather to individual persons. The Second Amendment’s only goal is to allow states to maintain a militia. Another semi-collective model holds that the right to keep and bear arms exists only for individuals actively serving in the armed forces.¹⁹

Yet another model exists, stating that individuals all have rights to own firearms, similar to how the First Amendment protects citizens’ free speech. This individualistic view is reflected in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller*, which will be discussed later in this paper.

Court Interpretations of the Second Amendment

Many court cases throughout US history give verdicts that interpret the Second Amendment in a particular way. Several cases conclude that we should protect our Second Amendment rights and grant access to guns.

The first Supreme Court decision to directly address the Second Amendment was *United States v. Miller*.²⁰ This case involved a criminal prosecution under the National Firearms Act of 1934, which imposes an excise tax on the manufacture of certain firearms. A man named Jack Miller was arrested for possessing an unlicensed short-barreled shotgun, which violated the National Firearms Act of 1934. When this incident was brought to trial, the District Court ruled in favor of Miller, stating

¹⁹ Dorf, Michael

²⁰ Westlaw, *United States v. Miller*

that the NFA conflicts with the Second Amendment because the Act attempts to usurp police power reserved to the States. However, when the United States Attorney appealed to the Supreme Court, the original verdict was overturned.²¹ The Supreme Court wrote that Miller owning a shotgun shows no reasonable relationship towards being a part of a well-regulated militia, and the Second Amendment does not protect Miller's rights in this particular circumstance.

The case of *United States v. Miller* supports gun rights advocates' claims. The case protects ownership of weapons for "ordinary military equipment."²² If a restriction were placed on firearms, there would be no allocation of goods to achieve Pareto efficiency. Short-barreled shotguns have also been commonly used in combat, so the Second Amendment protects the ownership of a variety of weaponry.²³ Future court cases also looked at *United States v. Miller* for assistance in making a ruling.

For example, in the case of *United States v. Oakes*, the defendant was in possession of an unregistered machine gun.²⁴ The court looked at the *Miller* case to determine a proper ruling and quoted that the purpose of the Second Amendment was to assure the continuation of the state militia. This case did not, however, state an explanation as to how *Miller* would require the owner to be associated with an organized militia before being able to assert the protection of the Second Amendment.

In 1993, President Clinton passed the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act into law, which instituted federal background checks on firearm purchasers in the United States. The case of *Printz v. United States* established the unconstitutionality of

²¹ *United States v. Miller*, pg. 182

²² Fezell, Howard

²³ Carter-Yamauchi, Charlotte A.

²⁴ Westlaw, *United States v. Oakes*

certain requirements of this Act.²⁵ For instance, a firearms dealer who wants to sell a gun must get a sworn statement from the buyer that he or she is not among a class of prohibited purchasers. These include convicted felons, fugitives from justice, and unlawful aliens. The buyer also needs to provide a way to verify his or her identity to a “chief law enforcement officer” of the residential area.

Jay Printz, a chief law enforcement officer for Ravalli County, Montana, and Graham County, Arizona, filed actions that challenged the constitutionality of the Brady Act’s requirements. The lower courts declared that the background checks were unconstitutional and concluded that voluntary background checks may improve the system. *Printz v. United States* was an important ruling in support of limits on Federal power and States’ Rights.

Congress passed the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975, which banned residents of Washington D.C. from owning handguns and firearms. The law also required that all guns that are kept inside the home to be unloaded or locked, in effect limiting the availability of self-defense in the home.²⁶ In 2008, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the Second Amendment protects the individual’s right to carry weapons in a case titled *District of Columbia v. Heller*. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the historical background of the Second Amendment.²⁷ The Supreme Court repealed the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 because it banned many arms that most people would consider to be used for the lawful purpose of self-defense. Imposing the Act on the residents of Washington D.C. would be unconstitutional because the Second Amendment is an individual right tied intimately to the natural right of self-defense.

²⁵ Althouse, Ann

²⁶ National Rifle Association

²⁷ Westlaw, *District of Columbia v. Heller*

In economic terms, the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 was not efficient because it does not allocate goods in a Pareto efficient way. Individuals would gain more utility from having the right to own guns because they would have the security of knowing they can protect themselves should the need arise. Even if they do not own guns, individuals can still feel somewhat secure because criminals are less likely to commit crimes if they know guns are legal and that anyone can own one. *District of Columbia v. Heller* is a Pareto superior allocation of goods to the residents of Washington D.C. precisely due to the reasons previously mentioned.

In November of 2009, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit concluded that the law is consistent with *District of Columbia v. Heller*. The conviction of a Wisconsin man barred from owning firearms due to his criminal record was overturned because the lifetime prohibition was determined unconstitutional.²⁸ This is one of the first appeals court cases to analyze the effect of *District of Columbia v. Heller* on existing federal firearm laws.

Further Court Cases following Heller

How effective was the *Heller* case in setting a precedent for the future? In addition to the case previously mentioned, more than eighty other lawsuits regarding gun control laws under the Second Amendment have been in federal court after the *Heller* case. As a preliminary assessment of its impact, *Heller* has not been successful. Besides the one pointed out earlier, the federal courts have not invalidated a single gun control law on the basis of the Second Amendment.²⁹ For example, on August 29, 2008, *United States v. Artez* defended the federal ban on possession of un-registered shotguns and on

²⁸ CBS News

²⁹ The New York Times

January 28, 2009, *Maloney v. Rice* ruled that the Second Amendment does not apply to state and local government.³⁰ From the looks of it, *District of Columbia v. Heller* will in all probability turn out to be of no significance to anyone but constitutional theorists.

The Second Amendment and Ninth Amendment

Even if we ignore the ruling of *District of Columbia v. Heller* and assume that Second Amendment is only a militia right and not an individual right, the Ninth Amendment reserves the un-enumerated rights to the people.³¹ The right to self-defense is a God-given right and does not require permission of the State. The Founders of the United States would consider the right to self-defense to be within the un-enumerated rights protected by the Ninth Amendment and any law that prohibits the access to self-defense (i.e. firearms) would be unconstitutional. Gun rights activists argue for a basic right to bear arms that predates the U.S. Constitution and believe that the Second Amendment protects this pre-existing right.³²

The Second Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment

Many firearm owners only refer to the Second Amendment when discussing their individual rights. However, the Fourteenth Amendment can help clear up any confusion regarding the intent of the Second Amendment. Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment states:

“No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge
the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;
nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or

³⁰ Westlaw, *Maloney v. Rice*

³¹ Cornell University Law School

³² Johnson, Nicholas

property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person
within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

This quote of the 14th Amendment disproves the collective right model of the Second Amendment. This section also extends the limitations stated in the first 8 Amendments to the individual State governments. The 14th Amendment, in effect, rebuts the collectivistic views of the 2nd Amendment which state that guns are only beneficial to society if they are used for group militia purposes.

Current Status of Gun Laws

Presently, 44 of the 50 states have a provision in their constitution approving the right to bear arms.³³ When comparing the two types of states, no significant difference in crime rates can be observed.³⁴ The concept of utility can be observed again because citizens are happier when given the choice to own guns. This freedom increases ones happiness and hence, ones utility in the law.

It should be noted that not *everyone* is granted the privilege to own firearms. The Gun Control Act of 1968 states that fugitives, people under a restraining order, people under indictment for a crime.³⁵ The application of the Second Amendment is a clever balancing act to find the perfect amount of restrictions necessary for society’s benefit. This is similar to the Hand Formula if it were presented graphically. The horizontal axis would represent the units of care (amount of restrictions placed) and the vertical axis would represent the amount of dollars spent. The B line would (usually) slope upwards and the PL line would (usually) slope downwards. We try to find the

³³ National Rifle Association

³⁴ ABC 20/20

³⁵ National Rifle Association Institute for Legislative Action

intersection of the two lines represents the amount of care that should be given. In this case, the intersection represents the amount of restrictions placed on firearms.

The previous paragraph should not be interpreted to support the arguments made by gun control activists. The quantity of restricted persons mentioned in the Gun Control Act of 1968 far outnumbers the quantity of typical citizens of the United States. Instead of applying firearms restrictions for *all* residents of the United States, only a select few should be rejected the opportunity of owning guns. Our purpose is to determine the ideal amount of restrictions necessary that will result in the highest amount of security for inhabitants of the United States.

Conclusion

When considering the consequences of gun control vs. gun freedom, many factors tip the scale in favor of the right to bear arms. A key assumption in the argument for gun control is that criminals will actually obey laws prohibiting firearms. But if they are willing to commit crimes such as mass shootings and terrorist attacks, would they really care if a law restricting gun usage was forced? As an alternative to guns, law offenders may use a variety of substitute goods, smuggle guns from the black market, or maybe even make their own guns. This shifts the balance of power to the criminals and gives them a higher chance of successfully committing their crimes. Britain is a prime example of this, since their handgun related crime rates rose 40 percent after handguns were banned.³⁶ Had this country kept guns legal, their statistics may not have been so negative.

Additionally, the Second Amendment helps to strengthen the United States' economy. The firearms industry is a multi-billion industry which employs

³⁶ Learnaboutguns.com

thousands of people. Taking away the right to bear arms would increase the unemployment rate and decrease taxes generated, cutting the budgets of many states. The new law would cause the number of black markets to increase and alter the ratio of criminals who own guns to common citizens who own guns. The right to bear arms is too important of a law to repeal, as it directly affects our safety and financial security.

In an age of vast technological advances, applying the collectivistic model of the Second Amendment right is anachronous. We need to look beyond our first instincts and think about situations logically. If someone breaks into your house, which would you rather have to protect yourself- a handgun or a phone? Ethical issues aside, a reasonable person would have many reasons to prefer a handgun, mainly because your fate is not in someone else's hands. The law exists to protect society and maximize the liberty and security of the citizens of the United States. Increasing gun control thwarts the goal of the law and ultimately will be harmful to the social order.

References

- Althouse, Ann. *The Vigor of the Anti-Commandeering Doctrine in Times of Terror*,
69 Brook. L. Rev. 1231 (2004)
- Balkin, S. and J. McDonald, 1984, "A Market Analysis for Handguns and Gun Control
Issues," in D. Kates, ed., *Firearms and Violence*, San Francisco: Pacific Institute
for Public Policy Research.
- Barnes, David W. and Lynn A. Stout. *Cases and Materials on Law and Economics*. West
Publishing Co.: St. Paul, 1992.
- BBC News World Edition. "Gun Crime Soars by 35%." BBC News. 12 Jan 2003
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/2640817.stm>
- "Bear Arms." Def. 1a. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Print.
- Carter-Yamauchi, Charlotte A. (1991). *A Clash of Arms: The Great American Gun
Debate*. Honolulu, HI: Legislative Reference Bureau. p. 8–9.
- CBS News. "Court: Criminal Record may not Prevent Gun Ownership." CBS.
19 Nov 2009
<http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2009/11/19/taking_liberties/entry5711496.shtml>
- Cornell, Saul. *A well-regulated militia: the founding fathers and the origins of gun
control in America*. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Oxford University Press. pp. 23
- Cornell University Law School. Bill of Rights, United States Constitution.
- Cottrol, Robert. *Gun Control and the Constitution: Sources and Explorations on the
Second Amendment*, pg. 286
- Economist, The. "The Right to Bear Arms." 12 Oct 2009
<http://www.economist.com/daily/chartgallery/displaystory.cfm?story_id=14632169>

Fezell, Howard. "The misconstruction of United States v. Miller."

<<http://www.secondamendment.net/2amd4.html>>

Hardy, David. Book Review: *A Well-Regulated Militia: The Founding Fathers and the Origins of Gun Control in America*. William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal, Vol. 15, p. 1237.

Learn About Guns. "The Flawed Economic Argument against Gun Ownership."

19 Oct 2009

<<http://www.learnaboutguns.com/2009/10/19/the-flawed-economic-argument-against-gun-ownership>>

Malcolm, Joyce Lee. Book Review: *That Every Man Be Armed*. 54 *George Washington Law Review* 452, 455.

National Rifle Association. "The Case For Reforming The District of Columbia's Gun Laws."

<<http://www.nraila.org/Issues/FactSheets/Read.aspx?ID=72>>

Posner, Richard. *Economic Analysis of Law*. Aspen Publishing: Frederick, MD, 1992.

Rampell, Catherine. "The Gun Show Loophole and Gun-Deaths." *The New York Times*. 10 Dec 2009

<<http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/tag/gun-control>>

Sherman, Mark. "Supreme Court Says Americans Have Right to Guns".

The Washington Post. 10 Dec 2009

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/y2008/06/26/AR2008062600615.html>>

Westlaw. "*District of Columbia v. Heller.*" Campus Research. Westlaw.

Fondren Library, Houston, TX. 5 Nov 2009 <<http://campus.westlaw.com>>.

Westlaw. "*Maloney v. Rice.*" Campus Research. Westlaw. Fondren Library,

Houston, TX. 5 Nov 2009 <<http://campus.westlaw.com>>.

Westlaw. "*United States v. Miller.*" Campus Research. Westlaw. Fondren Library,

Houston, TX. 5 Nov 2009 <<http://campus.westlaw.com>>.

Westlaw. "*United States v. Oakes.*" Campus Research. Westlaw. Fondren Library,

Houston, TX. 5 Nov 2009 <<http://campus.westlaw.com>>.