

Restriction of legal possession of hunting weapons

When we are talking about terrorism what do you imagine? A hunter in the forest or a suicide bomber belted with explosives? Is he a sport shooter at the shooting range or „radicalized righteous citizen“ who hides a submachine gun at home? Everyone can imagine them, everyone knows them. In both model examples, they are the terrorists who possess something which would not be possible to hold for an ordinary citizen. So the question is: Why does the terrorist get the arms which should be available for only a few people and their order should be monitored? You can not just come with a firearms pass to the store and ask for an automatically burst weapon. Such weapons are not in the ordinary course of the business. Also you can not buy a dynamite simply.

Anyway we can ask: What is the impact of limited legal possession of weapons in these two models? The answer is simple: no impact. In Switzerland, every graduate of military service owns a machine rifle at home. From the perspective of the European Union every disagreements should be solved by shooting there, but it does not. Cars can be used as weapons. Kicking down of pedestrians runs daily and we still have not forbidden this vehicle.

If we want to wage war, we will not use hunting weapons, but something more effective and easier to gain. Martial arts are now considered as the sport, we all know them, but do you know the reason why and how it arised? Exactly the same way as the terrorism is there. The first users of martial arts were terrorists, radicals, revolutionaries - in today's words. When Japan conquered Okinawa , in the effort to suppress the resistance of local residents, they prohibited all weapons - swords, axes, knives etc. Knives have been a daily instrument, therefore in the village there was one knife transfixed by chain to the well - who wanted to cut, came next to the well and cut, but the knife was not took away. Citizens were searching for a solution that would ensure them victory over the enemy. They decided to turn their bodies into the weapons. They strenghtened their fingers, arms, legs. They used everyday objects as weapons.

Today we ask – does restriction or prohibition to possess weapons make sense? We deceive ourselves if we will think that this is way how to stop terrorists. Unarmed public is just an easier target. No one is afraid of the sheep but ram has already commanded respect. Thousands of years humankind has made progress thanks to the continuous improvement of weapons. Powerful ones have remained in the army and the inefficient have become available to the general public. Restriction and prohibition of possession of weapons is cause for reasonable question: Does the state fear the terrorists or losing the right to govern? Politics of appeasement we had already experienced, it resulted in the World War II.

Many modern Constitutions are based on the Constitution of the United States, which directly includes the right to possess arms. Its creators are not afraid of overthrowing its scheme. Restriction and prohibition of possession of weapons will not stop the terrorism. Terrorism has to be destroyed in the origin.