

Student
 COMS 160
 Fall 2016

Argument Maps

Peer Reviewed Source?	Yes: ____ No: <u>x</u>
Citation:	Lemieux, Frederic. "More Guns Do Not Make Us Safer: Six Things Everyone Should Know About Mass Shootings." <i>Slate Magazine</i> . N.p., 2015. Web. 05 Oct. 2016.
Author's Standpoint:	Criminologist
Final Conclusion:	Guns are the sole reason why there is a high crime rate in America
Values/Assumptions:	Guns are the reason for violence
Counter-Argument:	Without guns people can still access other weapons.
Claim 1:	The US has the highest number of mass shootings
Supporting Evidence:	1. The US has had 78 mass shootings during a 30 year period. 2. Germany would be second in the most amount of mass shootings — with seven. In the other 24 industrialized countries taken together, 41 mass shootings took place.
Values/Assumptions:	The US has a gun problem.
Counter-Argument:	Guns can prevent some mass shootings from occurring.
Claim 2:	The US needs a restrictive law when purchasing guns.
Supporting Evidence:	1. Due to the Second Amendment, the United States has permissive gun licensing laws. In contrast to other countries who have restrictive laws who have to prove that they need a gun for a safe and valid reason and display overall good character. 2. Countries with more restrictive gun licensing laws show fewer deaths by fire-arms and a lower gun ownership rate.

Values/Assumptions:	The US's permissive law allows the weapons to land in the wrong hands
Counter-Argument:	An individual can provide a faulty reason as to why they need a gun.
Claim 3:	Background checks are affective
Supporting Evidence:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In most restrictive background checks performed in developed countries, citizens are required to train for gun handling, obtain a license for hunting, or provide proof of membership to a shooting range. 2. "Individuals must prove that they do not belong to any "prohibited group," such as the mentally ill, criminals, children, or those who have a high chance of committing a crime. (Those with police records)
Values/Assumptions:	These procedures can decrease the number of mass shootings
Counter-Argument:	There can still be room for error due to faulty documentation.

Peer Reviewed Source?	Yes: ____ No: <u> x </u>
Citation:	Hemenway, David. "Does Owning A Gun Make You Safer." <i>Los Angeles Times</i> . Los Angeles Times, n.d. Web. 04 Oct. 2016.
Author's Standpoint:	Harvard professor at the Harvard School of Public Health.
Final Conclusion:	Guns do not make out society safer.
Values/Assumptions:	Guns aren't safe
Counter-Argument:	Guns may help with home invasions that revolve around theft.
Claim 1:	Having a gun at home does not make you safer
Supporting Evidence:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A recent study found that states with higher levels of household gun ownership have higher levels of firearm crime and do not have lower levels of other types of crime. 2. Another study, in 2003, found that counties with higher levels of household gun ownership have higher rates of household burglary, not lower. Although burglars like to steal cash and jewelry they also like to steal guns as well.
Values/Assumptions:	Having a gun at home won't prevent criminals from entering your home.
Counter-Argument:	Advocates argue that guns in the home stop criminals from entering the home in fear of being shot.
Claim 2:	Gun use for self defense is rare despite being in a gun rich country
Supporting Evidence:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "More than 42% of the time, the victim took some action — maced the offender, yelled at the offender, struggled, ran away, or called the police. Victims used a gun in less than 1% of the incidents." (Hemenway, David) 2. Mace is an equally effective weapon
Values/Assumptions:	There are different ways to defend yourself
Counter-Argument:	Gun advocates claim that guns are commonly used in self-defense, and that without a firearm, one is essentially defenseless.

Peer Reviewed Source?	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/>
Citation:	Kates, Don B., and Gary Mauser. "Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide." Law.harvard.edu. N.p., n.d. Web. 4 Oct. 2016.
Author's Standpoint:	Possible gun owner.
Final Conclusion:	Guns are not the sole reason for the big amount of murders and suicides.
Values/Assumptions:	Guns aren't the cause of murders and suicides.
Counter-Argument:	Those exposed to guns have are exposed to a tool that can murder or assist in a suicide.
Claim 1:	Legal gun ownership in a society does not increase the murder rate.
Supporting Evidence:	<p>1. "Analysis of perpetrator studies shows that violent criminals—especially murderers—"almost uniformly have a long history of involvement in criminal behavior". So it would not appreciably raise violence if all law-abiding, responsible people had firearms because they are not the ones who rape, rob, or murder." (Kates, Mauser)</p> <p>2. "Violent crime would not fall if guns were totally banned to civilians. As the respective examples of Luxembourg and Russia suggest, individuals who commit violent crimes will either find guns despite severe controls or will find other weapons to use." (Kates, Mauser)</p>
Values/Assumptions:	Guns aren't the only tools used to murder someone.
Counter-Argument:	If a gun is accessible to someone who is mentally unstable that could increase the changes of murder.

Claim 2:	There is no social benefit in decreasing the availability of guns if the result is only to increase the use of other means of suicide and murder, resulting in more or less the same amount of death.
Supporting Evidence:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taking away guns will only increase the demand, and those with a high demand will get their hands on a gun legal or not. 2. Other deadly and illegal weapons could be used therefore increasing the amount of murders and suicides.
Values/Assumptions:	If guns aren't available then individuals will result to other tools to assist in murder/suicide.
Counter-Argument:	One study asserts that Americans are more likely to be shot to death than people in the world's other 35 wealthier nations.
Claim 3:	The large limitation on guns provokes more crime
Supporting Evidence:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Use of firearms in crime was very much less [in England before 1920] when there were no controls of any sort and when anyone, convicted criminal or lunatic, could buy any type of firearm without restriction" (Kates, Mauser) 2. When limitations are put on individuals they are more likely to do the opposite of what those limitations are.
Values/Assumptions:	Limiting someone will only provoke them.
Counter-Argument:	Not having limitations on guns would allow the weapon to land in the wrong hands.