January 27, 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am taking American history at school this year and specifically I am learning about the founding of our nation. This includes a study of the Bill of Rights. The Second Amendment was written in response to concerns that American colonists were at risk from attacks by Redcoats, Native American Indians and certain other groups of people. The right to bear arms made sense in the context of a revolutionary era.

Also at that time, the technology of guns was that it would take a certain amount of time – maybe two minutes or more - to reload every shot. It was impossible for a single person to conduct a massacre.

Back then, the principal way of getting meat to eat was by hunting game. Now we have supermarkets on every corner. Very few people in our communities survive on the food they acquire through hunting.

We need to reconsider the right to bear arms in the context of society at present: Maybe if we limit the types of guns available to those that were the kind in use during the 18th Century I would feel less at risk.

I understand that some people use guns for the purpose of hunting. In a perfect world, you could imagine selling guns only for the purpose of hunting. But that's not realistic. Someone, somewhere could use a gun obtained for hunting and use it to kill people. Given the choice of guns everywhere or guns nowhere, I would choose the latter.

The fact is simple: if there were no guns at all, there would be no mass shootings. That would make our communities the safest.

Connor Larson (12)
Ridgefield, CT