# 1AC - Militarism

## 1AC

### Part I

#### In a world full of guns, death is but a political past time. Wide spread availability of guns has created a narrative that violence is but an inevitable aspect of American life.

Kairys ’08: (David Kairys, “Ch 15: Why Are Handguns So Accessible on Urban Streets?” AGAINST THE WALL: POOR, YOUNG, BLACK, AND MALE, Elijah Anderson, ed., Penn Press, 2008//FT)

Why are handguns so accessible on urban streets? Why is it easier for young black men to obtain a handgun[s] than an up-to-date school textbook[s] or a regular job? This question has two components: How does the gun market work to make a product designed to kill so easily available? And why do we allow it to function this way? The answers differ significantly from conventional wisdom. The common image of an underground, illegal market is largely fictional. Most of what goes on is the predictable result of simple distribution and marketing choices, and is surprisingly legal. The statistics on handguns are familiar. There are about 60 handgun deaths each day in the United States, with a yearly total of about 24,000. About three times that many people are injured but not killed each day. This level of non-war-related handgun deaths is among the highest in the world, and many times greater than in other countries of comparable development and wealth. Handguns have been the biggest and most consistent threat to urban safety and public health in the United States for the last several decades. Research has shown that bringing a gun into your home increases the probability that someone in the home will be the victim of a gun homicide by three times and increases the probability of a suicide in your home by five times. If there is a teenager in the household, the suicide risk is multiplied by ten. The toll of these grim statistics falls hardest on poor and black communities, particularly black young men. Black males aged twenty to twenty-four have the highest homicide rate of all groups, and homicide— about 90 percent of which is by guns—is the leading cause of death for black youth. The introduction of easily available handguns into communities that are deprived and struggling has created a daily disaster, fed false stereotypes (only a small proportion of black young men shoot people), provided a rationalization for the failure to deal with poverty or discrimination, and sapped efforts to reform and regain hope.1 Yet most Americans seem oddly immune to concern about the gun problem, unable to take it seriously. The dominant public attitude toward handgun homicide is “regrettably normal.” Every day on television, news anchors, reporters, pundits, and politicians express sadness about the latest deaths, but there is a pervasive acceptance, a strange sense that this extraordinary level of death and killing is a normal or inevitable aspect of life in urban America.

#### Militarism creates a society of castaway goods and people – violence is inevitable as fear drives politics. This has permeated our space as well. We must challenge militarization to create an imaginative future. The role of the ballot is to vote for the advocacy that best challenges our militaristic culture of violence.

Giroux ‘13: (Henry Giroux has a professorship at McMaster University and is a distinguished visiting professor at Ryerson University, "Beyond Savage Politics and Dystopian Nightmares“Beyond Savage Politics and Dystopian Nightmares” http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19025-beyond-savage-politics-and-dystopian-nightmares Wednesday, 25 September 2013 <!--JAG-->//FT)

Right-wing market fundamentalists want to root out those considered defective consumers and citizens, along with allegedly unpatriotic dissidents. They also want to punish the poor and remove their children from the possibility of a quality public education. Hence, they develop schools that are dead zones of the imagination for most children and highly creative classroom environments free of the frenzy of empiricism and test-taking for the children of the rich. It gets worse. In Pennsylvania, right-wing Gov. Tom Corbett and Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter are intent on destroying the public school system. Instead of funding public schools, Corbett and Nutter are intent on crushing the teachers union and supporting vouchers and charter schools. They also are fond of claiming that money can’t help struggling public schools as a pretext for closing more than 23 schools “while building a $400 million state prison.”[xv] As Aaron Kase reports, “Things have gotten so bad that at least one school has asked parents to chip in $613 per student just so they can open with adequate services, which, if it becomes the norm, effectively defeats the purpose of equitable public education, and is entirely unreasonable to expect from the city’s poorer neighborhoods.”[xvi] Vouchers and under-regulated charter schools have become the unapologetic face of a vicious form of casino capitalism waging war on the imagination while imposing a range of harsh and punitive disciplinary methods on teachers and students, particularly low-income and poor white minorities.[xvii] The vast stores of knowledge and human creativity needed by young people to face a range of social, economic and political problems in the future are not simply being deferred, they are being systematically destroyed. When the emancipatory potential of education does emerge, it is often couched in the deadening discourse of establishing comfort zones in classrooms as a way of eliminating any pedagogy that provokes, unsettles or educates students to think critically. Critical knowledge and pedagogy are now judged as viable only to the degree that they do not make a student uncomfortable. There is more at stake here than the death of the imagination; there is also the elimination of those modes of agency that make a democracy possible. In the face of such cruel injustices, neoliberalism remains mute, disdaining democratic politics by claiming there are no alternatives to casino capitalism. Power in the United States has been uprooted from any respect for public value, the common good and democratic politics. This is not only visible in the fact that 1 percent of the population now owns 40 percent of the nation’s wealth or took home “more than half of the nation’s income,” it is also evident in a culture that normalizes, legitimates and thrives in a politics of humiliation, cruelty, racism and class discrimination.[xviii] Political, moral and economic foundations float free of constraints. Moral and social responsibilities are unmoored, free from any sense of responsibility or accountability in a permanent war state. Repression is now the dominant mantra for all of society. As Zygmunt Bauman and David Lyons point out, the American public has been turned into “security addicts,” ingesting mistrust, suspicion and fear as the new common sense for a security state that seems intent on causing the death of everything that matters in a democracy.[xix] The surveillance state works hard to not only monitor our phone conversations or track our Internet communication but to turn us into consumers, ratchet up the desire to be watched, and enforce new registers of social exclusion between those inside and outside the official temples of consumerism, social rights and captainship itself. Confining, excluding and vigilantism is one register of the new face of authoritarianism in the US. As America enters a historical era dominated by an authoritarian repressive state, the refugee camp as a symbol of exclusion and suffering is everywhere, visible in the material encampments for the homeless, urban ghettoes, jails, detention centers for young people, and in the tents propping up alongside highways that hold the new refugees from the suburbs who have lost their jobs, homes and dignity. The refugee camp also has become a metaphor for those who question authority, because they are increasingly rendered stateless, useless and undesirable. Critical thought is now considered dangerous, discomforting and subject to government prosecution, as is evident in the war being waged against whistleblowers in the name of national (in)security.[xx] The technologies of smart missiles hunt down those considered enemies of the United States, removing the ethical imagination from the horror of the violence it inflicts while solidifying the “victory of technology over ethics.”[xxi] Sorting out populations based on wealth, race, the ability to consume and immigration status is the new face of America. The pathologies of inequality have come home to roost in America.[xxii] Moreover, as suffering increases among vast swaths of the population, the corporate elite and rich use the proliferating crises to extract more wealth, profits and resources.[xxiii] Crises become the new rationale for destroying the ideologies, values and institutions that give power to the social contract. [xxiv] The ethos of rabid individualism, hyper-masculinity and a survival-of-the-fittest ethic has created a society of throwaways of both goods and people. The savage ethic of economic Darwinism also drives the stories we now tell about ourselves. The state of collective unconsciousness that haunts America has its deepest roots not only in the writings of Friedrich Hyek, Ayn Rand, Milton Friedman and other neoliberal philosophers but also in the increasing merging power of private-sector corporations that, as John Ralston Saul has argued, has its roots in the “anti-democratic underpinnings of Fascist Italy in particular, but also of Nazi Germany.”[xxv] Today this “corporatism [is] so strong it that it has taken the guts out of much of daily democratic life.”[xxvi] Combined with the power of the national surveillance state, it is fair to say, again quoting Saul, that “corporatism, with all of the problems attached to it, is digging itself ever deeper into our society, undermining our society.”[xxvii] Clearly, those words echoed a few years ago were not only prescient but vastly underestimated the growing authoritarianism in the United States, in particular. We now live in a society in which leadership has been usurped by models of corporate management, self-interest has triumphed over the ethical imagination, and a respect for others is discarded for the crude instrumental goal of accumulating capital, regardless of the social costs. Intellectuals in too many public spheres have become either dysfunctional or they have sold out. Higher education is no longer the city on the hill. Instead it has become a corporate boardroom/factory in which Bill Gates wannabes govern the university as if it were an outpost of Wall Street. Outside of the boardrooms, intellectual violence prevails aimed largely at faculty and students, who are reduced to either grant writers or consumers. To make matters worse academic knowledge is drowning in firewalls of obtuseness, creating a world of dysfunctional intellectuals, at least those who have tenure. Those who don’t have such security are tied to the harsh rhythm and rituals of contingent subaltern labor and barely make enough money to be able to pay their rent or mounting debts - never mind engage in teaching critically and creatively while writing as a sustained act of dissent. At the same time, the wider culture is sinking under a flood of consumer and celebrity idiocy. There are some who suggest that such critiques of the growing authoritarianism and repression in American society are useless and in the long run do nothing more than reinforce a crippling dystopianism. I think this line of argument is not only wrong but complicitous with the very problems it refuses to acknowledge. From a left suffocating in cynicism, there is the argument that people are already aware of these problems, as if neoliberal hegemony does not exist and that its success in building a consensus around its ideology as a mode of common sense is passé. At the same time, liberals detest such criticism because it calls into question the totality of American politics rather than focus on one issue and gestures toward a radical restructuring of American society rather than piecemeal and useless reforms. The call for such a restructuring rather than piecemeal reforms sends liberals into fits of hysteria. Of course, the right in all of its varieties views criticism as a virus that destroys everything they admire about America - a society in which democracy has been eviscerated and largely benefits the top ten percent of the population. Most importantly, the banality of evil lies less in the humdrum cruelty of everyday relations but in its normalization, the depolicitizaton of culture, and, at the present moment, in the reproduction of a neoliberal society that eradicates any vestige of public values, the ethical imagination, social responsibility, civic education and democratic social relations. The enemy is not a market economy but a market society and the breakdown of all forms of social solidarity that inform democratic politics and the cultural, political and economic institutions that make it possible. The authoritarianism that now shapes American society is not a matter of fate but one rooted in organized struggle and a vision built on the recognition that there are always alternatives to the existing order that speak to the promise of a democracy to come. The contradictions of neoliberalism are unraveling, but the consensus that informs it is alive and well. And it is at that level of educational intervention that the war against market authoritarianism in all of its diverse forms has to be fought first. Commonsense has become the enemy of critical thought. Hope is no longer part of the discourse of the left, only a dreary sense of despair with no vision of how to imagine a radical democracy. Manufactured ignorance has become a virtue instead of a liability in a society ruled by the financial elite. And as such we have no serious crisis of ideas. Instead, we have a crisis of power relations and structures that needs a new political language if it is to be contested at the level of both a pedagogical and political struggle. The current neoliberal drive to ruthlessly extend the never-ending task of accumulating capital is matched only by its ruthless determination to produce[s] a notion of common sense that reinforces the idea that there is no way to think beyond the present system. The American public needs to break the authoritarian dysimagination machine that affirms everyone as a consumer and reduces freedom to unchecked self-interest while reproducing subjects who are willingly complicit with the plundering of the environment, resources and public goods by the financial elite. Class and racial warfare are alive and well in the United States. In fact, racism and the class warfare waged by right-wing politicians, bankers, hedge fund managers and the corporate rich are intensifying. Americans need to reject a politics in which public goods are demonized and eradicated, African-American youths become the fodder for wars abroad and the military-prison-industrial complex, the underclass disappears, public servants are disparaged, youths vanish into debt and despair, and the middle class passes into oblivion. While politics must be connected to its material moorings, it is not enough to imagine a different future than the one that now hangs over us like a suffocating sandstorm. Those intellectuals, workers, young people, artists and others committed to a radical democracy need to develop a new vocabulary about how to think about the meaning of politics, human agency and the building of a formative culture through which organized collective struggles can develop in the effort to imagine a new and more democratic future.

#### Don’t view the advocacy through the frame of real-politik consequentialism, it locks us into the status quo. Rather your ballot serves to validate the best worldview. We control uniqueness.

Dixon 99: (Nicholas Dixon 99---1999 (“Handguns, Violent Crime, and Self-Defense,” International Journal of Applied Philosophy, 13.2 (1999):239-260)

To allow considerations of realpolitik to influence our judgments about the morality of a practice or policy would effectively lock us into the status quo, and sabotage the role of applied ethics as a vehicle for proposing social change. Absurd consequences are easy to find. For instance, when the abolitionist movement first began, little doubt exists that it had no realistic chance at that time of persuading Congress to abolish slavery. Does this mean that its members were wrong to morally condemn slavery and call for its abolition? Similar comments apply to the suffragette movement in its early days. Worse still, if applied ethicists are to confine themselves to defending positions that have a realistic chance of currently being legally enacted, prolife philosophers will have to stop writing papers in which they condemn abortion, since, given the current composition of the Supreme Court, legislation banning¶ "regular" abortion is virtually impossible to enact and defend against constitutional challenges. ¶ Granted, the abolitionist movement did indeed take heed of political realities and worked incrementally to restrict slavery to certain states before finally pushing for its complete abolition. This is because it, like the suffragette movement, was a political movement, whose goal was to bring about concrete social change. Nonetheless, underlying both movements were moral arguments that made no compromise for political realities in their condemnation of slavery and the oppression of women. And this is precisely the role that applied ethicists should play in discussing handgun control: providing a moral vision of the handgun policy that would best reduce violence and respect rights. How to realize that moral vision is an important question, but a secondary one, and one that is best left to political organizations that are more knowledgeable about political realities. It may well tum out that Handgun Control, Inc.'s strategy of proposing moderate restrictions on handgun ownership is a shrewd first step that is a necessary prelude to the more radical proposal advanced here. But moral arguments for handgun prohibition are needed to guide and motivate even incremental change to achieve that goal. Nor is guiding and motivating those who already share a movement's goal the only role for applied ethicists. Even more important is the ability of cogent moral arguments to convince opponents and the uncommitted of the desirability of social change. The abolitionist, suffragette, and civil rights movements all illustrate this phenomenon. So another error made by those who reject as unrealistic my proposal to ban handguns is to regard one of the realities that do indeed make it difficult to achieve at present-i.e., the widespread belief that handguns make law-abiding citizens safer against crime as engraved in stone. They overlook the power of striking empirical evidence and clearly presented arguments to persuade the American public that the widespread ownership of handguns is a major cause of violent crime. We need to continue to present this evidence and these arguments until we convince enough people that handgun prohibition is desirable that it will eventually become eminently attainable (256-257).

### Advocacy: Variable Interp

#### Thus I affirm as a demand that private ownership of handguns ought to be banned in the United States– I will defend a ban implemented through mandatory buy back scheme. I will also defend either the 50 states or USFG if asked in CX but will not defend that alternative actors are competitive – the topic isn’t about that – just clarify in CX.

### Advocacy: States

#### Thus, I affirm: The state governments of the United States ought to ban the private ownership of handguns.

Kleck 86 (Gary Kleck, criminologist and is the David J. Bordua Professor of Criminology at Florida State University, “POLICY LESSONS FROM RECENT GUN CONTROL RESEARCH.” 1986//FT)

Yet, many advocates of federal controls go far beyond such measures. In their report to the National Violence Commission, Newton and Zimring recommended a federal restrictive licensing standard amounting to a virtual ban on private ownership of handguns. 67 Rather than simply supplementing state measures and thus making it possible for states effectively to apply whatever gun control measures they regard as necessary, such a far-reaching proposal is a substitute for state controls, a way of overriding state legislatures' unwillingness to pass more restrictive laws of their own. There are several good reasons to reject this approach. First, the concept of federalism implies that the states should have as much autonomy as possible in drafting their criminal law and other statutes. Second, federal controls are less satisfactory because traditionally there has been a very limited federal law enforcement apparatus in the area of ordinary crime. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) regards itself more as an investigatory than a law enforcement agency. Nothing at the federal level corresponds to a street police force, and local police agencies, where most law enforcement personnel are concentrated, have generally been reluctant to devote their limited resources to the enforcement of federal laws. Third, the need for gun control differs sharply from one state to another. Some states have almost no violent crime, with or without guns, while others have a great deal. For example, in 1981 South Dakota had only twelve murders and nonnegligent manslaughters and 122 robberies (1.8 and 17.8 per 100,000 population, respectively), while Nevada, with only twenty-three percent more people, had 148 homicides and 3,867 robberies (17.5 and 64.9 per 100,000, respectively) 68

#### To clarify, a ban entails the following:

**Etzioni ’92:** [Amitai Etzioni and Steven Hellend, “The Case for Domestic Disarmament”, The Communitarian Network, 1992] VM

PROPOSED HANDGUN LEGISLATION Prohibits the importation, exportation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns. Establishes a "grace period" during which time handguns may be turned into any law enforcement agency with impunity and for reimbursement at the greater of either $25 or the fair market value of the gun.

### Solvency (3:00)

#### For too long, we have let the gun industry and their politicians fracture society with fear --- gun culture normalizes daily violence and fortifies militarism. We control terminal uniqueness - we must challenge them now.

Giroux ’15: Henry A. Giroux, "Murder, Incorporated: Guns and the Growing Culture of Violence in the US,"vTruthout, 7 Oct 2015, VM.

Nine people were killed and seven wounded recently in a mass shooting at a community college in Roseburg, Oregon. Such shootings are more than another tragic expression of unchecked violence in the United States; they are symptomatic of a society engulfed in fear, militarism, a survival-of-the-fittest ethos and a growing disdain for human life. Sadly, this shooting is not an isolated incident. Over 270 mass shootings have taken place in the United States this year alone, proving once again that the economic, political and social conditions that underlie such violence are not being addressed. To read more articles by Henry A. Giroux and other authors in the Public Intellectual Project, click here. In the United States, calls for liberal, Band-Aid reforms do not work in the face of the carnage taking place. "The United States sees an average of 92 gun deaths per day - and more preschoolers are shot dead each year than police officers are killed in the line of duty." (1) Mass violence in the United States has to be understood within a larger construction of the totality of the forces that produce it. Focusing merely on the more dramatic shootings misses the extent of the needless violence and murders that are taking place daily. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. State repression, unbridled self-interest, an empty consumerist ethos and war-like values have become the organizing principles of US society, producing an indifference to the common good, compassion, a concern for others and equality. As the public collapses into the individualized values of a banal consumer culture and the lure of private obsessions, US society flirts with forms of irrationality that are at the heart of everyday aggression and the withering of public life. US society is driven by unrestrained market values in which economic actions and financial exchanges are divorced from social costs, further undermining any sense of social responsibility. In addition, a wasteful, giant military-industrial-surveillance complex fueled by the war on terror, along with the United States' endless consumption of violence as entertainment and its celebration of a pervasive gun culture, normalizes the everyday violence waged against Black youth, immigrants, children fed into the school-to-prison pipeline and others considered disposable. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. Under such circumstances, a society saturated in violence gains credence when its political leaders have given up on the notion of the common good, social justice and equality, all of which appear to have become relics of history in the United States. In the face of mass shootings, the public relations disimagination machine goes into overdrive claiming that guns are not the problem, and that the causes of such violence can be largely attributed to people living with mentally illness. When in actuality, as two Vanderbilt University researchers, Dr. Jonathan Metzl and Kenneth T. MacLeish, publishing in the American Journal of Public Health, observed that: Fewer than 6 percent of the 120,000 gun-related killings in the United States between 2001 and 2010 were perpetrated by people diagnosed with mental illness. Our research finds that across the board, the mentally ill are 60 to 120 percent more likely than the average person to be the victims of violent crime rather than the perpetrators.... There are 32,000 gun deaths in the United States on average every year, and people are far more likely to be shot by relatives, friends or acquaintances than they are by lone violent psychopaths. (2) It may not be an exaggeration to claim that the US government has blood on its hands because of the refusal of Congress to rein in a gun lobby that produces a growing militarism that sanctions a love affair with the unbridled corporate institutions, financial interests and mass-produced cultures of violence. The Oregon community college shooting is the 41st school shooting this year while there have been 142 incidents of violence on school properties since 2012. Yet, the violence continues unchecked, all the while legitimated by the cowardly acts of politicians who refuse to enact legislation to curb the proliferation of guns or support measures as elementary as background checks - which 88 percent of the American people support - or for that matter, ban large-capacity ammunition magazines and assault rifles. In part, this cowardly refusal on the part of politicians is due to the fact that gun lobbyists pour huge amounts of money into the campaigns of politicians who support their interests. For example, in 2015, the gun lobby spent $5,697,429 while those supporting gun control paid out $867,601. In a New York Times op-ed, Gabrielle Giffords pointed out that the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the 2012 election cycle "spent around $25 million on contributions, lobbying and outside spending." (3) Outside money does more than corrupt politics; it is also responsible for people being shot and killed. The culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Many Americans are obsessed with violence. They not only own nearly 300 million firearms, but also have a love affair with powerful weaponry such as 9mm Glock semiautomatic pistols and AR-15 assault rifles. Collective anger, frustration, fear and resentment increasingly characterize a society in which people are out of work, young people cannot imagine a decent future, everyday behaviors are criminalized, inequality in wealth and income are soaring and the police are viewed as occupying armies. This is not only a recipe for both random violence and mass shootings; it makes such acts appear routine and commonplace. Fear has become a public relations strategy used not only by the national security state but also by the gun industry. When you live in a country in which you are constantly bombarded by the assumption that the government is the enemy of democracy and you are told that nobody can be trusted, and the discourse of hate, particularly against Black youth, immigrants and gun control advocates, spews out daily from thousands of conservative radio stations and major TV networks, a climate of fear engulfs the country reinforcing the belief that gun ownership is the only notion of safety in which people can believe in order to live as free human beings. Under such circumstances, genuine fears and concerns for safety are undermined. These include the fear of poverty, lack of meaningful employment, the absence of decent health care, poor schools, police violence and the militarization of society, all of which further legitimate and fuel the machinery of insecurity, violence and death. Fear degenerates into willful ignorance while any semblance of rationality is erased, especially around the logic of gun control. As Adam Gopnik observes: Gun control ends gun violence as surely an antibiotics end bacterial infections, as surely as vaccines end childhood measles - not perfectly and in every case, but overwhelmingly and everywhere that it's been taken seriously and tried at length. These lives can be saved. Kids continue to die en masse because one political party won't allow that to change, and the party won't allow it to change because of the irrational and often paranoid fixations that make the massacre of students and children an acceptable cost of fetishizing guns. (4) President Obama is right in stating that the violence we see in the United States is "a political choice we make that allows this to happen." While taking aim at the gun lobby, especially the NRA, what Obama fails to address is that extreme violence is systemic in US society, has become the foundation of politics and must be understood within a broader historical, economic, cultural and political context. To be precise, politics has become an extension of violence driven by a culture of fear, cruelty and hatred legitimated by the politicians bought and sold by the gun lobby and other related militaristic interests. Moreover, violence is now treated as a sport, a pleasure-producing form of commerce, a source of major profits for the defense industries and a corrosive influence upon US democracy. And as such it is an expression of a deeper political and ethical corruption in US society. As Rich Broderick insists, US society "embraces a soulless free-market idolatry in which the value of everything, including human beings, is determined by the bottom line" and in doing so this market fundamentalism and its theater of cruelty and greed perpetuate a spectacle of violence fed by an echo chamber "of paranoia, racism, and apocalyptic fantasies rampant in the gun culture." (5) The lesson here is that the culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Murdering children in schools, the streets, in jails, detention centers and other places increasingly deemed unsafe has become something of a national pastime. One wonders how many innocent children have to die in the United States before it becomes clear that the revenue made by the $13.5 billion gun industry, with a $1.5 billion profit, are fueling a national bloodbath by using lobbyists to pay off politicians, wage a mammoth propaganda campaign and induct young children into the culture of violence. (6) What is clear is that as more guns are on the streets and in the hands of people a savage killing machine is unleashed on those who are largely poor, Black and vulnerable. The widespread availability of guns is the reason for the shooting and killing of children and adults in Chicago, Boston, Ferguson, New York City and in other major cities. The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence reports that "in 2010, guns took the lives of 31,076 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings. This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour. [In addition], 73,505 Americans were treated in hospital emergency departments for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2010." (7) And the toll of gun violence on young people is truly heartbreaking with almost 30,000 young people killed in a 10-year period, which amounts "to nearly 3,000 kids shot to death in a typical year." (8) According to a Carnegie-Knight News21 program investigation, For every US soldier killed in Afghanistan during 11 years of war, at least 13 children were shot and killed in the United States. More than 450 kids didn't make it to kindergarten. Another 2,700 or more were killed by a firearm before they could sit behind the wheel of a car. Every day, on average, seven children were shot dead. A News21 investigation of child and youth deaths in the United States between 2002 and 2012 found that at least 28,000 children and teens 19-years-old and younger were killed with guns. Teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 made up over two-thirds of all youth gun deaths in the United States. (9) Even worse, the firearms industry is pouring millions into recruiting and educational campaigns designed to both expose children to guns at an early age and to recruit them as lifelong gun enthusiasts. Reporting on such efforts for The New York Times, Mike McIntire writes: The industry's strategies include giving firearms, ammunition and cash to youth groups; weakening state restrictions on hunting by young children; marketing an affordable military-style rifle for "junior shooters" and sponsoring semiautomatic-handgun competitions for youths; and developing a target-shooting video game that promotes brand-name weapons, with links to the Web sites of their makers.... Newer initiatives by other organizations go further, seeking to introduce children to high-powered rifles and handguns while invoking the same rationale of those older, more traditional programs: that firearms can teach "life skills" like responsibility, ethics and citizenship. (10) As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws, social responsibility and a government responsive to its people matter. We must end the dominance of gun lobbyists, the reign of money-controlled politics, the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture and the ongoing militarization of US society. At the same time, it is crucial, as many in the movement for Black lives have stated, that we refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color. Gun violence in the United States is inextricably tied to economic violence as when hedge fund managers invest heavily in companies that make high-powered automatic rifles, 44-40 Colt revolvers, laser scopes for semiautomatic handguns and expanded magazine clips. (11) The same mentality that trades in profits at the expense of human life gives the United States the shameful title of being the world's largest arms exporter. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, "Washington sold 31% of all global imports during the 2010-2014 period." (12) This epidemic of violence connects the spreading of violence abroad with the violence waged at home. It also points to the violence reproduced by politicians who would rather support the military-industrial-gun complex and arms industries than address the most basic needs and social problems faced by Americans. Rather than arming people with more guns, criminalizing every aspect of social behavior, militarizing the police and allowing the gun lobby to sanction putting semiautomatic weapons in the hands of children and adults, the most immediate action that can be taken is to institute effective gun control laws. As Bernardine Dohrn has argued: We want gun control that sanctions manufacturers, distributors and adults who place, and profit from, deadly weapons in the possession of youth. We want military-style weaponry banned. We want smaller schools with nurses and social workers, librarians and parent volunteers - all of which are shown to contribute to less disruption and less violence. Let's promote gun-control provisions and regulations that enhance teaching and learning as well as justice and safety for children, not those that will further incarcerate, punish and demonize young people of color. We've been there before. (13)

#### At its core a gun ban represents more than just gun violence --- it affirms a world-view of solidarity contrary to the individualistic vision of neoliberalism.

Esposito and Finley 14 – brackets for clarity: (Luigi, Prof Sociology @Barry, Laura, Asst. Prof Sociology and Criminology @Barry, Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States, Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April ) Esposito and Finley, PhDs, 14//FT)

In a 2003 article, Yale legal scholar and psychologist Dan M. Kahan argues that the ongoing debate about gun control in the U.S. has been dominated by what he calls the “tyranny of econometrics” (i.e., debates revolve around whether or not “more guns” produce more or less crime and violence). Kahan suggests this focus on quantitative outcomes either ignores or trivializes how both sides of this debate are predicated on fundamentally different worldviews that shape and give coherence to their respective interpretations of “what America is and ought to be” (Kahan, 2003, p. 6). Specifically, a focus on econometrics downplays how the majority of those who support gun control base their position on an egalitarian and solidaristic view of the world, while a majority of those who oppose gun control base their arguments on a more hierarchical and individualistic vision. Without taking these opposing visions into account, the debate ignores the crucial relevance of culture in shaping people’s attitudes about gun control. Consistent with Kahan’s analysis, one might also argue that both sides of the gun control debate have very different understandings about the role of government in a free and democratic society. Among those who support gun control, a majority tends to embrace a progressive understanding of government. Stated simply, they believe that people— through activism and direct participation—can harness the power of government to advance human freedom, challenge societal injustices, and protect the common good (Esposito and Finley 2012). Government, in this sense, can be a potentially benevolent mechanism that works to create a better society for all. This position stands in sharp contrast to the vision espoused by a majority who oppose gun control. Among many of those [who oppose gun control] in this latter camp, government is invariably the enemy and can therefore never be trusted to promote the well-being of the populace. Self-reliant individuals competing in a free market, as opposed to a central authority, is what promotes an optimal society. According to this viewpoint, hierarchy is simply a natural product of freedom and it is really up to individuals to look after their own interests—including their personal safety. Having unrestricted (or minimally restricted) access to firearms as a way to protect oneself and one’s family should thus be a fundamental right. For over three decades, this latter position—which has dominated social, political, and cultural discourse in the United States—has been bolstered and reinforced by the market ideology often referred to as neoliberalism. At its most basic, neoliberalism is typically associated with pro-market policies such as de-regulation, privatization, and liberalization. Neoliberalism, however, is far more than simply a body of policy prescriptions. Developed in opposition to Keynesianism and similar theories calling for a regulated economy and a strong welfare state, the architects of neoliberalism, which include economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, understand the free market as a quasi-infallible mechanism for organizing social life (e.g., Harvey 2005; Klein 2007; Giroux 2008; Esposito 2011). Centralized state planning, according to neoliberals, is burdened by a series of bureaucratic restraints that compromise efficiency, particularly within the social and economic realms (Harvey 2005) . Therefore, rather than relying on the state, most social or economic objectives are best achieved by individuals operating within the private realm (e.g., Friedman and Friedman 1980; Friedman 1982). It is within the private realm that persons have the freedom to act in their self-interest as they “see fit.” Neoliberalism, in this respect, draws from classical liberal principles and emphasizes that, under conditions of freedom, individuals are rational actors who constantly makes calculations of what will serve them best. Minimizing government and handing over as much of the economy and society in general to the private sector is thus a central objective in the neoliberal agenda. This shift presumably promotes an efficient order of autonomous individuals who, by freely pursuing their preferences, are able to meet their own needs and control their own destinies.

#### The NRA uses Gun rights to fracture individuals—atomization guarantees rugged individualism of neoliberal ideology.

Firmin DeBrabander 15 [associate professor of philosophy at Maryland Institute College of Art, has written social and political commentary for numerous publications, including the Baltimore Sun, Common Dreams, Counterpunch, and the New York Times] “Do Guns Make Us Free?: Democracy and the Armed Society”, Yale University Press, 19 May 2015, BE

Rousseau and Tocqueville maintain that democracies, like all states, devolve through political concentration. Viewing the young American democracy, Tocqueville deduces that extreme individualism greases the wheels of this process. Materialism sharpens our individualism and makes us devoted to personal gain, as opposed to personal glory, which is more amenable to civic participation. Egalitarianism ironically urges us to dissociate from others, Tocqueville suggests; if my neighbors and compatriots are neither above me nor below me, what need do I have for them? In the ancien régime, people in different stations relied on one another, and the pieces of society fit together into a seamless whole. Not so in the new world: here, I may be self-determining and self-sufficient. Tocqueville offers a vision of aristocracy that is too rosy. He suggests that the masses should rely on the expertise of the nobility, who are bred and trained for leadership. But the American instinct to reject expertise and authority in favor of self-reliance is, for Tocqueville, at least equally disastrous. It is wonderful so long as it inspires the political attention and interest he witnessed in New England town meetings, but civic involvement is ultimately bound to lose out to capitalistic endeavors and the seductive joys of consumerism. Civic involvement has become a casualty in our own era, when we suffer from “time poverty,” as sociologist Juliet Schor put it: Americans put in long work days, combined with increasingly long commutes, and have little time or energy to interact with their peers, work for their communities, or even think much about politics. 88 This state of affairs is fueled by personal ambition, but also by plain greed. As Tocqueville presciently saw, Americans have little interest, and are left with little energy, to be political creatures, and to devote time to thoughtful and concerted political action and interaction. This fragmentation of society into atomistic individuals, each pursuing his or her own endeavor in isolation or in contention with others, renders us vulnerable and ripe for oppression: “What resistance can be offered to tyranny in a country where each individual is weak and where citizens are not united by any common interest?” 89 There is perhaps no individualism more extreme than that put forth by the contemporary gun rights movement. The NRA argues against the collective reading of the Second Amendment and insists instead upon the individual citizen’s right to amass a colossal private arsenal. The organization toils on behalf of individuals’ right to shoot intruders in their private abodes without accountability or social judgment. It works to ensure that individuals can act impulsively in private arguments, according to their personal whims, passions, and prejudices. It demands that they be permitted ammunition capable of piercing bulletproof vests worn by police. None of these advances a collective right or concern. It is to further the interests of each individual in being armed to the teeth, with whatever tools, for whatever purpose (provided it is within the law), and to have greater leeway in wielding and employing them. These arms represent a suspicion of the collective, and of the government that would represent the collective good. I argued in the previous chapter how these weapons are a mark of suspicion, and deepen the suspicion of the armed. A gun fundamentally severs its bearer from the community of his peers; it causes others to treat [them] him with trepidation and fear— if they approach him at all. As open carry proponents proudly assert, their weapons are intended to serve as a warning. Saul Cornell chides contemporary gun rights ideology for promoting gun ownership primarily as “a means for repulsing government or other citizens, not a means for creating a common civic culture.” 90 This, he argues, is at odds with the aims and intentions of our Founders. He believes they did envision an individual right to bear arms, but it was never meant to be a right in isolation. It was to be linked to a civic function and to collective obligation. Cornell writes, The original version of a well-regulated militia was premised on the notion that rights and obligations were inseparable. Arms bearing was a public activity, a way of nurturing and demonstrating one’s capacity for virtue. The militia was viewed by the Founders as a vital political and social institution, part of a seamless web that knit the locality, the state, and the national government together into a cohesive political community. 91 Cornell’s argument aptly depicts how the current gun rights movement undermines civic life. Gun rights, as they are currently conceived and championed by the NRA, are the ultimate go-it-alone rights. If our Founders felt that the Second Amendment would help oppose tyrannical government, it is reasonable to wonder how such opposition was ever to be mobilized. It could hardly happen in a nation of armed, isolated individuals, each in charge of a private arsenal. This purpose requires a trained, organized— regulated— force; it implies collective action, purpose, will, and commitment. George Washington grew tired of militias to the extent that they were loose collections of individuals. He wanted a fighting force with cohesion, identity, and organization because he was a warrior, and he knew what war— or the toppling of tyrannical regimes— required. The gun rights movement pits the individual against society. Collectives are suspect, groups weak, their members sheeplike, obedient, pliant, and ultimately subservient. Collectives breed collective behavior, which is reprehensible to the movement’s bold, assertive, fearless, and morally certain adherents. People mired in collective sensibilities wait for the police to bail them out of threatening situations. Free, confident, strong individuals go it alone. Collectives are corruptible, their members easy to manipulate and herd. Only the independent individual is pure and inviolate. Political freedom thus stems from the uncorrupted and incorruptible sovereign individual. To gun rights advocates, that is the center and foundation of liberty. This much is clear from the political vision put forth by Napolitano and LaPierre: the principal political battlefield, anticipated by the Founding Fathers who knew tyranny firsthand, is between the individual fighting to retain his sovereignty, and the collective that would strip it away. This stripping-away takes place through, among other things, government efforts to regulate guns, abetted by those who would cede their freedom for the short-term prospect of personal safety. In the process, such people unwittingly empower tyranny. Dan Baum writes Guns are the perfect stand-in for one of the fundamental, irresolvable, and recurring questions we face: to what extent should Americans live as a collective, or as a nation of rugged individuals? We have the same fight over health care, welfare, environmental regulations, and a hundred other issues. The firearm, though, is the ultimate emblem of individual sovereignty, so if you’re inclined in that direction, protecting gun rights is essential. And if you’re by nature a collectivist, the firearm is the abhorrent idol on the enemy’s altar. 92 Baum articulates the dichotomy aptly, at least as it is viewed by the gun rights movement. Tyranny has also been invoked in recent debates over health care and environmental regulation. It follows from, and is symptomatic of, collectivism and anything that points in that direction. The gun rights movement offers us radical individualism— the sovereign individual— as the requisite remedy. But its advocates do not perceive, or refuse to admit, how politically debilitating their agenda is. Contrary to what they assert, their sovereign individuals, even armed to the teeth, are no match for the brute power of tyrants. Instead, the NRA and company unwittingly assist tyrants with their (as Cornell puts it) radically “anti-civic vision.” 93 The gun rights movement undermines the collective or popular organization that alone might prove effective in countering a government bent on oppression.

#### And hand gun is the quintessential American gun.

Eugene Volokh 9 ~American law professor, the Gary T. Schwartz Professor of Law at the UCLA School of Law~, "IMPLEMENTING THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS FOR SELF-DEFENSE: AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND A RESEARCH AGENDA", UCLA LAW REVIEW 1443, 2009, BE

And the Court’s explanation of why the handgun ban is unconstitutional even if long guns are allowed is likewise consistent with an inquiry into how substantially a law burdens the right to bear arms: It is no answer to say, as petitioners do, that it is permissible to ban the possession of handguns so long as the possession of other firearms (i.e., long guns) is allowed. It is enough to note, as we have observed, that the American people have considered the handgun to be the quintessential self-defense weapon. There are many reasons that a citizen may prefer a handgun for home defense: It is easier to store in a location that is readily accessible in an emergency; it cannot easily be redirected or wrestled away by an attacker; it is easier to use for those without the upper-body strength to lift and aim a long gun; it can be pointed at a burglar with one hand while the other hand dials the police. Whatever the reason, handguns are the most popular weapon chosen by Americans for self-defense in the home, and a complete prohibition of their use is invalid.49 The Court is pointing out that handguns are popular for a reason: For many people, they are the optimal self-defense tool, and bans on handguns make self-defense materially more difficult. The handgun ban, then, is a material burden on the right to bear arms in self-defense.

#### And a gun ban is key --- it ruptures the neoliberal narrative and forces a cultural shift

DONOHUE ’15: [[JOHN DONOHUE](http://www.newsweek.com/user/18974), columnist at Newsweek, “Gun Control: What We Can Learn From Other Advanced Countries”, Newsweek, 10/3/15//VM]

The story of Australia, which had [13 mass shootings](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2704353/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) in the 18-year period from 1979 to 1996 but none in the succeeding 19 years, is worth examining. The turning point was the 1996 Port Arthur massacre in Tasmania, in which a gunman killed 35 individuals using semiautomatic weapons. In the wake of the massacre, the conservative federal government succeeded in implementing tough new [gun control laws](http://www.loc.gov/law/help/firearms-control/australia.php%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) throughout the country. A large array of weapons were banned—including the Glock semiautomatic handgun used in the Charleston shootings. The government also imposed a mandatory gun buy back that substantially reduced gun possession in Australia. The effect was that both gun suicides and homicides (as well as total suicides and homicides) [fell](http://andrewleigh.org/pdf/gunbuyback_panel.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). In addition, the 1996 legislation made it a crime to use firearms in self-defense. When I mention this to disbelieving NRA supporters they insist that crime must now be rampant in Australia. In fact, the Australian murder rate has fallen to close to [one per 100,000](http://www.aic.gov.au/dataTools/facts/vicViolentRate.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) while the U.S. rate, thankfully lower than in the early 1990s, is still roughly at [4.5 per 100,000](https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/tables/1tabledatadecoverviewpdf/table_1_crime_in_the_united_states_by_volume_and_rate_per_100000_inhabitants_1994-2013.xls%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)—over four times as high. Moreover, robberies in Australia occur at [only about half](http://www.aic.gov.au/dataTools/facts/vicViolentRate.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) the [rate of the U.S.](https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/violent-crime/robbery-topic-page%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) (58 in Australia versus 113.1 per 100,000 in the U.S. in 2012). How did Australia do it? Politically, it took a brave prime minister to face the rage of Australian gun interests. John Howard [wore a bullet-proof vest](http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/anger-lingers-among-those-who-lost-their-firearms/2006/04/27/1145861489398.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) when he announced the proposed gun restrictions in June 1996. The deputy prime minister was [hung in effigy](http://www.latitudenews.com/story/i-was-hung-in-effigy-changing-a-countrys-gun-culture/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). But Australia did not have a domestic gun industry to oppose the new measures, so the will of the people was allowed to emerge. And today, support for the safer, gun-restricted Australia is so strong that going back [would not be tolerated](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/dec/14/america-mass-murder-australia-gun-control-saves-lives%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) by the public. That Australia hasn’t had a mass shooting since 1996 is likely more than merely the result of the considerable reduction in guns—it’s certainly not the case that guns have disappeared altogether. I suspect that the country has also experienced a cultural shift between the shock of the Port Arthur massacre and the removal of guns from every day life as they are no longer available for self-defense and they are simply less present throughout the country. Troubled individuals, in other words, are not constantly being reminded that guns are a means to address their alleged grievances to the extent that they were in the past, or continue to be in the U.S.

#### Laws can affect culture – history confirms.

Masket 15 –brackets SETH MASKET, OCT 5, 2015, “You Can Change Laws Without Changing Hearts and Minds” http://www.psmag.com/politics-and-law/you-can-change-laws-without-changing-hearts-and-minds

In the wake of yet another mass shooting, a rather familiar public debate is playing out. Liberals are calling for restrictions on access to weapons. President Obama, in one of the better examples of the inherent weaknesses of the presidency, gave a statement that gun laws are needed but he knows full well that Congress will never pass them and there's not a damned thing he can do to about it. Meanwhile, many of those opposed to gun regulations cited the usual issues. For one, they noted, mass shootings are almost invariably perpetrated by the mentally ill, so we should do a better job caring for or monitoring the mentally ill. But as many others have noted, raising this issue is a dodge. Mental illness is a very serious issue in this country, but no more so than it is in others that have far, far fewer gun-related deaths each year. Besides, even if most shootings are done by the mentally ill, that does not mean that most mentally ill people are prone to violence. We could just as accurately note that mass shootings are almost invariably perpetrated by white men, but singling them out as potential criminals is as morally abhorrent as it is impractical. But another issue frequently raised is that gun culture runs deep in our nation. America, that is, has a fiercely individualistic culture and access to firearms is a part of that, dating back to the nation's founding and earlier. Gun violence is a deeply complex and intractable issue in the United States that is rooted in region, faith, race, poverty, and family. You can't just change the laws without changing our hearts and minds first. Let's not assume that an issue is untouchable because it's complex or has deep cultural roots. So does every social issue. To hear this reminds me of a fascinating and surprisingly revealing recent exchange between Hillary Clinton and activists from the Black Lives Matter movement. Wary of her support for their movement, activists asked Clinton on what issues she had changed in her heart that had brought her around. "I don’t believe you change hearts," Clinton responded. "I believe you change laws, you change allocation of resources, you change the way systems operate." Clinton's response, while perhaps harsh, was basically correct. Actually changing the political culture can take decades, or it may never even happen. It's not even clear how one does it or how we would measure it. But laws can be changed. We saw this during the Civil Rights Movement, when activists pursued a decade-long strategy to pressure elected officials and challenge existing laws in courts to do things like end segregation in public schools and public transportation and secure voting rights. Yes, civil rights leaders also sought to persuade the public and change the culture, but majorities of whites thought those activists were pushing too fast even at the height of their political influence. Southern white culture did eventually change, but it followed, rather than preceded, the change in the law. We have seen changes in laws affecting same-sex couples, abortion, poverty, health insurance—all issues with deep and complicated political and cultural histories. Those changes came because groups advocated for them and pressured the judicial, legislative, and executive branches to respond. In some cases, the culture shifted to reflect the legal change. In other cases, the culture never changed, but the law did. We should also consider the example of Australia, which swiftly passed tight gun controls and a massive gun buyback program in the wake of a 1996 mass shooting in Tasmania. It would be difficult to argue that Australians' individualistic culture changed overnight, but the law did. And firearms deaths have dropped dramatically there. None of this is to say that changing gun laws would be easy in America. It wouldn't. Unfettered access to firearms has become one of the defining tenets of the party currently controlling the Congress. Unless party control changes or that tenet is strongly challenged within the party, there will be little movement on this issue at the federal level. But let's not assume that an issue is untouchable because it's complex or has deep cultural roots. So does every social issue. Some have seen legal changes anyway, and some of those changes have done the country a great deal of good.

#### A Handgun Ban would crush gun giants --- we undermine the NRA --- this is the first step.

Fendrock ’13: (John J. Fendrock 13 (The Second Amendment in the 21st Century [Xlibris Co])

U.S. firearms are produced by 5,400 licensed manufacturers. 40°/o are sold by unlicensed private sellers.110 In addition, as of October, 2012 according co me Bureau of Tobacco, Firearms a11d Explosive records, there were 50,812 federally Licensed gun dealers in the United Scaces.111 These statistics gives an overview of me size of industry and business supporting and profiting from the production and distribution of firearms in the United States. The accuracy of some of the numbers may be questioned by reasonable individuals but it is clear that this activity employs thousands of people and supports a large number of businesses—manufacturing and marketing/sale activities. Restricting the possession of firearms would have a serious-fatal in many cases-effect on these activities. The lucrative American market would be closed except for the legitimate needs of the government to replace obsolete arms used by the federal, state and municipal law enforcement agencies or to support the Federal government to outfit a growth in the military to meet a perceived threat against the country. If necessary the government could support certain companies in maintaining production capability within their facilities. Companies that found themselves unable to compete in the limited market in sales to the the tightly controlled hunting and sport shooting would have to adapt their skills and facilities to producing goods for the electro-mechanical needs of industries such as automotive communication, industrial equipment and similar industries. In short, they would have to adapt their activities to a changing market or close shop.

#### And aff reduces violence—takes out the illicit market

LaFollette 2k (Hugh, USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor, “Gun Control,” Ethics 110 (January 2000): pp. 263–281) PO

1. The connection between availability of guns and murder.—Perhaps the most well-established statistic is this: the more widely available guns (especially handguns) are, the more people are murdered. The figures are duplicated time and again in country after country. Here is the bottom line: ‘‘The correlation between any gun-prevalence and the overall murder rate is .67, while it is .84 between handgun prevalence and overall murder rate.’’ 11 These figures are significant to the .01 level; that is, the chance that these correlations could occur merely by chance is less than one out of 100. This correlation meets the statisticians’ gold standard. But this does not resolve the issue, for it does not establish what gun control advocates claim it shows, namely, that gun control is an effective way of substantially lessening the murder rate. First, a statistical correlation shows that two things are linked, but it does not tell us if the first caused the second, the second caused the first, or if there is some third factor which caused both. Second, even if the items are causally related, we do not know that changing the cause will automatically and straightforwardly change the effect since another factor might intervene to sustain the effect. Gun advocates proffer their own armchair explanation for the correlations: These correlations reflect the character of the respective social and political systems. The European countries where murder rates are lower have more social solidarity and are more heterogeneous than the United States. Whether these social factors explain all the correlation is debatable, but I am confident they explain some of it. Were the United States to regulate guns as tightly as most European countries, our murder rates would arguably fall, but they would not immediately plummet to their levels. We might settle the issue if we conducted controlled experiments, randomly dividing our population in half, giving half of them guns, removing all the guns from the other half, and then monitoring the murder rate. Of course, that would be morally unacceptable, politically unrealistic, and probably even scientifically unachievable. Before we had enough time to exclude all possible intervening causes, sufficient time might have elapsed so that new intervening causes could have emerged. But we are not in the dark. We have empirical evidence that helps adjudicate between competing explanations of the correlation. First, we have empirical evidence, bolstered by armchair arguments, that guns are more lethal than other weapons. Some claim the ratio is 5:1; no estimates are lower than 2:1 (Reiss, A. J., Jr. and Roth, J. A. 1993: 260). This partly explains the strong correlation between guns and homicides. If people get angry the same number of times, those using the most lethal weapons are more likely to kill their victims. Second, the nature of secondary gun markets helps explain how the widespread availability of guns increases crime in general, and homicides in specific. Various opponents of gun control claim that "If we outlaw guns, only outlaws will have guns." Armchair arguments suggest why this is a silly claim. Where, one might ask, do criminals get their guns? They often steal them or buy them from those who purchased them legally. Even guns obtained from other criminals are usually traceable to people who purchased them legally. Empirical evidence supports this armchair supposition. Most criminals report having stolen their guns, received them from a friend or family member, or purchased them from someone who had stolen it. At least half a million guns are stolen each year (Cook, P. J. et al. 1995: 81), and these swell the numbers of guns available illegally. Not only does the primary (legal) market effect the availability of guns on secondary markets, it also affects the price of guns on those markets, much "like the analogous markets for motor vehicles or prescription drugs" (Cook, P. J. et al. 1995: 71). As we restrict availability of guns in the primary market, the supply of guns in the secondary markets decreases and their cost increases (Cook, P. J. et al. 1995: 73). This increase in cost will diminish teenagers' ability to obtain guns, since they are least able to afford hefty prices. Since teenagers commit most deadly crimes, decreasing the availability of legal guns will thereby decrease the number of homicides. Conversely, having huge numbers of legally available guns increases the number of guns on secondary markets and typically lowers their price. This makes it easier for prospective criminals, including teenagers, to obtain guns. Third, having a gun around the house (or on the person) - even for self-protection - apparently increases the chance that someone in the family will kill themselves with the gun, or will be the victim of a homicide or an accident. One study found that "for every time a gun in the home was involved in a self-protection homicide, they noted 1.3 unintentional deaths, 4.5 criminal homicides, and 37 firearm suicides" (Reiss, A. J., Jr. and Roth, J. A. 1993: 267). This implies that for every case where someone in a gun-owning household kills an intruder to thwart a life-threatening attack, nearly 43 people in similar households will die from a gunshot. Taken together the evidence does not prove that widespread availability of guns increases the number of homicides. However, that empirical evidence, bolstered by earlier armchair arguments, makes the claim highly plausible.

#### No substitution

Dixon 93: Nicholas Dixon [Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College, Alma, Michigan], “SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PUBLIC LAW REVIEW”, 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243, 1993

One has to doubt the reliability of the statements of prisoners as to what firearms they would carry in certain circumstances. Macho bragging and outright lying are very likely in such situations, and relegate Kleck's projections to the status of unsupported conjecture. In view of the fact that such a small percentage of the actual murders in the United States in 1990 were committed with long guns,' the burden on Kleck to prove his hypothetical speculation is even heavier. As for Kates and Benenson, their projections are based on the unsupported assertion that the 70% of handgun killers who do not turn to long guns would instead use knives, the most lethal weapon other than firearms. It is more probable that at least some potential murderers would turn to less lethal weapons or their bare hands, and that some would be deterred from assaults altogether. Since Kates and Benenson ignore these probable scenarios, and since their substitution predictions are in any case purely speculative, it is safe to conclude that their estimate of the increase in the homicide rate in the event of a handgun-only ban is inflated. The conjectures offered in support of the substitution hypothesis are inadequate and fail to meet the burden of proof encumbent on opponents of my proposal.¶ Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homi- cides is that long guns are obviously much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will cause everyone in sight to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested¶ when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, a bank robber car-¶ rying a long gun will be immediately detected by security guards,¶ alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful¶ robbery greatly diminished. Handguns are obviously much more¶ convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson¶ point out that most homicides occur in the home, where¶ concealability is "irrelevant."95 However, concealability would seem¶ to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may¶ well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even¶ in the home. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle. Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes such arguments more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape.

# 1AR - Case

## Case

### 1AR – Impact Extension

#### -------- Impact --------

#### Militarism creates a society of castaway goods and people – violence is normalized and critical thought is repressed, which guarantees all their impacts are inevitable – so it’s try or die for the aff. That’s Giroux 13.

#### Outweighs Gourevitch – school to prison pipeline is inevitable – from war on drugs to criminalization of blacks – we must deal with the underlying culture

#### Their turns don’t access our impact – it’s not about crime but the normalization of violence by supposedly good people like you and me.

#### --------- Solvency -------

#### A gun ban creates the necessary cultural shift –Donohue proves a nation-wide ban on atomistic individual gun rights can show that “handguns” are not the solution to our problems. That’s key to disrupt the national identity of the atomized individual, armed for self-defense, that neoliberalism thrives on – that’s Esposito and Debrabander.

#### Masket answers their culture too strong arg - History has seen similar radical culture shifts incited by the law, such as civil rights or same sex marriage

#### Only about 30% of people even own a gun in the U.S – the other 70% won’t backlash, and will start to shift.

#### We solve substitut

### Fendrock Add-on

#### And – we gut the gun industry – which solves all their gun industry too strong claims.

Fendrock ’13: (John J. Fendrock 13 (The Second Amendment in the 21st Century [Xlibris Co])

U.S. firearms are produced by 5,400 licensed manufacturers. 40°/o are sold by unlicensed private sellers.110 In addition, as of October, 2012 according co me Bureau of Tobacco, Firearms a11d Explosive records, there were 50,812 federally Licensed gun dealers in the United Scaces.111 These statistics gives an overview of me size of industry and business supporting and profiting from the production and distribution of firearms in the United States. The accuracy of some of the numbers may be questioned by reasonable individuals but it is clear that this activity employs thousands of people and supports a large number of businesses—manufacturing and marketing/sale activities. Restricting the possession of firearms would have a serious-fatal in many cases-effect on these activities. The lucrative American market would be closed except for the legitimate needs of the government to replace obsolete arms used by the federal, state and municipal law enforcement agencies or to support the Federal government to outfit a growth in the military to meet a perceived threat against the country. If necessary the government could support certain companies in maintaining production capability within their facilities. Companies that found themselves unable to compete in the limited market in sales to the the tightly controlled hunting and sport shooting would have to adapt their skills and facilities to producing goods for the electro-mechanical needs of industries such as automotive communication, industrial equipment and similar industries. In short, they would have to adapt their activities to a changing market or close shop.

#### handguns are key

Plumer ’12: (Brad Plumer, “How the U.S. gun industry became so lucrative.” Washington Post, December 19, 2012//FT)

3. Handguns make up roughly half of the guns produced in the United States nowadays — and that number has been growing rapidly. In 2011, about half of the six million guns manufactured in the United States were pistols and revolvers. That's up from just one-third in 2001, according to a report from First Research. Rifles now account for 35 percent of the market, with shotguns and other guns making up the rest. 4. Ammunition is an enormous portion of the gun industry's revenues: Here's how one gun lobbyist put it: "You make a product for $300, and somebody could buy this revolver and, by the time they are 80, they'll have fired $10,000 worth of ammunition through it." In 2012, the industry made nearly as much on small arms ammunition as it did on small arms.

#### This alone is sufficient to access our solvency – the gun industry is the main cause of fear politics and rampant militarism – they’ve even created programs to indoctrinate kids into militarism – that’s Giroux 15

### 1AR – Extension (vs 1)

#### -------- Impact --------

#### Militarism creates a society of castaway goods and people – violence is normalized and critical thought is repressed, which guarantees all their impacts are inevitable – so it’s try or die for the aff. That’s Giroux 13.

#### Outweighs their turns – a] b] Root cause

#### Their turns don’t access our impact – it’s not about crime but the normalization of violence by supposedly good people like you and me.

#### [40s] Two ways we solve

#### 1] We wreck the gun industry and NRA– gun bans are a huge restriction that collapse the gun industry and cut off political power – that’s Fendrock. That’s sufficient to access our solvency, they are a main cause of fear politics and controls politicians – they’ve even created programs to indoctrinate kids into militarism – that’s Giroux 15.

#### Yes handguns are sufficient.

Plumer ’12: (Brad Plumer, “How the U.S. gun industry became so lucrative.” Washington Post, December 19, 2012//FT)

3. Handguns make up roughly half of the guns produced in the United States nowadays — and that number has been growing rapidly. In 2011, about half of the six million guns manufactured in the United States were pistols and revolvers. That's up from just one-third in 2001, according to a report from First Research. Rifles now account for 35 percent of the market, with shotguns and other guns making up the rest. 4. Ammunition is an enormous portion of the gun industry's revenues: Here's how one gun lobbyist put it: "You make a product for $300, and somebody could buy this revolver and, by the time they are 80, they'll have fired $10,000 worth of ammunition through it." In 2012, the industry made nearly as much on small arms ammunition as it did on small arms.

#### 2] Cultural shift –Donohue proves a nation-wide ban on atomistic individual gun rights can show that “handguns” are not the solution to our problems. That’s key to disrupt the national identity of the atomized individual, armed for self-defense, that neoliberalism thrives on – that’s our Esposito and Debrabander ev.

#### Masket answers their culture too strong arg - History has seen similar radical culture shifts incited by the law, such as civil rights or same sex marriage

#### Only about 30% of people even own a gun in the U.S – the other 70% won’t backlash, and will start to shift.

### A2 Gourevitch (30s)

#### 1] Militarism creates school to prison pipeline, from the war on drugs to criminalization of blacks, they’ll end up there anyways – unless we deal with the larger culture at play.

#### 2] Non-unique -the impact isn’t linear but logarithmic- since the internal link is limited enforcement resources which is a threshold question – gun control alone give police the excuse they need for selective enforcement like stop and frisk

#### 3] Lafollete answers this - overtime handguns aren’t accessible so there’s nothing to enforce

#### 4] While it has a material harm, doesn’t prevent a shift away from militarization – which would ultimately solve this disad.

#### 5] This misses the point – their pessimism doesn’t link to the ROB.

De Leeuw, Michael B., et al. "Ready, Aim, Fire? District Of Columbia V. Heller And Communities Of Color." Harvard Blackletter Law Journal 25.(2009): 133-179. Academic Search Premier. Web. 22 Apr. 2016.

Although Cottrol and Diamond add an important perspective to the debate over gun control, the fact that early firearms regulations grew in part out of racist motives is simply not relevant to contemporary gun control laws, for several reasons. First, the context surrounding gun control laws has changed dramatically -- early firearms restrictions were often adopted within the context of de jure segregation as a means of reinforcing racial inequality; contemporary gun control laws, by contrast, have typically been enacted with the participation and support of minority communities. Second, the proposition that a greater prevalence of firearms would improve public safety in minority communities is dubious at best. While there is admittedly mixed data on the effectiveness of gun control laws at reducing firearms-related violence, there is absolutely no reliable data showing an inverse relationship between rates of gun ownership and incidence of violent crime in urban areas. And finally, although we take seriously Cottrol and Diamond's argument about racially disparate enforcement of facially neutral firearms laws, this point speaks more to the way that existing criminal firearms laws are enforced and the penalties that are sought by prosecutors, rather than to the per se desirability of such laws. **A** change in priorities with respect to the enforcement of criminal firearms laws, rather than the wholesale abandonment of such laws, is the proper response to concerns about racially disproportionate enforcement. Each of these points is discussed in further detail below. […] Assuming that its ruling will be extended to non-federal actors, Heller represents a significant challenge to communities of color, and to everyone concerned with or affected by handgun violence. The United States' rate of firearms violence, which vastly outstrips that of any other developed nation, is already heavily concentrated in urban municipalities, and any weakening of firearms regulations in those areas could have devastating consequences. To be sure, the history of early firearms regulation is tainted by this country's history of slavery and Jim Crow. Even today, many efforts to enforce criminal firearms laws have the effect of perpetuating racial inequalities. The question, however, is whether these disparities counsel a reevaluation of criminal firearms laws. We conclude that they do not, because such disparities go to the manner in which criminal firearms laws are enforced and to our enforcement priorities, not to the desirability of gun control generally. While staunch civil libertarians may argue to the contrary, we conclude that, as urban dwellers are the overwhelmingly disproportionate victims of firearms-related violence in this country, citizens living in a given city are the best judges of whether, on balance, certain firearms regulations are desirable in that city. The Court's ruling in Heller is ominous because it threatens to make federal judges, and not ordinary citizens in urban areas, the decision makers as to what sorts of firearms regulations are reasonable.

### Substitution

#### No substitution – this is a troll arg

Nicholas Dixon 93 [Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College, Alma, Michigan], “SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PUBLIC LAW REVIEW”, 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243, 1993, BE

One has to doubt the reliability of the statements of prisoners as to what firearms they would carry in certain circumstances. Macho bragging and outright lying are very likely in such situations, and relegate Kleck's projections to the status of unsupported conjecture. In view of the fact that such a small percentage of the actual murders in the United States in 1990 were committed with long guns,' the burden on Kleck to prove his hypothetical speculation is even heavier. As for Kates and Benenson, their projections are based on the unsupported assertion that the 70% of handgun killers who do not turn to long guns would instead use knives, the most lethal weapon other than firearms. It is more probable that at least some potential murderers would turn to less lethal weapons or their bare hands, and that some would be deterred from assaults altogether. Since Kates and Benenson ignore these probable scenarios, and since their substitution predictions are in any case purely speculative, it is safe to conclude that their estimate of the increase in the homicide rate in the event of a handgun-only ban is inflated. The conjectures offered in support of the substitution hypothesis are inadequate and fail to meet the burden of proof encumbent on opponents of my proposal.¶ Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homi- cides is that long guns are obviously much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will cause everyone in sight to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested¶ when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, a bank robber car-¶ rying a long gun will be immediately detected by security guards,¶ alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful¶ robbery greatly diminished. Handguns are obviously much more¶ convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson¶ point out that most homicides occur in the home, where¶ concealability is "irrelevant."95 However, concealability would seem¶ to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may¶ well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even¶ in the home. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle. Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes such arguments more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape.

### Illicit markets

#### Bans solve - Supply side approach is best – criminals get once legally purchased guns and decreases supply makes guns financially inaccessible to youth which are the majority of victims of culture of violence.

#### Defense at best – illicit market is already at max demand – it’s not like criminals legally buy their guns themselves – that’d be too easy to track - they steal or buy legally bought guns

#### Buy back solves – no need for people to sell it illegally.

#### Mass production of rudimentary guns made in someone’s garage is just not plausible – and it’d be an easy target for police.

### Gourevitch

#### 1] Militarism creates school to prison pipeline, from the war on drugs to criminalization of blacks, they’ll end up there anyways – unless we deal with the larger culture at play.

#### 2] Non-unique -the impact isn’t linear but logarithmic- since the internal link is limited enforcement resources which is a threshold question – gun control alone give police the excuse they need for selective enforcement like stop and frisk

#### 3] Lafollete answers this - overtime handguns aren’t accessible so there’s nothing to enforce

#### Differential enforcement disads miss the point – their pessimism doesn’t link to the ROB.

De Leeuw, Michael B., et al. "Ready, Aim, Fire? District Of Columbia V. Heller And Communities Of Color." Harvard Blackletter Law Journal 25.(2009): 133-179. Academic Search Premier. Web. 22 Apr. 2016.

Although Cottrol and Diamond add an important perspective to the debate over gun control, the fact that early firearms regulations grew in part out of racist motives is simply not relevant to contemporary gun control laws, for several reasons. First, the context surrounding gun control laws has changed dramatically -- early firearms restrictions were often adopted within the context of de jure segregation as a means of reinforcing racial inequality; contemporary gun control laws, by contrast, have typically been enacted with the participation and support of minority communities. Second, the proposition that a greater prevalence of firearms would improve public safety in minority communities is dubious at best. While there is admittedly mixed data on the effectiveness of gun control laws at reducing firearms-related violence, there is absolutely no reliable data showing an inverse relationship between rates of gun ownership and incidence of violent crime in urban areas. And finally, although we take seriously Cottrol and Diamond's argument about racially disparate enforcement of facially neutral firearms laws, this point speaks more to the way that existing criminal firearms laws are enforced and the penalties that are sought by prosecutors, rather than to the per se desirability of such laws. A change in priorities with respect to the enforcement of criminal firearms laws, rather than the wholesale abandonment of such laws, is the proper response to concerns about racially disproportionate enforcement. Each of these points is discussed in further detail below. […] Assuming that its ruling will be extended to non-federal actors, Heller represents a significant challenge to communities of color, and to everyone concerned with or affected by handgun violence. The United States' rate of firearms violence, which vastly outstrips that of any other developed nation, is already heavily concentrated in urban municipalities, and any weakening of firearms regulations in those areas could have devastating consequences. To be sure, the history of early firearms regulation is tainted by this country's history of slavery and Jim Crow. Even today, **many efforts to enforce criminal firearms laws have the effect of perpetuating racial inequalities**. **The** question, however, is whether these disparities counsel a reevaluation of criminal firearms laws. **We conclude that** they do not, because such disparities go to the manner in which criminal firearms laws are enforced and to our enforcement priorities, not to the desirability of gun control generally. While staunch civil libertarians may argue to the contrary, **we conclude that, as urban dwellers are the overwhelmingly disproportionate victims of firearms-related violence in this country,** citizens living in a given city are the best judges of whether, on balance, certain firearms regulations are desirable in that city. The Court's ruling in Heller is ominous because it threatens to make federal judges, and not ordinary citizens in urban areas, the decision makers as to what sorts of firearms regulations are reasonable.

, gun owners are more than twice as likely as non-owners to be part of a "social gun culture" in which family and friends often own guns and look down on non-gun owners.

## Self Defense

### Womin

#### Their defense of guns is gendered

Chemaly: (Chemaly, Soraya. Media Critic and Activist “Why Don’t We Talk About the Gender Safety Gap in the U.S.?” Ms. Magazine Blog, April 24, 2015//FT)

This safety gap is routinely ignored in attempts to find solutions to violent crime. Consider, for example, the recent argument made by the gun lobby and its supporters that “hot young girls” should carry guns to class to protect themselves against rape. This suggestion reflects a profound and dangerous ignorance about the nature of sexual assault and intimate partner violence. First, women being raped are unlikely to shoot the person assaulting them, often because that person is known to them, including relatives, intimate partners and friends (73 percent of sexual assaults are committed by someone known to the survivor). Studies indicate that guns are used defensively in sexual assaults in 0.1 percent of cases. Second, there are marked gender difference in considerations regarding the efficacy of guns. Pro-gun legislation is a gendered affair, particularly when linked to Stand Your Ground laws, which repeatedly fail women in their own homes. Gallup’s “Guns in the Home: Safer or Not?” survey, published in November 2014, found that about “six in 10 Americans say guns make home safer.” However, that number is 67 percent of men, compared to 58 percent of women; 65 percent whites to 56 percent non-whites. Women are almost a third more likely to say that a gun in the home makes it a more dangerous place—and for good reason: Unlike a man, a woman in the United States is more than twice as likely to be killed by a man she knows than by a stranger, and she is often shot to death. Forty percent of women killed by partners are shot to death and a woman is more than 3.5 times more likely to be killed by an intimate partner than a man is.

#### Your argument is just empirically false.

NRCDV: (NRCDV “Talking Points,” http://www.nrcdv.org//FT)

A woman is far more likely to be the victim of a handgun homicide than to use a handgun in a justifiable homicide. Source: Violence Policy Center. (2001). A Deadly Myth: Women, Handguns, and Self-Defense. Washington, DC. • A study found that for every time a woman used a handgun to kill an intimate partner in self-defense, 83 women were murdered by an intimate partner with a handgun. Source: Violence Policy Center. (2001). A Deadly Myth: Women, Handguns, and Self-Defense. Washington, DC. • In general, firearms are rarely used in self-defense by victims of violent crimes. From 2007 to 2011, crime victims engaged in self-protective behaviors that involved a firearm in only 0.8% of the cases. Source: Violence Policy Center. (2013, April). Firearm Justifiable Homicides and Non-Fatal Self-Defense Gun Use: An Analysis of Federal Bureau of Investigation and National Crime Victimization Survey Data. Washington, DC.

# 1AR – DA’s

## Impact Calc

#### Martial culture here translates to foreign policy.

Cowen 12/10 Tyler Cowen (econ professor at George Mason). "How martial a country should the United States be? ~#guncontrol". Marginal Revolution, December 10, 2015. (Tyler Cowen occupies the Holbert C. Harris Chair of economics, professor at George Mason, co-author, with Alex Tabarrok, of the popular economics blog Marginal Revolution. He writes the "Economic Scene" column for the New York Times. He also writes for such publications as The New Republic, the Wall Street Journal, Forbes, Newsweek, and the Wilson Quarterly. Cowen also serves as general director of George Mason's Mercatus Center, a university research center that focuses on the market economy. In February 2011, Cowen received a nomination as one of the most influential economists in the last decade in a survey by The Economist.[1] He was ranked #72 among the "Top 100 Global Thinkers" in 2011 by Foreign Policy Magazine "for finding markets in everything." graduated from George Mason University with a bachelor of science degree in economics in 1983 and received his PhD in economics from Harvard University in 1987 with his thesis titled Essays in the theory of welfare economics. At Harvard, he was mentored by game theorist Thomas Schelling, the 2005 recipient of the Nobel Prize in Economics.)

Chris Blattman cites a recent estimate that Americans own 42% of the civilian guns in the world. You’ll also see estimates that America accounts for about half of the world’s defense spending. I believe those numbers are a misuse of purchasing power parity comparisons, but with proper adjustments it is not implausible to believe that America accounts for…about 42% of the defense spending. Or thereabouts. I see those two numbers, and their rough similarity, as the most neglected fact in current debates about gun control. I see many people who want to lower or perhaps raise those numbers, but I don’t see enough people analyzing the two as an integrated whole. I don’t myself so often ask “should Americans have fewer guns?”, as that begs the question of how one might ever get there, which indeed has proven daunting by all accounts. But I do often ask myself “should America be a less martial country in in its ideological orientation?” Note that the parts of the country with the most guns, namely the South, are especially prominent in the military and support for the military. More importantly, if America is going to be the world’s policeman, on some scale or another, that has to be backed by a supportive culture among the citizenry. And that culture is not going to be “Hans Morgenthau’s foreign policy realism,” or “George Kennan’s Letter X,” or even Clausewitz’s treatise On War. Believe it or not, those are too intellectual for the American public. And so it must be backed by…a fairly martial culture amongst the American citizenry. And that probably will mean a fairly high level of gun ownership and a fairly high degree of skepticism about gun control. If you think America can sustain its foreign policy interventionism, or threat of such, without a fairly martial culture at home, by all means make your case. But I am skeptical. I think it is far more likely that if you brought about gun control, and the cultural preconditions for successful gun control, America’s world role would fundamentally change and America’s would no longer play a global policeman role, for better or worse. So who’s in this debate? 1. There are the anti-gun modern Democrats, who want Americans to own many fewer firearms, and who maybe favor slight cuts in defense spending, in order to spend more on redistribution. They don’t come to terms with the reality that their vision for America’s international state requires a fairly martial supporting culture at home, including strong attachments to gun ownership. By the way, citations of the Australian gun control experience are a good indicator of this position and its partial naivete; Australian pacifism can to some extent free ride upon American martial interest. Another “warning sign” is if someone is incredulous that the San Bernardino attack is strengthening America’s attachment to a relatively martial internal culture, rather than leading to gun control. That person is out of touch, even if he or she is right about the substance of the issue. 2. There is the radical, anti-war, anti-military-industrial complex, semi-pacifist, anti-gun Left. Their positions on these issues are quite consistent, though this branch of the Left has disappeared almost entirely. 3. There are the libertarians, who hate martial culture on the international scene, but who wish to allow it or maybe even encourage it (personally, not through the government) at home, through the medium of guns. They are inconsistent, and they should consider being more pro-gun control than is currently the case. But I don’t expect them to budge: they will see this issue only through the lens of liberty, rather than through the lens of culture as well. They end up getting a lot of the gun liberties they wish to keep, but losing the broader cultural battle and somehow are perpetually surprised by this mix of outcomes. I except non-American libertarians from these charges, and indeed many of them, albeit under the table, in fact support gun control as a libertarian and indeed pro-peace position. 4. There are the “right-wing conservatives.” They support a martial ethic, they support America’s active foreign policy abroad, and they are anti-gun control for the most part. And they find their greatest strength in the relatively martial American South. Like the old anti-war Left, their positions are consistent, and their positions are rooted in a cultural understanding of the issue. They see the gun control movement as a war on America’s greatness, America’s martial culture and the material embodiments of said culture. They don’t understand why “the world’s greatest nation” should give up its superpower role, and its supporting internal martial culture, all for the sake of limiting the number of suicides and maybe stopping a few shootings too. To them it’s not close to being worth it. OK, now look at who is winning this debate in terms of actual policy changes. It is the conservatives, for the most part. No matter how much you may disagree with them, they have the most coherent cultural and intellectual position, apart from the old anti-war Left. And in a fight between the right-wing conservatives, and the old anti-war Left, for the hearts and minds of the American people, we already know that, for better or worse, the conservatives usually will win. I find that pro-gun control Democrats, and libertarians, are incapable of understanding the issue in these cultural terms. But if you read something by a “really stupid conservative” on gun control, the more emotive and manipulative the text the better, it is often pretty close to the mark on the actual substance of what is at stake here.

## Elections DA

### Top level

#### We control terminal uniqueness – reason why someone like trump can be elected is b/c of militaristic culture – not a matter of “if” he gets elected, but “when”.

#### Prefer structural impacts

#### A] Predictions of future catastrophes are not value neutral— their shoddy internal link work and hyperbolized tags are tactics of the military industrial complex – that’s Jackson – They concede the ROB, which means this comes first.

#### B] We control root cause - structural violence creates priming that psychologically structures escalation – which means your impacts are inevitable and it’s try or die – that’s Scheper Hughes.

#### Impact defense –

#### Their predictions and empirical claims are flawed- selection bias makes their conclusions suspect

Inan 4, dr. A. (Annette) Freyberg Inan Associate Professor, the Director of the Master's Program in Political Science, Univ of Amsterdam, PhD in Political Science at the University of Georgia, USA. Her MA degrees in Political Science and English were obtained at the University of Stuttgart in her native Germany. Editorial Board Member: International Studies Review, Globalizations Journal, Advisory Board Member: Millennium, What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations and Its Judgment of Human Nature 2004

How is it that the bias in the assumptions underlying realist theory can translate into a bias in the findings which result from the application of that theory? When choosing to study a particular aspect of realit y, we always also have to choose a particular approach to the subject of interest. Thomas Kuhn has pointed out that, if two persons are committed to different theoretical approaches, “we cannot say with any assurance that the two men even see the same thing, [that they] possess the same data.”1 While we may not be aware of the partialit y which is introduced by our particular perspective, it nonetheless has a significant impact on how we will perceive our object of inquiry. In his study of foreign policy decision making, Graham Allison has found that analysts “think about problems of foreign . . . policy in terms of **largely implicit conceptual models** that have **significant consequences for the content of their thought**.”2 His results suggest that the analyst’s choice of the decision-making model to use in the study of political events has a **profound impact on the findings of the subsequent analysis.** Allison thus confirms that the analyst’s choice of paradigm, which includes a choice of paradigmatic assumptions, does indeed help to determine how reality will be perceived. The analyst employs models of the relevant elements of realit y and the relationships between them as **heuristic devices** in his quest for explanations and predictions of observable outcomes. Which kinds of explanations and predictions he derives, however, depends on which model, based on which assumptions, he uses to begin with. In short, conceptual models are based on foundational assumptions. **Biased assumptions translate into particular explanations and expectations**. These expectations then inform both scientific hypotheses **and policy recommendations**. The t ype of bias introduced into science by theoretical assumptions is exceedingly difficult to eliminate. On the one hand, occurrence of the expected results is 119 taken as proof of the correctness of the assumptions used. On the other hand, even results that contradict the researcher’s expectations may well be explained away, rather than leading to a revision of those assumptions. This problem is commonly referred to as an “expectancy bias” in the theory of science.3 It has been studied most thoroughly in the form of the experimental bias effect in experimental psychology, but, for methodological reasons, the kind of “fudging” that it t ypically encourages is even more common in nonexperimental social science. The scientific standard of the intersubjectivit y of conclusions cannot realistically be met if this problem exists. As a consequence of the biases introduced by different research strategies, scientific findings are too easily rejected by analysts who apply different models to the interpretation of the same events. Vice versa, they are not easily enough rejected by analysts working within the same approach. Perfecting the logic of the models only serves to exacerbate this problem to the point where anyone who shares the assumptions underlying the model must agree with the results of the analysis, and anyone who does not cannot logically agree with the analyst’s explanation of those results. To escape this logic, which threatens to reduce the social sciences to rhetorical arts**, it is necessary to examine the various assumptions** that allow analysts who are ostensibly examining the same reality to develop their divergent conclusions. According to Alan Lamborn, specialized theoretical approaches to the study of international relations have evolved from empirical disagreements concerning the relevant “t ypes of issues, actors, political arenas, and strategic situations.”4 Lamborn claims that among the “**effects that restrictive empirical assumptions** in issue-oriented theories have on analysts’ understanding of the political process,” are “subtle forms of **selection bias** that . . . threaten both the validit y and generalizabilit y of much existing theory.”5 By accepting highly restrictive motivational assumptions, realism can capture but a small part of human realit y. Since these assumptions are biased, the theory is **empirically misleading**. This causes a serious risk of inaccurate interpretations of political reality. In the words of Robert Jervis, “[I]t is both easy and dangerous to build models on the assumption that a general knowledge of what we take to be human nature, combined with our understanding of the situation, will tell us what incentives are operating.”6 It is easy because it absolves us from finding out what actors actually want. It is dangerous because, as Mark Petracca points out, the assumptions about what it is that they want, which underlie such models, whether they are correct or not, “shape research strategies, which in turn affect political cognition as well as political possibilities and actual behavior.”7 (119-120

### Hillary already going for Guns.

### Trump win inevitable.

#### Trump wins guaranteed.

**Pfeiffer 4/27:** [Alex Pfeiffer, “Democratic Strategist: Trump Will Beat Hillary Like ‘A Baby Seal’”, The Daily Caller, 4/27/16.//vm]

Democratic strategist Dave “Mudcat” Saunders believes Donald Trump will beat Hillary Clinton like a “baby seal,” and that working class whites who haven’t already left the Democratic Party for cultural reasons will do so now for economic ones. “I know a ton of Democrats — male, female, black and white — here [in southern Virginia] who are going to vote for Trump. It’s all because of economic reasons. It’s because of his populist message,” Mudcat told The Daily Caller Wednesday. Saunders has experience working with Jim Webb, helping getting him elected to the U.S Senate in 2006 and advised his failed bid for the presidency in 2016. Saunders was also an advisor to John Edwards in his 2008 presidential bid. The Democrat strategist is renowned for connecting politicians to “Bubbas” — white, working class Southerners. “Working class whites in the South have already departed the Democratic Party for cultural reasons. Well the working class whites in the North are now deserting the Democrats because of economic reasons,” Mudcat told TheDC. He added, “this is the new age of economic populism, man. This is about survival for a lot of people.” Hillary Clinton, throughout the Democratic primary, has relied heavily on the black vote, she has struggled to gain support from white men. In the SEC primary, she didn’t win over 60 percent of the white vote in any of the six states. She did however gain over 80 percent of the black vote in all of them. There has been one demographic this cycle that Clinton has lost consistently to Sanders — white men. “I know less than half a dozen white male Democrats in my part of the world who are going to vote for Hillary,” Saunders told TheDC. He added, “Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump have very similar messages; they’re just dressed in different clothes. I think you’re going to see a lot of Sanders people jump to Trump.” When Sanders entered the primary he made a pledge to not go negative. This has hurt him as even the slightest attacks on Hillary have created a strong reaction from the Clinton campaign. When he called her unqualified to be president, Hillary’s spokesman, Brian Fallon, [said](http://dailycaller.com/2016/04/06/sanders-says-clinton-isnt-qualified-to-be-president/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) it was “a new low.” “Hillary hasn’t been shot at yet. I hear on TV people taking about Bernie Sanders being negative, he ain’t attack her, he just tapped on her,” Mudcat said. He added, “Trump’s going to take a wire-brush to her.” Both Trump and Clinton have unfavorable ratings in polls, both at near 60 percent. Mudcat said, “I think [Trump] can drive her negs to 80.” He thinks Trump will win the general election and said, “he’s going to knock her around like a baby seal.” Paul Begala, adviser to pro-Clinton super PAC Priorities USA Action, refuted this sentiment, telling TheDC, “She has taken more incoming fire than a redneck rifle range — and she’s still standing. No one better to stand up to the bully Trump — who has gotten nothing but air-kisses from his weakling GOP opponents.” “Hillary is going to be President. I hope Mudcat picks out a nice dress to wear to the inaugural ball,” Begala added. Mudcat says that Trump will bring up quid pro quo with the Clinton foundation and foreign nations, something that has not been brought up so far this election by Sanders. One theme that Trump will share with the Vermont senator is knocking Hillary on NAFTA and her support for China’s “favored nation status” in trade. “I think she’s going to have to say NAFTA was a mistake, favored nation status for China was a mistake,” Mudcat told TheDC. The Democratic strategist added, “unless she just says these are all screw-ups, which I question that she will do, there’s no way she’s going to get working class people.” Trump won every county Tuesday in Pennsylvania and performed strongly throughout the Rust Belt, Mudcat sees this happening the general. “I don’t know how in the hell she’s going to win Ohio and Pennsylvania.” He added that Virginia, his home state, is definitely a “swing state now.”

### A2 Ukraine

#### Economic interdependence checks *escalation* and *US-Russia rivalry*

Lawless, 2014 (Jill Lawless Special Reporter for the Associated Press, “East Vs West Ukraine Conflict Not a New Cold War”, ABC News, 3-17-2014, <http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/east-west-ukraine-conflict-cold-war-22939847>)

NATO planes monitor Ukraine's border. East and West fight for influence and trade angry warnings. Russian troops conduct massive war games as tensions rise. With its brinksmanship, bellicose rhetoric, threats and counter-threats, the crisis over Moscow's takeover of Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula seems to have whisked the world back to the Cold War, when the United States and the Soviet Union squared off in a high-stakes standoff that divided the world into two opposing camps. But this is not Cold War 2.0. Communism has long ceased to be the feared enemy. The ideological certainties of that era are gone. And Russia and the West are locked in economic interdependency. Here is a look at how the Ukraine crisis may have turned into an East-West standoff — but not a Cold War. ENTWINED ECONOMIES The West's economic and diplomatic pressure may harken back to an age of isolated blocs. And measures such as visa bans, financial sanctions and threats to boycott the G-8 summit that Russia is slated to host all certainly seem intended to isolate Moscow. But the economies of Russia and the West have become entwined since the Berlin Wall fell 25 years ago — meaning it would be hard to go back to the hermetic "us-versus-them" world of the Cold War. U.S. brands including McDonald's and Pepsi have a big presence in Russia, and the European Union does far more trade with the country than the U.S. The Europeans are less eager than Washington to take punitive economic measures, in part because European companies from German engineering firm Siemens to British oil giant BP have major Russian investments. And Russia supplies almost a third of Europe's natural gas. But economic rupture could hurt Russia even more. Russia relies heavily on income from oil and gas, which make up more than two-thirds of the country's exports. Around half of Russia's exports, mainly natural gas, oil and other raw materials, heads to the EU. And rich Russians rely on places like London for a place to stash their cash in homes, businesses and discreet, stable banks — so much so that some British people refer to their capital as "Londongrad." "London is more important to Russians than Russians are to London," said Yolande Barnes, head of global research at real estate agent Savills. She says Russians buy about 2.5 percent of prime London properties. "If Russians disappeared, I think London would barely blink." MILITARY LIMITS Rhetoric such as "dangerous escalation" and "brink of disaster" — as well as talk of boosting military defenses in Europe — echo Cold War tensions. But Western leaders show little appetite for a military response. NATO did deploy two surveillance planes to fly over Poland and Romania on Wednesday to monitor Ukraine, and the U.S. sent additional fighter jets to Lithuania and Poland to boost air patrols. Russia is in military control of Crimea but has not moved into other areas of Ukraine, aside from seizing a gas distribution facility just outside of Crimea's border. The crisis could still escalate. Adrian Basora, a former U.S. ambassador to the Czech Republic, said that if Russia sent troops into eastern Ukraine, it could trigger an escalation that might pull NATO troops into eastern Europe. He acknowledged that would be "an extremely dangerous situation." But even that is unlikely to turn into a global confrontation. Crucially, China — the rising global power of the 21st century — has shown no desire to take sides. Chinese President Xi Jinping, who has discussed the crisis with U.S. President Barack Obama, has merely urged calm and restraint. It is true that Putin has launched a huge military modernization program. And Russia's defense minister said last month that it was seeking to expand its worldwide presence by seeking permission for navy ships to use ports in Algeria, Cyprus, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Cuba, Seychelles, Vietnam and Singapore. Still, Matthew Clements, editor of Jane's Intelligence Review, said Russia's "ability to undertake operations across the globe is fairly limited." "This is not a reformation of the Soviet Red Army," he said. CLASH OF CULTURES In one area the Cold War comparison may be apt: a mutual lack of comprehension and trust. The Ukraine crisis has revealed that Russia and the West remain far apart — not just politically and diplomatically, but culturally and temperamentally. Putin has stoked a brand of macho nationalism increasingly at odds with liberal Europeans, who have reacted with anger to the jailing of punk protesters Pussy Riot and Russia's ban on homosexual "propaganda." Attempts to isolate Russia further may boost support for Putin — whose poll ratings have soared due to his tough stance on Ukraine — and make rapprochement harder. But historians see fundamental differences. "Two things characterized the Cold War. First of all there was an ideological divide which was kind of black and white — 'You're either with us or against us,'" said Margot Light, professor emeritus of international relations at the London School of Economics. "That really doesn't exist anymore. "And the Cold War started off as European, but it became global. And again, this isn't it. I think neither Russia nor the United States have that kind of global reach any longer."

#### Cold war is empirical proof for me – rhetoric of “dangerous escalation” where common – but nothing happened. This is how the war machine operates – it creates its own threats to justify violence at home.

### A2 Warming

#### House elections are stacked in favor of the GOP – districts are too gerrymandered for even Trump to drag GOP candidates down. Dems would have to flip 30 of 31 at-risk seats and lose on of their own. Even a total landslide for Hillary isn’t enough

Daley 4/1 [David Daley is the editor-in-chief of Salon. His book on the modern politics of redistricting will be published by Liveright in June. The GOP rigged the House: Even a massive Donald Trump defeat wouldn’t give Democrats control. Salon, 4/1/16. http://www.salon.com/2016/04/01/no\_democrats\_wont\_take\_the\_house\_pretending\_otherwise\_isnt\_just\_bad\_journalism\_its\_punditry\_as\_fantasy/]

District by district, no one understands the political landscape of the House of Representatives quite like the Cook Political Report’s brilliant David Wasserman, whose job it is to analyze every detail of all 435 races. So it was news on March 18 when Wasserman issued a report that updated and revised his thinking on 10 Congressional races, all of them in the Democrats’ favor. From California to Connecticut, and across states as different as New York, Nebraska, Iowa and Minnesota, Wasserman either upgraded the Democrats or signaled trouble for the Republican incumbent in Latino districts and also suburban districts filled with high-income, high-education voters. Wasserman’s takeaway: Democrats could be getting what they’ve dreamed of, a polarizing GOP nominee like Donald Trump or Ted Cruz who could add uncertainty to down-ballot races. “Congressional Republicans,” he wrote, “are entering uncharted and potentially dangerous territory.” Wasserman presented his findings carefully, with appropriate context, and presented the overwhelming odds against the Democrats. He noted the Republican advantage in redistricting and the fact that true swing seats — legitimately competitive districts that could be won by either side any given November — have dwindled to a mere handful. But his piece then launched a series of think pieces in USA Today, Politico, The New York Times and several other publications all taking seriously the possibility of a Democratic rout this fall so big that it destroys the Republican firewall in the House and leads to Speaker Nancy Pelosi. Some of them were smart (Politico), others maddeningly incomplete (The New York Times). As New York magazine’s astute columnist Ed Kilgore put it: “Now a Topic for Serious Discussion: Could a Trump-Led Ticket Cost the GOP Its House Majority.” Any moment now, the earnest panel discussions will begin on the cable networks and the Sunday morning shows. After all, the brokered convention long-dreamed-about by political journalists might actually happen this year. Why not put another beloved, big story in play and consider whether the House might flip? But his piece then launched a series of think pieces in USA Today, Politico, The New York Times and several other publications all taking seriously the possibility of a Democratic rout this fall so big that it destroys the Republican firewall in the House and leads to Speaker Nancy Pelosi. Some of them were smart (Politico), others maddeningly incomplete (The New York Times). As New York magazine’s astute columnist Ed Kilgore put it: “Now a Topic for Serious Discussion: Could a Trump-Led Ticket Cost the GOP Its House Majority.” Any moment now, the earnest panel discussions will begin on the cable networks and the Sunday morning shows. After all, the brokered convention long-dreamed-about by political journalists might actually happen this year. Why not put another beloved, big story in play and consider whether the House might flip? There is one very good reason: It is not going to happen. One hesitates to call anything impossible during a campaign season that has upended so much historical wisdom. Nevertheless, this is impossible. But if we’re going to have seven more months of debating whether the Democrats have even the tiniest chance of capturing the House, it is important to understand all the politics and recent history which explains why it’s off the table, even if Trump leads the GOP into an epic rout at the presidential level. Our political conversation around the partisan divide in Congress — and how it got this way — is too often shallow, ahistorical and patchy at best. Much of this comes down to two words — redistricting and gerrymandering — two words that The New York Times would not even dare mention in its frustratingly anecdotal piece larded with the same golly-whiz quotes Democrats working on Congressional races offer every two years. There is a significant segment of the D.C. journalism elite that believes it is unsophisticated to talk about gerrymandering and redistricting as the reason why the GOP has such a hammer-lock on the House. They believe that both sides do it, that it’s the way politics has been played for centuries, or they subscribe to the “Big Sort” theory — our districts are more homogenous because similar-minded people choose to live around each other, especially Democrats in urban areas. And for years, both sides did do it. However, what’s missing from The New York Times piece and from too much of the discussion around who controls Congress is a real understanding of how sophisticated the GOP redistricting operation was in 2010 and 2011 — and how it has made our politics more extreme both in the House and in many state legislatures. It was different, perhaps historically so, thanks to driven GOP strategists determined to take full advantage of redistricting, new mapping and demographic technologies that made it easier than ever to craft unbeatable GOP majorities, and the wave of post-Citizens United dark money which helped fund it. They called it REDMAP, for Redistricting Majority Project, and did it ever live up to its name. Perhaps the most revealing statistic illustrating how well it worked and how redistricting has changed is this. During the 1991 redistricting, Democrats controlled the lines in 172 districts, 240 were under split control, and Republicans governed merely five. (The remaining seats were either commissions or states with only one member of Congress). By 2001, the Democrats’ advantage was down to 135-98, with 161 seats under divided control. After Election Day 2010, the transformation was complete. Commissions (88) controlled twice as many seats as the Democrats (44). Another 103 seats were drawn by both parties. The Republicans could draw 193 on their own. A party needs only 218 seats to control Congress. Moreover, NPR labeled 70 districts “competitive” in 2010. After Election Day 2010, the GOP controlled the lines in 47 of those. Democrats drew 15, commissions controlled eight. That sophisticated takeover can not be easily undone, not even with one bad election. The GOP mapping models in many states took even a worst-case scenario like this into consideration when drawing the lines. But first, the history. After the Democrats captured the House in 2006 and Barack Obama reclaimed the White House in 2008, many political analysts thought that changing demographics and a mini-realignment might lead the GOP into the political wilderness. Republicans licked their wounds for a moment, and then the geniuses at the Republican State Leadership Committee (RSLC) recognized that 2010 wasn’t just a usual midterm that favors the opposition party. It was a midterm likely to favor them in a census year — a big win, played right, could be locked in by controlling the every-10-years process of redistricting. Enter REDMAP. The RSLC strategists decided to target as many state legislative chambers as they could in 2010, with an eye to maximizing the number of states where they could have total control of drawing new maps the following year. They spent $30 million — a steal when you consider that’s the cost of some Senate races — in local elections in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and North Carolina, all with the goal of asserting GOP dominance in purple states. They were aided by the fact that 2010 became an anti-Obama wave election and many discouraged Democrats stayed home. But by the end of Election Night 2010, the GOP had attained several hundred new state legislative seats (hitting a decades-long high point) and captured some two-thirds of state legislative chambers nationwide. They pressed that advantage big-time in 2011, using the most advanced map-making and demographic technology ever to super-glue their gains in place. As we head into the 2016 election, it’s worth taking a look at how well those new maps performed in the last presidential cycle, a solid 2012 win by Barack Obama in which he defeated Mitt Romney by 126 electoral votes. It was a good year for the Democrats nationally; taken in the aggregate, Democratic House candidates earned 1.4 million more votes than their GOP counterparts. Despite that plurality, Democrats gained merely eight seats in the House; the GOP retained a big majority of 33 seats, down a little from the previous 41-seat edge. What this means is that Democrats start in a hole — with these electoral maps, it is not enough for more people to vote for Democratic candidates. That 1.4 million edge in 2012 amounted to 50.4 percent of the two-party vote overall for the Democrats. You would need something upwards of 55 percent to get in the ballpark of the chambers switching, which would require many millions more votes. It would require Republicans to punish their party not only by voting for Hillary Clinton, but to further punish them by taking away the House, instead of keeping it in GOP hands as a check on Clinton and the Democrats. How did this undemocratic situation become our (in every likelihood) unchangeable reality? Take a look at the numbers in three states that went for Barack Obama, but nevertheless sent a GOP-dominated delegation to Washington. In Michigan, after REDMAP helped create big majorities in the state House and Senate, Republicans had complete control of redistricting. Obama won by 10 points. Debbie Stabenow was returned to the U.S. Senate by 20 points. But thanks to those maps, Michigan’s 14-seat House delegation included nine Republicans and just five Democrats — despite some 240,000 more votes being cast for Democratic candidates than GOP candidates. In neighboring Ohio, Obama won with a smaller majority, as did Sen. Sherrod Brown. But Republicans controlled the entire redistricting process there as well — and despite the strong Democratic year, Ohio sent 12 Republicans and only four Democrats to Washington. And then in bordering Pennsylvania, where REDMAP helped deliver complete control of redistricting to Republicans in 2010, Obama took the state by five points, Sen. Bob Casey was re-elected by just under nine points, voters cast 83,000 more ballots for Democratic House candidates than GOP candidates — and yet Republicans won 13 of the 18 seats. This Pennsylvania district, the 7th, explains a lot if you want to understand just how precisely mapmakers did their work after 2010. Every one of these lines — described by some as Donald Duck kicking Goofy — exists to draw specific Republicans into this district, and to make as many surrounding districts as Republican as possible. Then, mapmakers packed so many Democrats into Chaka Fattah’s Philadelphia district that he won with more votes than any congressman in the country in 2012. (The RSLC lays out exactly how they did this right here.) You can also look at purplish states like Wisconsin, Florida and North Carolina, all of which went for Barack Obama at least once, but have overwhelmingly GOP congressional delegations. Wisconsin is just 5-3 GOP. But North Carolina is 10-3 GOP. Florida is 17-10 GOP. The maps are the overwhelming reason why. (Democrats did gerrymander portions of Illinois and Maryland after 2010, but it’s false equivalence to suggest both sides do it when the proportion and overall result is so dramatically different.) Email records and depositions show the epic lengths the Republicans went to in 2011 to draw maps with the goal of locking in a decade — at least — of House dominance. In court case after court case — whether in Wisconsin, North Carolina, Florida or Texas — or in other states like Ohio where Freedom of Information Act requests have uncovered revelatory email exchanges between operatives and mapmakers, the story is scary for anyone who cares about participatory democracy. In Florida, a federal judge overturned two districts in 2014, ruling that it seemed to him that there was a shadow redistricting process conducted by GOP masterminds. In Wisconsin, even some Republican lawmakers howled at being forced to sign confidentiality agreements to view the new maps, which were constructed, in part, at a law firm across the street from the state capitol. A judge later rejected the idea that attorney-client privilege would allow the mapmakers to keep details of the process private. In Ohio, emails suggested how operatives made changes to maps after receiving last-minute communications from Speaker Boehner’s political team, and how they dubbed their secret redistricting headquarters “The Bunker.” OK, put all this recent history aside. What if Trump is nominated and he runs as poorly as George McGovern or Walter Mondale, both of whom lost 49 states? Republicans currently hold their largest House majority since the New Deal. They command a 247-188 seat advantage, meaning Democrats would have to flip 30 seats to retake control. In Ronald Reagan’s 49-state landslide over Mondale in 1984, the GOP gained just 16 seats. Richard Nixon’s 49-state walloping of McGovern in 1972 generated just 12 additional seats for the Democrats. Partisan loyalties have only intensified since those elections, so it is more difficult to imagine a candidate of either party sweeping to that commanding a victory. But previous landslides have not moved the House. And when Democrats got 1.4 million more votes than Republicans, it shifted only a handful of seats. Getting to 30 — on these maps — is more unlikely than anything else that has happened even in this unpredictable year. The numbers do spell disaster for Trump. A wave that big is simply unrealistic to imagine. Moreover, what too many pundits don’t understand is that in many states, these maps were drawn to withstand waves like this, with the help of powerful computer programs and all the available demographic and voting information. In Ohio, for example, GOP-aligned mapmakers in 2011 created multiple indexes and algorithms to perfect the districts they drew. Mapmakers looked to create districts where John McCain would have defeated Barack Obama in 2008, despite running 5 percent beneath the average for a Republican candidate statewide in Ohio. First, they used the percentage of vote received by John McCain in 2008. McCain ran at just under 47 percent, about 5 percent underneath the average for a statewide Republican candidate – so if you could create a Congressional district where McCain would have defeated Obama, you’d know that this was a solid Republican seat even in an off year for the GOP. Eleven of the 12 districts held by the GOP are safer than safe. Only one, the 14th, is a potential swing seat even in a wave. Now look at the demographics of these new districts. When House insurgents forced then Speaker John Boehner into the 2013 government shutdown, the New Yorker’s Ryan Lizza and David Wasserman wanted to know more about who these 80 new members of the House Freedom Caucus were and where they lived. They ran some numbers, and discovered, shockingly, that Republican districts in 2012, after redistricting, had managed to be drawn more white, even as the national trends marched toward greater diversity. The average district, won by a Republican in 2012, was 2 percent more white than it was in 2010. They found that those 80 conservatives were elected from districts, on average, that were 75 percent white, compared to the national average of 63. In the 2012 presidential election, Obama defeated Romney by 4 percentage points. In the 80 districts held by the insurgent conservatives, Romney won by an average of 23 points, they found. The congressmen – and 76 of the 80 were men – managed even larger victory margins, an average of 34 percent. These seats simply are not flippable. The Democrats may be able to take back a handful of suburban seats if Republicans nominate Trump and the party recoils. But the current Congressional maps are built to favor the same angry, older and whiter voters who have fueled Trump’s rise. To take back the House, Democrats have would have to win in Trump Country, with Hillary Clinton likely at the top of the ticket. These districts, in part, helped create Trump. The big House majority helped convince the GOP base that they should be winning in Washington more often, that the answer was to be more confrontational and less compromising. Districts where the only viable challenger comes in a primary from the right also drive parties to the extreme and nurture the echo chamber. That enough of these far-right districts would now turn around and elect a Democrat — that there is even a challenger in these districts capable of mounting a winning campaign — strains credulity. Sure, Democrats could improve on the handful of seats they won in 2012. But we all saw how eager that Congress was to work with President Obama. It’s hard to imagine that changing even if the Democrats take back a dozen seats. In order to take control Wasserman told USA Today – he really is the expert on this — Democrats would have to win 30 of the 31 seats where a GOP candidate appears “at risk.” Oh, and not lose any seats of their own. Trump or no Trump, that’s a steep hill.

#### Warming inevitable – they assume “negative emissions” will save us, which is a hoax

Le Page 10/30 [By Michael Le Page. A reporter at New Scientist, covering everything from climate change to gene editing. “The climate fact no one will admit: 2 °C warming is inevitable.” New Scientist, 10/30/2015. Daily News Section. https://www.newscientist.com/article/dn28430-the-climate-fact-no-one-will-admit-2-c-warming-is-inevitable/]

It is time to start preparing for a world more than 2 °C warmer than now. The UN’s own analysis of what countries are offering to do to limit greenhouse gas emissions shows they fall far short of what’s required. In fact, they suggest the world will have emitted enough carbon dioxide to warm the planet 2 °C by around 2036. These offers, formally known as Intended Nationally Determined Contributions or INDCs, will be the basis of the global treaty on climate change to be finalised in Paris in December. It was always clear that this treaty would not go nearly far enough to limit warming to 2 °C by 2100, but now the numbers are in. Ahead of the meeting, 119 INDCs have been submitted, representing 147 countries and 88 per cent of current emissions. The UN has now released a synthesis report analysing what impact they will have. It concludes that even if countries stick to them, annual global emissions will hit 43 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide (GtCO2) by 2030 – and will still be rising. It has been calculated that to have a 66 per cent chance of limiting warming to 2 °C, cumulative emissions from 2011 must be limited to 1000 GtCO2. The UN report, however, says we’ll have burned through 75 per cent of this carbon budget by 2030. That means we could only emit another 250 GtCO2 after 2030 – which means we’ll bust the budget in around 2036 assuming emissions stay above 40 GtCO2 per year. “I think it is clear that the INDCs will fall well short of what is required for any reasonable probability of avoiding 2 °C,” says Alice Bows-Larkin of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research in Manchester, UK. And what happens after 2030 is crucial, too, she says. “We can’t assume that emissions will immediately decline.” At a meeting in London on 28 October, New Scientist asked the chief UN climate negotiator, Christiana Figueres, if it was now time for the world to accept that limiting warming to 2 °C is unrealistic and to start preparing for even greater warming. Figueres vehemently rejected this idea. “Would you want that for your children,” she responded. “This is about the quality of life on this planet.” The Paris treaty would “build a pathway” to 2 °C, she said, by paving the way for further cuts. This claim is repeated in the official UN press release accompanying the latest report, which says the INDCs “keep the door open to” the 2 °C limit. But the grim numbers in the report tell a very different story. So why do some reports still claim that 2 °C is achievable? The answer is that they almost always assume that the world will resort to geoengineering and somehow suck vast quantities of CO2 out of the atmosphere, so-called “negative emissions”. But many scientists are extremely sceptical about the idea that this can be done on the stupendous scale required.

### No Impact

#### Case outweighs

#### No impact

#### Trump can’t win

#### Trump gets rekt

Mehta ’16: (Varad Mehta. “Why Donald Trump Can’t Win The White House.” The Federalist. FEBRUARY 22, 2016)

Donald Trump is the candidate of the white working class. His popularity with this cohort was recognized early in his candidacy. The preponderance of commentary on the Trump phenomenon since then, whether favorable to the tumescent real-estate mogul and reality television star or not, has proceeded from this assumption. These analyses affirm Trump’s allure to white, working-class voters as central to his candidacy. It is the pillar on which his dominant standing in the polls rests. If Trump wins the Republican nomination, it will be through their support. Yet these analyses, revealing as they are, overlook a salient fact. The verdict of working-class voters will not be the only one rendered on Trump, or the most important one. However popular Trump may be with the working class, he is as unpopular with voters who have graduated from college, a group without whose backing the GOP has no shot at regaining the White House. Trump does respectably among college-educated Republicans. In Quinnipiac University’s most recent poll of the Republican race, Trump received the support of 30 percent of respondents who had a college degree, more than any other Republican. This was an improvement from earlier this month, when Trump trailed Marco Rubio in this demographic. But if three-tenths of college-educated Republicans back Trump, then seven-tenths of them don’t. To put it another way: the vast majority of Republicans with college degrees oppose Donald Trump. Let’s Compare Donald Trump to Everyone Else Trump does have a positive favorability score among college Republicans of 55 to 37 percent. Yet his net rating is the lowest of any GOP candidate. Ted Cruz (61 to 27 percent), Marco Rubio (75 to 15 percent), and John Kasich (62 to 9 percent) all best Trump on this measure. Source: Quinnipiac University Poll, 17 February 2016. Source: Quinnipiac University Poll, 17 February 2016. Trump also does worst on the question of which candidate “you would definitely not support for the Republican nomination for president.” Twenty-eight percent of all Republican voters would refuse to back him, which improves to 26 percent when only Republican college graduates are considered. Trump has a hard ceiling with the latter group that manifests in survey after survey. College graduates constituted 54 percent of Republican turnout in the New Hampshire primary. Trump won this group with 29 percent of the vote. This is a good number. But it also means the other 71 percent went for Trump’s rivals. In Iowa, Trump fared worse. College graduates made up 51 percent of the GOP caucus electorate. Trump could do no better than third, winning 21 percent of college-educated Iowa Republicans. Both Rubio (28 percent) and Cruz (25 percent) bested him in this crucial demographic. All told, fourth-fifths of Iowa Republicans who graduated college opposed Trump. As Tim Alberta notes in his exegesis of the exit polls from the first two nominating contests, these results suggest “the formation of an anti-Trump coalition among college-educated Republicans.” Trump’s “weak link,” as Ron Brownstein calls it, followed him to South Carolina, where Rubio beat Trump 27 to 25 percent among voters with at least a four-year degree. There is no reason to believe Trump’s fortunes with college-educated Republican voters will improve—and this is just Republicans. With college-educated voters as a whole, Trump is poison. Pure, lethal poison. Mehta2 The preceding chart, also drawn from Quinnipiac’s latest polling, is illuminating. For one thing, it shows that Hillary Clinton, the frontrunner for the Democratic nomination, is 13 points underwater with college-educated voters. Yet she is a homecoming queen compared to Trump, who is an unfathomable 37 points in arrears with college-educated voters. Cruz is also anathema to college graduates. They even look askance at Rubio now, while earlier this month they were enamored of him. Only Bernie Sanders gets positive marks from this group. A candidate’s standing with college graduates is significant because it correlates with how well he or she performs on head-to-head ballot tests against other candidates. Here the news is no better for Trump. He would get crushed among college voters, and consequently lose the election. Mehta3 This chart reveals just how poorly Trump would do with college graduates against Hillary Clinton. While he loses to Clinton by one point overall, his deficit soars to 15 points with college graduates. This is a gap Trump’s vaunted working-class support can’t fill. According to Quinnipiac, he only leads by five points with voters who don’t have college degrees, 45 to 40 percent. Cruz, not usually categorized as a champion of the working class, does better with them against Clinton than Trump does. The Texas senator gets 48 percent of working-class voters to 39 percent for the former secretary of state. His deficit among college voters is only 13 points (52 to 39 percent), though, so he leads Clinton 46 to 43 percent. Rubio polls best against Clinton with both groups, trailing 40 to 46 percent with college voters and leading 50 to 37 percent with non-college voters. This translates to a 48 to 41 percent lead for the Florida senator overall. College-Educated People Vote More The “diploma divide” among Republican voters was a key factor in the 2012 primary, and it has recurred in 2016. In 2012, college-educated Republicans lined up behind Romney, while those without degrees fragmented among several candidates. But in 2016, as David Wasserman noted in December, it is college-educated Republicans who have divided their support while those without degrees have coalesced behind Trump. Consequently, Trump leads the GOP field because even though he gets only a quarter of Republicans who graduated from college, he gets two-fifths of those who didn’t. The problem for Trump (or any candidate) is that winning non-college graduates while losing degree holders does not a winning coalition make. The problem for Trump (or any candidate) is that winning non-college graduates while losing degree holders does not a winning coalition make. All it does is guarantee defeat. Per the 2012 exit polls, Romney won college graduates 51 to 47 percent over President Obama. It was the only educational cohort Romney won on his way to a four-point loss. Trump supporters might counter that he would make up for it by winning overwhelming support from working-class voters. This is wrong for two reasons. The first reason is that, as seen in the Quinnipiac poll, Trump only breaks even with non-college graduates in the general election. The second reason is that there simply aren’t enough working-class voters to make up for the catastrophic losses among college-educated voters Trump is destined to incur. Voting propensity is strongly correlated with educational attainment. The more educated one is, the more likely one is to vote. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the two most reliable voting groups in the United States are voters with bachelor’s degrees and those with post-graduate degrees. The following chart, drawn from the 2012 election review by the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey, shows that these two groups turned out at rates of 75 percent and 81 percent, respectively. Even those who attended but did not finish college had a voting rate higher than 60 percent. The rate for high school graduates was just over 50 percent, and it declined sharply for those who did not finish high school. Mehta4 There is simply no way a candidate can win a presidential election now by losing the biggest turnout group by ten or more points, as polls consistently show Trump doing. College graduates cannot stand Trump, and this surely is no small factor in him having the highest negative rating of any presidential candidate Gallup has ever tested. Sixty percent of Americans have an unfavorable view of Trump. That kind of radioactivity usually requires a Geiger counter to measure. College graduates vote more, and there are more of them who vote. According to the 2012 exit polls, 47 percent of voters had at least a four-year degree. Another 29 percent spent at least some time enrolled on campus. That adds up to 76 percent. The overlap is not perfect, but if working-class voters are defined as voters with no more than a high school education, then Trump’s hopes rest on taking larger and larger bites from a cherry. Donald Trump’s Missing White Voters Even the pit has been consumed. Psephologists and pundits have fixated on “the mystery of the missing white voters” ever since Sean Trende noticed their disappearance after the 2012 election. In a recent series on the Trump phenomenon, Trende posits that the candidate most likely to appeal to these missing voters is Trump, as they were, for the most part, rural blue-collar whites with an affinity for populism who in another age voted for Ross Perot. There simply aren’t enough working-class voters to make up for Trump’s catastrophic losses among college-educated voters. As Nate Cohn puts it, Trump’s base consists of irregularly voting nominal Democrats from the industrial north, the South, and Appalachia. The problem, Trende writes, is that there simply aren’t enough of them to win even if you hold everything else constant. The alternatives are either to win more non-white support or increase the GOP’s already staggering edge with white voters. There’s the rub. Trump could theoretically get more non-white voters (perhaps by appealing to black voters more than Romney did). Or, more plausibly, he could boost turnout among blue-collar whites with his stances against free trade and immigration. But he would do so almost certainly at the expense of support from white-collar voters. Liam Donovan framed the dilemma well in a recent article in National Review: “Trump can run up the popular-vote score all he wants riding white-working-class resentment. It won’t help him when he gets buried in swing counties such as Fairfax, Hamilton, Hillsborough, and Arapahoe. Sure, he can target the Rust Belt, but big margins in Western Pennsylvania or the Upper Peninsula won’t matter if he can’t play in Bucks or Oakland Counties.” Trump won’t play in Bucks County. He won’t for reasons Trende articulates in the final part of his excellent series. He argues that Trump is the avatar of what he labels “cultural traditionalism.” Cultural traditionalists share certain attitudes “about the importance of family, religion, achievement, intellectual advancement, diversity (at least within categories deemed important by elites), patriotism, and nationalism” distinct from, and often diametrically opposed to, those of their counterparts, the “cultural cosmopolitans.” In voting terms, there are more cultural cosmopolitans than there are cultural traditionalists, and by a considerable margin. The GOP establishment is made up for the most part of cultural cosmopolitans, while many of its voters are cultural traditionalists. Out of this untenable tension sprang Trump. The cultural traditionalists love him not least because he is a giant middle finger to the cosmopolitans. The nation’s metropolitan areas and suburbs, though, are populated by cultural cosmopolitans, affluent, college-educated professionals who cringe whenever Trump promises to ban Muslims or deport every illegal immigrant in the country. As we have already seen, there are, at least in voting terms, more cultural cosmopolitans than there are cultural traditionalists, and by a considerable margin. As we have also seen, they loathe Donald Trump. They are never going to vote for someone who so grievously offends their sensibilities. Evidence Trump Haters Won’t Switch Sides A Trump backer might rejoin that I am merely speculating that college-educated Republicans would not flock to Trump if he became the nominee. Supporters of one candidate during a primary often say they won’t support his opponent but rally around the party flag for the general election. This is a fair point. It is hard to prove a negative, especially one that hasn’t happened yet. There is some evidence, however, to indicate Trump may not benefit from this normal pattern. On Election Day, Akin lost college graduates 50 to 44 percent, a seven-point swing. There are few analogues to Trump in recent years. One who resembled the magnate, at least in his capacity for intemperate remarks, was Todd Akin. In the last poll conducted before he devoured his leg, Akin led his 2012 Missouri Senate race against incumbent Claire McCaskill by 11 points. This included a one-point advantage with college graduates, 46 to 45 percent. Yet on Election Day, Akin lost college graduates 50 to 44 percent, a seven-point swing. Moreover, 15 percent of Republican voters defected and voted for McCaskill. Another GOP Senate candidate who made foolish remarks about abortion in 2012 was Richard Mourdock of Indiana. He managed to win college-educated voters, but like Akin he bled considerable Republican support: 14 percent of Hoosier Republicans backed Democrat Joe Donnelly, who won. In 2010, Sharron Angle, the controversial GOP Senate nominee in Nevada, lost 11 percent of Republicans to Harry Reid. Her Colorado counterpart, Ken Buck, saw 10 percent of Republicans shift to Michael Bennett. Most instructive, perhaps, is the 2008 presidential election, which saw Barack Obama win 9 percent of Republicans and an astounding 20 percent of self-described conservatives. Given the aspirational qualities of Obama’s candidacy, we should not be surprised he had so much cross-ballot appeal. Nine or 10 percent is not much in a decisive contest like his first presidential campaign, but in a close election or a swing state it could be the difference between victory and defeat.

#### Double bind – if trump is plausible it spells the end of GOP party – means they lose control in congress and future elections.

Mehta ’16: (Varad Mehta. “Why Donald Trump Can’t Win The White House.” The Federalist. FEBRUARY 22, 2016)

By now you have surely begun to suspect that I oppose Trump. You’re right. I oppose him on philosophical and ideological grounds. But I also oppose him for practical reasons. Nominate Trump, and the GOP would lose college-educated voters for at least a generation, and possibly forever. With them would go the prospect of ever again winning states like Colorado, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Florida. So, without them, would the GOP be finished as a national party, and perhaps as any kind of party at all. The data speaks in a clear voice

#### No impact – republicans win congress we’ll just have the status quo

## State Politics

### --- Cali Rainy Day Funds

#### Brown’s politics are literally framed through fear.

Nazaryan ’16: (ALEXANDER NAZARYAN “HOW JERRY BROWN QUIETLY PULLED CALIFORNIA BACK FROM THE BRINK.” Newsweek. 4/14/16//FT)

Those trying to make sense of Brown’s pessimistic view of the state’s future note his friendship with the Stanford philosopher Jean-Pierre Dupuy, a theorist of the apocalypse who believes that telling people about the worst thing that could happen might actually make them act in a way that prevents it: instead of the audacity of hope, the efficacy of despair. In a recent op-ed, close California watcher Joe Mathews wrote that “ Brown’s famous skepticism of new programs makes sense if you believe, as Dupuy argues, that man is blind to the consequences of his own progress. Brown’s focus on avoiding catastrophes—including his rainy-day fund and his crusade on climate change—reflects Dupuy’s ‘prophet-of-doom’ calls.”

#### No Uniqueness

Walters ’16: (Dan Walters “California scores lowest on Moody’s fiscal ‘stress test’.” The Sacramento Bee. April 22, 2016//FT)

In addition to revenue volatility, the Moody’s report also cites California’s relative inflexibility on the spending side of the budget ledger and the fact that a the Legislature needs two-thirds vote to raise taxes, both of which expose it to greater peril if recession strikes

#### Your internal links are shoddy af

#### 1] Rainy day funds are important to keep gov budgets – but not for the private sector and its economy as a whole.

#### 2] Even if Cali is a big economy – there are hundreds of big economies and cali alone can’t trigger the link – empirically proven in 2008.

## Politics

### --- Sentencing Reform

#### Virtually no impact – case is only way to solve.

Lennard 1/11: (Natasha Lennard, “ELECTION YEAR ANTI-CRIME POSTURING COULD DERAIL EVEN LIMITED SENTENCING REFORM,” the Intercept, Jan. 11 2016, 12:08 p.m.//FT)

That such legislation might reach the president’s desk does signal a shift in contemporary U.S. politics. Consensus support for any reform of this sort on Capitol Hill is significant in recent history, but that speaks mainly to decades of political intransigence on the issue. The legislation has limited reach, reducing harsh penalties for a select subset of drug offenders, and is also flawed; both bills introduce new mandatory minimums. Credit for the modest progress the bills represent certainly belongs to a popular resistance movement powerfully asserting that U.S. criminal justice systematically decimates black life. In June, Politico published an article titled “Riots spur Senate look at sentencing reform.” It was a causal stretch for which I’ll blame the vagaries of clickbait, but it conveyed a kernel of truth. Riots have historically prompted placation-aimed reforms. At the same time, decarceration efforts are now more palatable for tough-on-crime politicians, thanks to the existence of a vast nexus of technologies to surveil and control those deemed criminal, offering grim assurance that the carceral state is well-established beyond prison walls.

#### The uniqueness on this is just too good - it will happen sooner or later

Lennard 1/11: (Natasha Lennard, “ELECTION YEAR ANTI-CRIME POSTURING COULD DERAIL EVEN LIMITED SENTENCING REFORM,” the Intercept, Jan. 11 2016, 12:08 p.m.//FT)

Such was the landscape of allegedly historic shifts and realpolitikal compromise on criminal justice reform in 2015. All Democratic presidential candidates and most Republicans called for it, specifically but ambiguously citing the need to end mass incarceration. In December, the general counsel of Koch Industries met for the fourth time with White House officials to discuss support for bipartisan reform bills advancing through the House and Senate. The House bill, the Sentencing Reform Act, and the Senate bill, the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act, have passed their respective judiciary committees. Both reduce federal mandatory minimums for nonviolent drug offenses, lower the sentence for three-strike drug felons from life to 25 years and (importantly) would apply retroactively — so would be applicable to current prisoners to seek early release. That such legislation might reach the president’s desk does signal a shift in contemporary U.S. politics. Consensus support for any reform of this sort on Capitol Hill is significant in recent history, but that speaks mainly to decades of political intransigence on the issue. The legislation has limited reach, reducing harsh penalties for a select subset of drug offenders, and is also flawed; both bills introduce new mandatory minimums.

#### Bill is weak – so case easily outweighs

Hunter 4/27: (Dee Hunter/Urban News Service, “Criminal justice reform snagged in campaign politics.” District Chronicles. April 27, 2016//FT)

Grassley’s measure addresses several stringent sentencing provisions that have helped swell the federal prison population over the past 30 years. It would repeal the “three strikes” law that requires a mandatory life sentence without parole for anyone with a third conviction on drug or violent-felony charges. Instead, the bill creates a mandatory 25-year sentence. This legislation retroactively applies a 2010 sentencing-reform provision that reduced the disparity between crack and powder cocaine penalties. This change alone would let about 6,500 prisoners petition the courts for release or reduced sentences. Grassley’s bill also includes juvenile justice reforms and language to help former prisoners transition back into society. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Kentucky), facing pressure from tough-on-crime Republicans, has not said whether he will allow a vote on Grassley’s proposal. “Our system of justice is not broken,” former U.S. attorney general John Ashcroft wrote last month in a letter to McConnell, signed by 40 high-ranking former law enforcement officials. “Mandatory minimums have caused a dramatic reduction in crime.” Reform advocates do not consider Grassley’s legislation the major overhaul of mandatory minimum sentences for which they long have fought, saying his bill does not go far enough. “It’s a Goldilocks reform bill. It’s not too much. It’s not too little. But it’s better than nothing,” said Nkechi Taifa of the Open Society Policy Center. “There was a time when this looked like a slam dunk … It was the right issue at the right time. Now it is not so clear.”

#### Impact is marginal – only federal justice system

Hunter 4/27: (Dee Hunter/Urban News Service, “Criminal justice reform snagged in campaign politics.” District Chronicles. April 27, 2016//FT)

This bill only applies to the federal justice system, where about 200,000 inmates are held. This is just 8 percent of the 2.5 million Americans confined to state prisons and local jails.

# 1AR – K’s

## Generics

### Case outweighs

#### Culture of violence outweighs—neolib causes politics of disposability—root cause of their impact.

Henry A. Giroux 14 [American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy], “Neoliberalism's War on Democracy”, Truthout, 26 Apr 2014, BE

The not-so-hidden order of politics underlying the second Gilded Age and its heartless version of economic Darwinism is that some populations, especially those marginalized by class, race, ethnicity, or immigration status, are viewed as excess populations to be removed from the body politic, relegated to sites of terminal containment or exclusion. Marked as disposable, such populations become targets of state surveillance, violence, torture, abduction, and injury. Removed from all vestiges of the social contract, they have become the unmentionables of neoliberalism. For them, surviving— not getting ahead—marks the space in which politics and power converge. The politics of disposability delineates these populations as unworthy of investment or of sharing in the rights, benefits, and protections of a substantive democracy.48 Pushed into debt, detention centers, and sometimes prison, the alleged human waste of free-market capitalism now inhabits zones of terminal exclusion—zones marked by forms of social and civil death. Particularly disturbing is the lack of opposition among the US public to this view of particular social groups as disposable—this, perhaps more than anything else, signals the presence of a rising authoritarianism in the United States. Left unchecked, economic Darwinism will not only destroy the social fabric and undermine democracy; it will also ensure the marginalization and eventual elimination of those intellectuals willing to fight for public values, rights, spaces, and institutions not wedded to the logic of privatization, commodification, deregulation, militarization, hypermasculinity, and a ruthless "competitive struggle in which only the fittest could survive."50 This new culture of cruelty and disposability has become the hallmark of neoliberal sovereignty, and it will wreak destruction in ways not yet imaginable—even given the horrific outcomes of the economic and financial crisis brought on by economic Darwinism. All evidence suggests a new reality is unfolding, one characterized by a deeply rooted crisis of education, agency, and social responsibility.

### State Phobia DA

#### This logic is inherently neoliberal and effectively privatizes survival

Giroux 3 – McMaster University, Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies (Henry A, Pedagogies of Difference, Race, and Representation: Film as a Site of Translation and Politics Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Change, edited by Peter Pericles Trifonas, pg. 95-96)

Any attempt to address Baby Boy as a form of public pedagogy would have to analyze the largely privatized and individualized analysis that shapes this film and how it resonates with the ongoing privatization and depoliticization of the public sphere. As neoliberalism has gained momentum since the 1980s, one of its distinguishing features has been an assault on all those public spheres that are not regulated by the language of the market. Under the onslaught of neoliberal ideology and its turn toward free market as the basis for human interaction, there is an attempt to alter radically the very vocabulary we use in describing and appraising human interest, action, and behavior. Individuals are now defined largely as consumers, and self-interest appears to be the only factor capable of motivating people. Public spaces are increasingly displaced by commercial interests, and private utopias become the only way of understanding the meaning of the good life. It gets worse. As public life is emptied of its own separate concerns -importance of public goods, civic virtue, public debate, collective agency, and social provisions for the marginalized-it becomes increasingly more difficult to translate private concerns into public considerations. The Darwinian world of universal struggle pits individuals against each other while suggesting that the misfortunes and problems of others represent both a weakness of character and a social liability. Within such a system, the state gives up its obligations to provide collective safety nets for people and the ideology of going it alone furthers the myth that all social problems are the result of individual choices. Unfortunately, Baby Boy not only refuses to challenge the myth of individual motivation and pathology as the source of unemployment, violence, welfare dependency, bad housing, inadequate schools, and crumbling infrastructures, it actually reinforces this well rehearsed stable of conservative ideology. It does so by suggesting that collective problems can only be addressed as tales of individual survival, coming of age stories that chronicle either selfishness, laziness, and lack of maturity or individual perseverance. By suggesting that Jody 's life is colonized by the private, cut off from larger social, economic, and political issues, Baby Boy both renders hope private and suggests that communities in struggle can only share or be organized around the most private of intimacies, removed in large part from the capacity to struggle over broader issues. Dependency in this film is a dirty word, and seems to ignore the ways in which it resonates with right wing attacks on the welfare state and the alleged perils of big government. Granted, Baby Boy is supposedly about the refusal of immature African-American youth to grow up, but the film 's attack on dependency is so one-sided that it reinforces the myth that social safety nets simply weaken character, and it supports this ideology, in part, by refusing to acknowledge how dependency on the welfare state has worked for those millions for whom it has "made all the difference between wretched poverty and a decent life."41 Similarly, if Jody 's dreams are limited to the demands of the traditional family structure and the successes associated with the market ideology, there is no room in Baby Boy to recognize democracy, not the market, as a force of dissent and a relentless critique of institutions, as a source of civic engagement, or as a discourse for expanding and deepening the possibilities of critical citizenship and social transformation. In the end, Baby Boy fails to offer a space for translating how the private and public mutually inform each other; consequently, it reinforces rather than ruptures those racially oppressive trends in American society that disfigure the possibility of racial justice, democratic politics, and responsible citizenship.

### States Good

#### We need to embrace the state as a heuristic – our argument is not that the state is good but that learning the levers of power is key to confronting it.

Zanotti ’14: (Dr. Laura Zanotti is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Virginia Tech. Her research and teaching include critical political theory as well as international organizations, UN peacekeeping, democratization and the role of NGOs in post-conflict governance.“Governmentality, Ontology, Methodology: Re-thinking Political Agency in the Global World” – Alternatives: Global, Local, Political – vol 38(4):p. 288-304,. A little unclear if this is late 2013 or early 2014 – The Stated “Version of Record” is Feb 20, 2014, but was originally published online on December 30th, 2013. Obtained via Sage Database//FT)

By questioning substantialist representations of power and subjects, inquiries on the possibilities of political agency are reframed in a way that focuses on power and subjects’ relational character and the contingent processes of their (trans)formation in the context of agonic relations. Options for resistance to governmental scripts are not limited to ‘‘rejection,’’ ‘‘revolution,’’ or ‘‘dispossession’’ to regain a pristine ‘‘freedom from all constraints’’ or an immanent ideal social order. It is found instead in multifarious and contingent struggles that are constituted **within** the scripts of **government**al rationalities and at the same time exceed and transform them. This approach questions oversimplifications of the complexities of liberal political rationalities and of their interactions with non-liberal political players and nurtures a radical skepticism about identifying universally good or bad actors or abstract solutions to political problems. International power interacts in complex ways with diverse political spaces and within these spaces it is appropriated, hybridized, redescribed, hijacked, and tinkered with. Governmentality as a heuristic focuses on performing complex diagnostics of events. It invites historically situated explorations and careful differentiations rather than overarching demonizations of ‘‘power,’’ romanticizations of the ‘‘rebel’’ or the ‘‘the local.’’ More broadly, theoretical formulations that conceive the subject in non-substantialist terms and focus on processes of subjectification, on the ambiguity of power discourses, and on hybridization as the terrain for political transformation, open ways for reconsidering political agency beyond the dichotomy of oppression/rebellion. These alternative formulations also foster an ethics of political engagement, to be continuously taken up through plural and uncertain practices, that demand continuous attention to ‘‘what happens’’ instead of fixations on ‘‘what ought to be.’’83 Such ethics of engagement would not await the revolution to come or hope for a pristine ‘‘freedom’’ to be regained. Instead, it would constantly attempt to twist the working of power by playing with whatever cards are available and would require intense processes of reflexivity on the consequences of political choices. To conclude with a famous phrase by Michel Foucault ‘‘my point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So my position leads not to apathy but to hyper- and pessimistic activism.’’84

### 1AR T – No PIKs

#### A] Interpretation – neg advocacy cannot result in a handgun ban

#### B] Violations in CX

#### 1] They moot all my offense since they subsume 99% of the aff – restarts the debate creating a 13-7 skew. And takes out my ability to leverage the aff – Kills fairness, which is a voter b/c debate is a competitive activity where the role of the judge is to determine who did the better debating.

#### 2] Aff doesn’t get choice of when it’s implemented – that would be extra-T and include an element of time – means the neg can always avoid discussion of the normative implications of a gun ban, and focus on minutiae like the context its implemented in. Our interp is better, you can still read disads to the aff in the current context – but you can’t effectively have a delay CP to avoid debates.

## Prison Abolition

### Perm

#### We cannot wait – that’s the Kratchowil ev on the bottom.

## Black Self Defense

### ROB

#### Scholarship is important – but it has to be tested in its application to the real world.

### Case outweighs

#### Case outweighs

#### A] Culture of violence causes politics of disposability—root cause of their impact.

Henry A. Giroux 14 [American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy], “Neoliberalism's War on Democracy”, Truthout, 26 Apr 2014, BE

The not-so-hidden order of politics underlying the second Gilded Age and its heartless version of economic Darwinism is that some populations, especially those marginalized by class, race, ethnicity, or immigration status, are viewed as excess populations to be removed from the body politic, relegated to sites of terminal containment or exclusion. Marked as disposable, such populations become targets of state surveillance, violence, torture, abduction, and injury. Removed from all vestiges of the social contract, they have become the unmentionables of neoliberalism. For them, surviving— not getting ahead—marks the space in which politics and power converge. The politics of disposability delineates these populations as unworthy of investment or of sharing in the rights, benefits, and protections of a substantive democracy.48 Pushed into debt, detention centers, and sometimes prison, the alleged human waste of free-market capitalism now inhabits zones of terminal exclusion—zones marked by forms of social and civil death. Particularly disturbing is the lack of opposition among the US public to this view of particular social groups as disposable—this, perhaps more than anything else, signals the presence of a rising authoritarianism in the United States. Left unchecked, economic Darwinism will not only destroy the social fabric and undermine democracy; it will also ensure the marginalization and eventual elimination of those intellectuals willing to fight for public values, rights, spaces, and institutions not wedded to the logic of privatization, commodification, deregulation, militarization, hypermasculinity, and a ruthless "competitive struggle in which only the fittest could survive."50 This new culture of cruelty and disposability has become the hallmark of neoliberal sovereignty, and it will wreak destruction in ways not yet imaginable—even given the horrific outcomes of the economic and financial crisis brought on by economic Darwinism. All evidence suggests a new reality is unfolding, one characterized by a deeply rooted crisis of education, agency, and social responsibility.

#### B] Modern racism no longer acts predominantly through overtly racist state violence--- rather by creating segregated, poor communities and flooding them with guns

DeBrabander ’15: (Firmin DeBrabander 15 [associate professor of philosophy at Maryland Institute College of Art, has written social and political commentary for numerous publications, including the Baltimore Sun, Common Dreams, Counterpunch, and the New York Times] “Do Guns Make Us Free?: Democracy and the Armed Society”, Yale University Press, 19 May 2015, FT)

But this is far from the real thing. Gruesome Hollywood depictions spark deep, irrational fear of crime, but they do not communicate or reflect its real face, which is readily seen— if we care to look— in our inner cities and countless poor communities across America. While Americans eagerly devour spectacular bloodshed as entertainment— and use that to justify their need for a gun, indeed, many guns— hundreds of people meet an unglorious, unremarked death on the streets of cities like Baltimore every year. The television viewing public does not come to know the mean conditions of their demise, the quick, blunt ends of desperate lives. The fates of Baltimore’s murdered poor are hardly celebrated or studied by the media, and are instead belittled or swept under the rug by police and politicians. Suburbanites commute to work every day amidst the violence that afflicts Baltimore’s most desperate neighborhoods on either side of the highway; they flock to football and baseball games downtown, oblivious to the misery that rules the city’s roughest streets and how they are so surely insulated from it. For poor blacks— who are disproportionately affected by violent crime— the America they know can be a veritable war zone. According to a Bureau of Justice Statistics report, between the years 1976 and 2005, the homicide rate for white Americans was 4.8 per 100,000, but an astounding 36.9 [per 100,000] for blacks. 80 The United States Conference of Mayors, one of the loudest voices calling for gun control, noted in 2012 that “homicide is the leading cause of death for African American males between the ages of 15 and 24.” African Americans comprise just 15 percent of the nation’s child population, but “made up 45 percent of child gun deaths in 2008 and 2009,” the Children’s Defense Fund reports. 82 Many of our nation’s mayors, as well as many African Americans, complained following the Sandy Hook shootings, when the American public seemed newly aware of gun violence, that the constant flood of gun deaths in our inner cities is neglected and ignored. The Washington Post ran an article on residents of the most dangerous neighborhood in the District, noting their frustration that the killings “in mostly white, middle class Newtown, Connecticut” spurred political concern. “Twenty-six people died in Sandy Hook Elementary. In the District’s Sixth Police District, an area of fewer than 10 square miles … 19 lives were lost to gun violence last year and 55 people were wounded in shootings. The year before that, 22 people were killed and 35 were wounded. Eighty-eight lives were lost in the city last year.” 83 A quarter of Washington’s murders took place in one small part of the city, a neighborhood subjected to a merciless onslaught of violence. It is no surprise that inner-city residents tend to find the notion of “gun rights” a bit offensive. Of the homicide epidemic that afflicts the African American community at large, the Centers for Disease Control points out, “more than 90 percent of the violence is from other blacks, mostly from guns.” 84 As one Washington resident put it, “[guns] are for wars, and we have a war in the inner city.” 85 It is hardly conceivable that the rest of America would tolerate all the talk equating gun rights and freedom if middle-class whites were killing one another at similar rates.

### Perm

#### Perm do both

#### No links -

#### The aff doesn’t claim that black self-defense is bad – but that the white neoliberal valorization of gun culture is. It’s contextual to how the gun is used in the real world.

### Alt Fails

#### Williams’ solvency is predicated on a psychological claim – moreover the end goal is still “integration”

Curry and Kelleher ‘15: (Tommy J. Curry A&M prof, and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015//FT)

Some find it fanciful to believe violence against whites is ever necessary to address racism, but these individual also lack knowledge of what racism truly is: the unrelenting violence and genocidal logics producing endless Black deaths with little recourse for the loss of those lives. Williams believes he survived that day for the operation of one maxim: “When an oppressed people show a willingness to defend themselves, the enemy, who is a moral weakling and coward is more willing to grant concessions and work for a respectable compromise. Psychologically, moreover, racists consider themselves superior beings and they are not willing to exchange their superior lives for our inferior ones. They are most vicious and violent when they can practice violence with impunity.”78 Similar to the charge against lynch mobs advanced by Ida B. Wells-Barnett, the reason every Black home should have a special place for a Winchester rifle, Williams recognized that challenging white life was ultimately the key to Black survival. Because racist orders cannot see Black people as human beings, there is not any regard for the suffering, pain or even death of Blacks. Such logics can only be uprooted; they cannot be persuaded. This is where one begins to grasp the meaning of his pre-emptive program.

#### But this fails - Every instance of black insurrection with guns only empowered anti-black structures.

**Everitt ’10:** [Ladd Everitt, Director of Communications at the [Coalition to Stop Gun Violence](http://www.csgv.org/), “Debunking the ‘gun control is racist’ smear”, Waging Non-Violence, 2010] VM

Thomas also refers to Nat Turner, a Virginian slave and preacher who staged a rebellion to seek God’s judgment against the institution of slavery. The revolt began on the night of August 13, 1831, when Turner and six of his followers went from house to house killing slave owners and their families with a hatchet and a broad axe. At each house, the rebels freed any slaves they encountered and stocked up on more weapons. Eventually, his force numbered 60 men—all armed with guns, axes, swords and clubs. The revolt lasted nearly 10 days and 57 whites were killed before the group was pushed back by militia and federal forces. Although Turner escaped, he was caught two months later, immediately convicted, and hanged. In Virginia, the [retribution](http://www.jstor.org/pss/2713592%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) was brutal: A reign of terror followed in Virginia. Labor was paralyzed, plantations abandoned, women and children were driven from home and crowded into nooks and corners. The sufferings of many of these refugees who spent night after night in the woods were intense. Retaliation began. In a little more than one day 120 Negroes were killed … One individual boasted that he himself had killed between ten and fifteen Negroes … Negroes were tortured to death, burned, maimed and subjected to nameless atrocities. Thomas himself tells us the broader consequences of Turner’s exercise of “Second Amendment rights”: “The fear generated by these and other rebellions led southern legislatures to take particularly vicious aim at the rights of free blacks and slaves to speak or to keep and bear arms for their defense.” The Colfax Massacre is another tragedy frequently cited by the majority in McDonald.Colfax actually began as a civil rights success story. During the Reconstruction period, African-Americans in the small Louisiana town elected officeholders, held important public positions, and even organized a state militia company led by a black man, William Ward. Eventually, however, their unit was demobilized after moving too aggressively to arrest white terrorists. A withdrawal of federal government support set the stage for the [massacre](http://books.google.com/books?id=IGrlvhXUetoC&printsec=frontcover&cd=1&source=gbs_ViewAPI#v=onepage&q&f=false) on April 13, 1873, when between 62-81 African Americans—more than half of them armed with firearms—were slaughtered by a larger, better-equipped force of whites. As my boss, CSGV Executive Director Josh Horwitz, and Casey Anderson [put it](http://books.google.com/books?id=9qDIamIBC90C&pg=PA122&dq=guns,+democracy,+and+the+insurrectionist+idea+the+collapse+of+reconstruction&hl=en&ei=piiSTJ_cC8Lflgefh5mnCg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCgQ6AEwAA" \l "v=onepage&q&f=false" \t "_blank), according to gun rights activists: …the collapse of Reconstruction—and every tragic consequence that followed—could have been avoided if the newly freed slaves had had access to firearms. This explanation of events is a fantasy. It is easy…to identify incidents where the victim of racist violence might have defended themselves more effectively if they had been armed with guns. The idea that white racists could have been kept in check by ensuring widespread access to firearms among black southerners, however, is absurd. In fact, the American experience during and after Reconstruction illustrates that the…premise…that private ownership of guns safeguards individual rights against tyranny of the majority is exactly backward in explaining the relationship between private force and state power in protecting individual rights … Not only is the claim that gun rights could have stopped the Jim Crow system a falsehood, but it covers up the even more important insight that [this argument] is a continuation of a concerted effort, born and nurtured in the antebellum South, to limit the federal government’s effectiveness in protecting the democratic rights of the most vulnerable Americans. I can’t help but think of Lifetime National Rifle Association (NRA) Member Rand Paul[advocating](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/josh-horwitz/second-amendment-remedies_b_616191.html) for the repeal of a section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and stating that gun carriers should be a protected class like minorities. Nor could “Reclaim the Dream” rally organizer Rev. Al Sharpton when he recently [referred](http://www.nationalactionnetwork.net/media-info/revs-written-opinions/409-tea-party-runs-counter-to-the-civil-rights-movement.html) to Paul while noting that King’s life work was conducted “for the precise purpose of pushing for increased federal action and involvement to nullify all discriminatory state and local practices.”

## Esposito & Finley

#### Perm:

#### Solves 100% - gun bans would be part of the alternative world – which means the alt is plan plus at best

Esposito and Finley 14: (Luigi, Prof Sociology @Barry, Laura, Asst. Prof Sociology and Criminology @Barry, Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States, Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April ) Esposito and Finley, PhDs, 14

Although a full examination of what must be done to challenge the sort of neoliberal logic that is so deeply engrained in U.S culture is beyond the scope of this article, we offer here a few brief suggestions. Recent mass shootings have galvanized the public’s attention to gun violence, and this might constitute a strategic moment for taking action to minimize this violence. These efforts, however, cannot remain focused solely on tweaking gun laws (although this is obviously important). What is also needed is a popular movement that will not only challenge the pro-gun lobby and push for more gun control, but also align itself with other anti-neoliberal movements that are calling for systemic social and economic changes, as well as a shift in the values, norms, and attitudes that shape our relations and the way most Americans live their lives.

#### No link:

#### We don’t think the aff is the only step – that’s the framing and Esposito + Finley

#### 1NCs scholarship doesn’t examine all causes either – there’s obviously time and resolutional constraints – there’s no link differential and the perm would include anything we miss so it solves.

#### Aff is a huge solvency deficit to the alt – Guns are a large internal link they make violence normal and the NRA pollutes politics– that’s Kairys and Giroux 15

#### All the concrete action and incremental change good arguments are disads to the alt and net benefits to the perm – we have to start somewhere

## Agamben

#### Case outweighs

#### State Phobia DA

#### Your view of violence is myopic and obscures how the state subtly employs individuals for its violent ends.

Young 15 (Alex Trimble, Dornsife Preceptor Postdoctoral Teaching Fellowship at the University of Southern California, “The Settler Unchained Constituent Power and Settler Violence,” September 2015, http://www.academia.edu/16407736/The\_Settler\_Unchained\_Constituent\_Power\_and\_Settler\_Violence\_)//ghs-VA

As the steady rollback of gun control measures and the proliferation of “stand your ground” laws attest, in the United States this conception of the sovereign citizen is gaining ground against liberal advocacy for a state “monopoly of violence” (a phrase Beck spuriously attributes to the founding fathers).5 This being the case, and given that people of color and indigenous peoples bear the brunt of gun violence in overwhelmingly disproportionate numbers, it is necessary to ask whether this conception of the Weberian state adequately accounts for the endemic violence against racialized and indigenous populations in the United States. The drafting of the Second Amendment, while inspired in part by settler colonists’ fear of centralized state power, was also profoundly motivated by a fear of slave uprisings and of what the Declaration of Independence calls “the inhabitants of our frontiers . . . the merciless Indian savages.” 6 Anglo-American settlers enshrined the right to bear arms in the constitution in large part because they believed the federal government — like the British imperial government before it — would be too cumbersome and centralized a bureaucracy to facilitate the violence necessary to sustain the process of indigenous dispossession and the institution of chattel slavery. Beck argues for the Second Amendment’s role in preserving constituent power as a check on racial and anti-indigenous violence. This decoupling of necropolitical violence from the state however serves as vital means of perpetuating the very forms of oppression and dispossession that Beck claims the right to bear arms might prevent. My purpose in this article is to argue that the mode of resistance to the state’s “monopoly of violence” exemplified by Beck’s gun politics is indicative of a specifically settler colonial conception of sovereignty. In his essay “Necropolitics,” Achille Mbembe employs an expansive definition of sovereignty to capture the fluid nature of sovereign power in a colonial African context in which “the generalization of insecurity has deepened the societal distinction between those who bear weapons (armes) and those who do not.”7 For Mbembe, “the ultimate expression of sovereignty resides, to a large degree, in the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die. . . . To exercise sovereignty is to exercise control over mortality and to define life as the deployment and manifestation of power.”8 Such an understanding of sovereignty is equally important for understanding the irregular nature of the exercise of sovereign power on the settler colonial frontier and the peculiar situation in the contemporary United States, where an increasing power to “dictate who may live and who must die” is granted to individual citizens. This mode of sovereignty distributes the capacity for necropolitical violence throughout the settler polity, allowing it to be unleashed by individuals operating independently of, and occasionally in defiance of, the constituted power of the state. In Mbembe’s analysis, Europe stands as a stronghold of the jus publicum in which the power to kill is “civilized” by its accrual to the state, whereas “the colonies are like the frontiers. They are inhabited by ‘savages.’ The colonies are not organized into a state form and have not created a human world.”9 The postfrontier settler colony stands as an anomaly in this spacialization of sovereign power. There is no doubt that these societies share with Europe a juridical order shaped by the extreme violence of the state.10 Settler colonies never succeed, however, in overcoming indigenous resistance or in shedding their own frontier self-images. As a result, the settler colony never relegates the category of the “savage” to a space beyond its borders or entirely suppresses the anomic violence employed against indigenous and racialized bodies by the settler polity within the sovereign territory of the settler state. The contemporary United States — with its proliferation of violent right-wing terrorist groups operating with near impunity in defiance of the liberal state — stands as the extreme example of this phenomenon. While suggesting that the gun politics of Glenn Beck and his followers constitutes a mode of settler violence might seem an obvious enough point to make, the parallels in his rhetoric to that of the academic Left is not an accident. A romanticization of settler sovereignty also haunts many leftist theorizations that imagine liberation struggles as a Manichean showdown between constituent power and the state’s monopoly of violence. Such formulations celebrate constituent power as a mode of popular sovereignty that predates and exceeds the constituted power of the state.11 In so doing, these formulations either elide or, in extreme examples such as the one considered below, celebrate the anti-indigenous violence that underwrites popular sovereignty in European political philosophy’s favorite example of the space of

## Arkles

#### Perm– disarm both private individuals and the state (police) – resolves 100% of you offense

#### Alt can’t solve the case - their focus is myopic

Giroux ’13: (C.J. Polychroniou, Interview, “Violence is Deeply Rooted in American Culture: An Interview With Henry A. Giroux,” Truthout, 17 January 2013//FT)

As I have said elsewhere, violence has arisen from the breakdown of public space, the erasure of public goods, the embrace of a deadly war psychology, and a growing disdain for the common good. Gratuitous violence has become central to a society that trades on fear and fetishizes hyper-violent and punitive practices and social relations. Brutal masculine authority now rules American society and wages a war against women’s reproductive rights, civil liberties, poor black and brown youth, and Mexican immigrants. Americans inhabit society run by a financial elite that refuses to recognize that war is a descent into madness and the scope and breadth of the violence it produces infects our language, values, social relations, and democracy itself. War has become an all-embracing ideal that feeds the most totalitarian practices and shores up an authoritarian state. As an organizing principle of society, the politics and culture of violence unravels the fabric of democracy suggesting that America is at war with itself, its children, and its future. The political stooges who have become the lapdogs of corporate and financial elite must be held accountable for the deaths taking place in a toxic culture of gun violence. The condemnation of violence cannot be limited to police brutality. Violence does not just come from the police. In the United States there are other dangers emanating from state power that punishes whistle blowers, intelligence agencies that encourage the arrests of those who protest against the abuse of corporate and state power, and a corporate controlled media that that trades in ignorance, lies, and falsehoods, all the while demanding and generally “receiving unwavering support from their citizens.”[19]

#### Case outweighs -

#### No example of positive use of self-defense.

#### Alt causes more police militarization

DeBrabander 5/12 (FIRMIN DEBRABANDER, “The NRA’s sinister project: Turn America into a “shoot first” society,” The Salon, MAY 12, 2015//FT)

In sum, [The idea that] police are either absent or overwhelmed, or they are part of the problem of violence, in which case it makes good sense for citizens to be armed. Both arguments suit the NRA just fine. The gun lobby works tirelessly to arm ever more Americans, expand the laws that enable us to carry guns in public spaces, and drum up extreme levels of fear that support its radical agenda. But more armed citizens will not make police work any easier—if anything, they will only make it more challenging. There is good reason to believe that police shootings owe a lot to the fact that so many of the citizens they “serve and protect” are already armed. With more than 300 million privately owned guns in America, police must presume that the citizens they pull over, even for routine traffic stops, could have a gun. They must always be on edge, always fear the worst. This was borne out in the killing of Tamir Rice in a Cleveland playground earlier this year. Police had been summoned on reports of a man with a weapon; when they spied 12-year old Rice with his toy gun in hand, they opened fire, killing him. In a similar incident, on the other side of Ohio, police shot and killed John Crawford in a Wal-Mart, when he was walking the aisles—talking on his cell phone—with an air rifle in hand. It was reported afterwards that the officers involved in this incident had only just been trained for responding to “active shooters”—i.e., mass shooters, like at Columbine and Sandy Hook—and “were taught to be aggressive,” according to the prosecuting attorney. This is not to say that race wasn’t a factor in either case; it likely was. (Rice and Crawford were both African American.) But police error in similar incidents is compounded by the fact that they must fear armed citizens all the time.

Fact that Britain and Germany don’t have many armed police --- is proof --- they haven’t gotten rid of homophobia or racism --- but guns.

## Cap – Revolution

#### Alt cannot fiat that a revolution occurs, only that the state doesn’t ban handguns and a potential revolution uses them --- this solvency is tenuous and terrible

#### A] aff straight turns this – neoliberalism thrives on state phobia – which fractures the populace and paves way for militarism. It doesn’t result in revolution

#### B] NRA has been getting stronger and stronger – even small gun control policies can’t get past – which empirically disproves your view of history.

#### 2] **And, Marxism is just wrong – retrenches capitalism.**

Buchanan 14 Buchanan, I. (2014). Schizoanalysis and the pedagogy of the oppressed. In M. Carlin and J. J. Wallin (Eds.), Deleuze and Guattari, Politics and Education: For a People-Yet-to-Come (p. 1-14). USA: Bloomsbury Publishing. IM

In the 1950s and 1960s the key political problem for the Left was why hadn’t the great socialist revolution Marx predicted taken place in Western Europe? According to classical Marxist theories, the **socialist revolutions in China and Russia were historical anomalies because they were peasant-led revolutions and not** **proletarian**-led **as** they were supposed to be. **Marxist doctrine held** that **the revolution**(s) **should have taken place in France, England or Germany. The bigger problem** though was that **once the spark was lit in Russia the fire didn’t spread** west. This led Western Marxism as a whole to see itself, in Perry Anderson’s words, as the ‘product of defeat. The failure of the socialist revolution to spread outside Russia […] is the common background to the entire theoretical tradition of this period. Its major works were, without exception, produced in situations of political isolation and despair’ (ibid., p. 42). Paradoxically, the socialist victories in Russia and China, did not leaven this despair, nor energize Western Marxism as one might have expected, because they brought with them their own problems: first, **in** both **Russia and China the needs of the Party were prioritized over** and above **all other considerations**, with the effect that **Marxism became** in some circles **synonymous with authoritarian bureaucracy** (later as news of the Gulags became common knowledge this image soured further to the point where high-profile Marxists began to leave the party in protest – the so-called ‘nouveau philosophes’, despised by both Deleuze and Guattari, were only the most prominent); second, as the geographical axis of Marxism shifted from the West to the East, Marxism lost its meaning on the ground in its former strongholds in Paris and Berlin – where once it had been part of working-class culture, now it was simply an ideological cover for the Power of the Party (ibid., p. 43). In the process, Marxism became separated from mass struggle, and theory lost its mooring in praxis. This situation created a problem that Marxists writing in the latter part of view of things, 1960s radicalism, in all its counterculture glory, simply paved the way for a still more complete capture of society as a whole by capitalism by setting aside all the social and cultural impediments that hitherto blocked its expansion.2 Neo-liberalism is the result of these transformations. Government mishandling of various crises through the 1960s became the justification for the rolling back of the ‘welfare state’, i.e. the very idea that the state’s primary purpose is to oversee the welfare of the people, and the subsequent privatization of services hitherto deemed the preserve of the state, such as healthcare, but also key infrastructure (roads, sewerage, telecommunications, water and so on), and even elements of both the military and the police.3 Moreover, in **the** **U**nited **S**tates in particular, the state **responded** to the civil unrest generated by 1960s radicalism **by declaring ‘war’ on its own people** – the war on poverty saw the steamrolling of **entire neighbourhoods deemed ‘slums’** **only to be left as a vacant lots** because the state lacked the resources to rebuild them; **the war on drugs** that followed was even more devastating because **it resulted in** extraordinarily high and utterly **disproportionate levels of incarceration**, particularly among the Black and Latino populations.4 There was no obvious historical answer to the problem of the failure to revolt in Western Europe. According to **all the indicators Marxists generally relied on, the circumstances were in fact ripe for revolution. A large and well-organized working class existed** at least until the early 1960s and although it had suffered several defeats, it was still more than willing to flex its muscles to obtain better conditions, as May 1968 demonstrated in Paris when more than 10 million bluecollar workers went on strike and brought the whole country to a standstill. This, for Marx at least, was the essential precondition for revolution and yet it had not happened. Why not? Western Marxism’s answer to this rather perplexing problem, which it used Hegel to theorize, was that although the economic conditions were primed for revolution, the social and cultural conditions were not. The problem was that **the people** – understood in the broadest possible sense – **lacked not just revolutionary spirit, but revolutionary consciousness, the sense that the position of the oppressed is in fact powerful.** **But more than that, it is the sense that it is in the people’s interest to revolt**. As Freire (1996) puts it, ‘what characterizes the oppressed is their subordination to the consciousness of the master, as Hegel affirms’, adding that ‘true solidarity with the oppressed means fighting at their side to transform the objective reality which has made them these “beings for another”’ (p. 31).

#### 3] You are a double turn --- means the alt can’t solve for the DnG impacts --- also an independent reason why revolution won’t happen.

Buchanan 14 Buchanan, I. (2014). Schizoanalysis and the pedagogy of the oppressed. In M. Carlin and J. J. Wallin (Eds.), Deleuze and Guattari, Politics and Education: For a People-Yet-to-Come (p. 1-14). USA: Bloomsbury Publishing. IM

As we’ve seen, Freire’s brand of **Marxism depends on the idea of consciousness and D**eleuze and **G**uattari **reject this on what might be termed empirical grounds, or perhaps it would be better to say historical grounds, but also on theoretical grounds** as I’ll explain below. Basically, their position, which I will expand upon **in** what follows, is that consciousness-raising, the catch cry of **the** radical **1960s**, did not work in the way Marxists thought it would. **People became conscious of their oppression** and more importantly their interests **but did not rise up**. No doubt this was in large part because in contrast to Freire’s Latin America, people in the West generally did not see themselves as the oppressed, and in many ways they were not. For a start, they were vastly better off materially than at any other time in history. Thus the pedagogic task of Western Marxism’s educators was doubly hard – before they could discuss the strategies and tactics of revolution they had to convince their respective constituencies that a revolution was in fact required. This, **despite the fact that it could readily be shown that a change to a socialist model of government such as Western Marxism envisaged was in the interest of the great majority of people** (this line of thought persists in the recent treatises on Communism for our time by Badiou (2010), Bosteels (2011) and Deans (2012)). But **as** the ‘**Obamacare’** case **demonstrated** all too well, **interest is very far from self-evident to the majority of people.** This was undoubtedly Western Marxism’s biggest stumbling block. How do you foster revolutionary consciousness in a population that has ceased to think of itself as ‘the oppressed’ and no longer thinks of its interest in collective terms? **Marx thought that once people saw the true nature of their situation, their actual, objective reality, they would rise up against their oppressors and bring forth a new era of world socialism. But history didn’t follow this script**. At first it was thought that this was because the people were not fully aware of their situation and that with the proper education this could be changed. But it soon became clear, in the West at least, that the problem was different from and more pernicious than simple ignorance. The people were not unaware of their true situation – how could they not know? – and yet somehow they did not see that their interests would be better served by a change in the mode of production.

#### We do not affirm the state as is --- our demands highlight the inconsistency of the state and that we should constantly keep it in check with radical democracy

Newman 10: Saul Newman 10, Reader in Political Theory at Goldsmiths, U of London, Theory & Event Volume 13, Issue 2

There are two aspects that I would like to address here. Firstly, the notion of demand: making certain demands on the state – say for higher wages, equal rights for excluded groups, to not go to war, or an end to draconian policing – is one of the basic strategies of social movements and radical groups. Making such demands does not necessarily mean working within the state or reaffirming its legitimacy. On the contrary, demands are made from a position outside the political order, and they often exceed the question of the implementation of this or that specific measure. They implicitly call into question the legitimacy and even the sovereignty of the state by highlighting fundamental inconsistencies between, for instance, a formal constitutional order which guarantees certain rights and equalities, and state practices which in reality violate and deny them.

# 1AR - CPs

## Consumer Product CP

#### They assume the CP would terminate in a gun ban – you are mistaken.

Kopel ‘2k: (DAVID B. KOPELt. “TREATING GUNS LIKE CONSUMER PRODUCTS.” UNIVERSITY OFPENNSYLVANIA LAWREVEW 2000//FT)

"Guns are the most lethal, least regulated product in the U.S.," says the gun control lobby Handgun Control, Inc.' Advocates of more restrictive firearms laws, including gun bans, have taken up the mantra of treating "guns like other consumer products. "2 The fathers of this idea, and its most articulate champions, are Stephen Teret and Jon Vernick, and I am honored to have the opportunity to contribute to the dialogue about this new concept. Teret and Vernick are among the smartest and most fair-minded people working on the gun issue; they consistently frame their arguments to appeal to reason rather than to negative emotions. Were all of the Great American Gun Debate conducted in Teret and Vernick's style, our political life would be more civil. I will essay a closer look at the implications of treating guns like consumer products. First, I compare the regulatory treatment of guns to that of two other consumer products associated with a large number of deaths: automobiles and alcohol. I suggest that, statistically speaking, automobiles and alcohol are at least as dangerous as guns. Yet were we to treat guns like automobiles or alcohol, we would have to remove most gun restrictions because guns are already regulated much more strictly than automobiles or alcohol.

He Continues.

The first law to go would be the 1986 federal ban on manufacture of new machine guns for sale to ordinary citizens. 6 Machine guns were banned because they fire much more rapidly than ordinary guns, and this high-speed potential was considered dangerous and unnecessary-since no ordinary person had a need for such a high-speed gun. We do not ban cars like Porsches just because they are high-powered and can be driven much faster than the speed limit. Even though it is much easier to exceed the speed limit in a Porsche than in a Hyundai, we let people choose their cars regardless of their potential for speeding abuse. We even allow people to buy 13,000 horsepower Pratt & Whitney Jet Cars, which seem almost deliberately designed for speeding. Likewise, we do not ban automobiles because they are underpowered, or are made with poor quality metal. Those who want a Yugo can buy one. Under this analogy, the state-level bans on inexpensive guns (so-called 'Junk guns" or "Saturday Night Specials") and federal rules against the import of cheap guns would have to go. These laws are based on the theory that consumers should not be allowed to purchase guns made from metal that melts at too low of a temperature, because such guns are not well-made enough. Further, if we agree with Handgun Control, Inc. President Robert Walker that we need to "treat[] guns like cars,"" we must repeal the thousands of laws regulating the purchase of firearms and their possession on private property. The simple purchase of an automobile is subject to essentially no restrictions. When a buyer shows up at the dealer's showroom, the dealer does not conduct a background check to find out if the buyer has a conviction for vehicular homicide or drunk driving. The only "waiting period" for car purchases runs from the time of the buyer's decision to purchase to the time the salesman hands him the keys. This waiting period may last a half hour or more if the auto dealership has a great deal of paperwork, or it may be even shorter.

#### Moreover – proves there is no guarantee on the CP – all our uniqueness ev indicates congress and the NRA would strong arm them into deregulations not the other way around.

#### CP Text does not include repealing current gun control laws – which means you still link to Gourevitch

#### ATF can’t enforce crap.

Willis ’16: (Willis, Tiffany. "Better Gun Control Would Reduce Gang-Related Violence." Organized Crime. Ed. David Haugen, Susan Musser, and Michael Chaney. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2014. Opposing Viewpoints. Rpt. from "Who Arms America's Gangs?: Responsible Gun Owners." LiberalAmerica.org. 2013. Opposing Viewpoints in Context. Web. 9 Jan. 2016//FT)

We have to face the facts that criminals don't buy retail. They steal guns, they buy stolen guns, they buy [and] perfectly legal guns from "responsible" gun owners at gun shows, they use straw purchasers to buy guns, and they buy from federally licensed dealers who know that the chance of the ATF [Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives] inspecting them is near zero because of ATF budgets. They know the weaknesses in the system and they exploit them. And we as a nation pay dearly for that in loss of life, in costs for emergency rooms, and in law enforcement costs associated with the thousands of deaths and injuries each and every year because of illegal guns.

## USFG CP

#### Neg counterplans must be by the same actor as the aff.

#### Net-benefits

#### 1] As an actor you can’t control the actions of other– alt agent counterplans don’t answer the question of what should the government do and so have no education value – Their question is only relevant when asking “who should we ask to do the plan,” – which is nonsense b/c of durable fiat. In the real world that decision not only determined by efficacy, but also the actor’s likelihood of acting.

#### 2] Agent PICs destroy my ability to leverage the aff. Forcing a debate on politics for the hundredth time kills unique education of this topic, and incentivizes increasingly obscure affs to avoid clash, which hurts everyone. Under our interp, they still get to read indicts to our actor as solvency deficits.

#### Implication is to drop the argument.

#### USFG impositions doesn’t solve - nullification

McDaniel et al 14 (McDaniel, Justine; Korth, Robby; Boehm, Jessica. "Eight states have passed laws voiding federal firearms regulations," News21. 8-16-2014. http://gunwars.news21.com/2014/eight-states-have-passed-laws-voiding-federal-firearms-regulations)

Across the country, a thriving dissatisfaction with the U.S. government is prompting a growing spate of bills in state legislatures aimed at defying federal control over firearms - more than 200 during the last decade, a News21 investigation found. Particularly in Western and Southern states, where individual liberty intersects with increasing skepticism among gun owners, firearms are a political vehicle in efforts to ensure states’ rights and void U.S. gun laws within their borders. State legislators are attempting to declare that only they have the right to interpret the Second Amendment, a movement that recalls the anti-federal spirit of the Civil War and civil-rights eras. “I think the president and the majority of Congress, both in the House and Senate, are just completely out of touch with how people feel about Second Amendment rights,” said Missouri state Sen. Brian Nieves, who has fought for bills to weaken the federal government’s authority over firearms in his state. Share this story Over 200 bills to void federal control over guns were proposed in states in the last decade. #gunwars Culture, libertarian politics woven into movement to make federal gun laws unenforceable in states. #gunwars GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU In Idaho, the Legislature unanimously passed a law to keep any future federal gun measures from being enforced in the state. In Kansas, a law passed last year says federal regulation doesn’t apply to guns manufactured in the state. Wyoming, South Dakota and Arizona have had laws protecting “firearms freedom” from the U.S. government since 2010. A News21 analysis shows 14 such bills were passed by legislators in 11 states, mainly in Western states, along with Kansas, Tennessee and Alaska. Of those, 11 were signed into law, though one was later struck down in court. In Montana, Missouri and Oklahoma, three others were vetoed. More than three-quarters of U.S. states have proposed nullification laws since 2008. More than half of those bills have come in the last two years after the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. All but three have been introduced since President Barack Obama took office. Underneath the policy jargon lies a culture of firearms woven into the heritage and politics of states whose histories were shaped by guns. “(The federal government) is diving off into areas unchecked that they’re not supposed to be involved in,” said Montana state Rep. Krayton Kerns, who introduced a bill in 2013 to limit the ability of local police to help enforce federal laws. “Not only is it our right in state legislatures to do this, it’s our obligation to do it. Somebody’s got to put a ‘whoa’ on it.”

#### Doesn’t solve—ATF is too limited.

William S. Harwood 2 [attorney in Portland, Maine. He is President of Maine Citizens Against Handgun Violence and a member of the American Bar Association Coordinating Committee on Gun Violence], “Gun Control: State Versus Federal Regulation of Firearms”, Maine Policy Review Volume 11 | Issue 1, 2002, BE

The federal agency with primary responsibility for firearm regulation is the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Despite having been in existence for many years, ATF’s powers are mostly limited to the licensing and taxation of firearm dealers. Because of its limited jurisdiction, ATF has a relatively small workforce; less than ten agents are assigned to the¶ state of Maine. With this limited workforce, it is hard to imagine how ATF can effectively regulate the 1.3 million firearms in a state covering an area larger than the other five New England states combined. Although the federal government could expand the ATF workforce and investigatory powers, ATF does not¶ currently have the resources to take on the primary responsibility for regulation of firearms.

#### Perm Do both: Both actors will work in coordination – aff is necessary for cooperation

#### Perm Do both – they’ll act independently.

## Gun Control

### Israel

#### Gun Control doesn’t send the right message – it puts the focus on criminalizing bodies instead of rejecting the symbol of rugged individualism and militarism.

Bovy ’15: (Bovy, Phoebe Maltz, “It’s Time to Ban Guns. Yes, All of Them,” The New Republic, December 10, 2015//FT)

Progressives who might have been able to brush off accusations of anti-rural-white classism may have a tougher time confronting arguments about the disparate impact gun control policies can have on marginalized communities. These, however, are criticisms of certain tentative, insufficient gun control measures—the ones that would leave small-town white[s] families with legally-acquired guns well enough alone, allowing them to shoot themselves or one another and to let their guns enter the general population. Ban[ing] Guns, meanwhile, is not discriminatory in this way. It’s not about dividing society into ‘good’ and ‘bad’ gun owners. It’s about placing gun ownership itself in the ‘bad’ category. It’s worth adding that the anti-gun position is ultimately about police not carrying guns, either. That could never happen, right? Well, certainly not if we keep on insisting on its impossibility. Ask yourself this: Is the pro-gun side concerned with how it comes across? More to the point: Does the fact that someone opposes gun control demonstrate that they’re culturally sensitive to the concerns of small-town whites, as well as deeply committed to fighting police brutality against blacks nationwide? I’m going to go with no and no on these. (The NRA exists!) On the pro-gun-control side of things, there’s far too much timidity. What’s needed to stop all gun violence is a vocal ban guns contingent. Getting bogged down in discussions of what’s feasible keeps what needs to happen—no more guns—from entering the realm of possibility. Public opinion needs to shift. The no-guns stance needs to be an identifiable place on the spectrum, embraced unapologetically, if it’s to be reckoned with.

turns the net benefit - people you claim need guns are not in the position to meet your stringent requirements – which makes them vulnerable to oppressors who can get guns.

#### A] CP can’t access the worldview framing – The reservation of the right to private guns fundamentally reflects a hierarchical worldview that causes neoliberal rugged individualism

#### B] Gun availability maintains the view that the gun is the ultimate solution to individual problems – causes atomization and doesn’t access the internal link in Donohue

#### C] The state determines who qualifies and “needs a gun” – all the aff ev proves they’d be pressued and inclined to say virtually everyone “needs a gun”.

#### Israel is pretty militaristic – not the greatest place to model our gun politics.

#### CP can’t resolve availability of guns

#### 1] CP can’t do anything about the some 300 million guns we have in the squo – mandatory buyback is key.

Matthews ’15: (Dylan Matthews, “What no politician wants to admit about gun control,” VOX, December 3, 2015//FT)

But let's be clear about precisely what kind of choice this is. Congress's decision not to pass background checks is not what's keeping the US from European gun violence levels. The expiration of the assault weapons ban is not behind the gap. What's behind the gap, plenty of research indicates, is that Americans have more guns. The statistics are mind-blowing: America has 4.4 percent of the world's population but almost half of [the world’s] its civilian-owned guns. Realistically, a gun control plan that has any hope of getting us down to European levels of violence is going to mean taking a huge number of guns away from a huge number of gun owners. Other countries have done exactly that. Australia enacted a mandatory gun buyback that achieved that goal, and saw firearm suicides fall as a result. But the reforms those countries enacted are far more dramatic than anything US politicians are calling for — and even they wouldn't get us to where many other developed countries are.

#### 2] There’s no accountability after production

Willis ’16: (Willis, Tiffany. "Better Gun Control Would Reduce Gang-Related Violence." Organized Crime. Ed. David Haugen, Susan Musser, and Michael Chaney. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2014. Opposing Viewpoints. Rpt. from "Who Arms America's Gangs?: Responsible Gun Owners." LiberalAmerica.org. 2013. Opposing Viewpoints in Context. Web. 9 Jan. 2016//FT)

We have to face the facts that criminals don't buy retail. They steal guns, they buy stolen guns, they buy [and] perfectly legal guns from "responsible" gun owners at gun shows, they use straw purchasers to buy guns, and they buy from federally licensed dealers who know that the chance of the ATF [Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives] inspecting them is near zero because of ATF budgets. They know the weaknesses in the system and they exploit them. And we as a nation pay dearly for that in loss of life, in costs for emergency rooms, and in law enforcement costs associated with the thousands of deaths and injuries each and every year because of illegal guns.

#### Lafollete in the aff proves supply side approach is only way to

#### AND - Regulating bullets only impacts crime – but not culture. We have to remove the handgun – it’s a symbol that individual fear politics being idolized as the natural solution to individual problems

#### Bullets are much easier to procure illegally and make yourself – they’re much smaller and less advanced

#### That outweighs the net benefit -

#### A] Self Defense

#### B] People you claim need guns are not in the position to meet your stringent requirements – this is empirically verified –

#### Internal link to cultural shift is perception – thus either CP links to the disad or it doesn’t create a sufficient cultural shift within the public

### DeGrazia

## CP – Manufacturing

#### This is silly

Jacobs ‘02: James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work? James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Proponents of handgun prohibition ought to see little point in banning the manufacture and sale of handguns without also banning possession. Failure to ban possession would leave the existing private sector stock of handguns intact. Moreover, if handgun possession was undisturbed, fol-lowing the model of National Alcohol Prohibition, there would be a tre-mendous opportunity for blackmarketeers to meet the demand for hand-guns with weapons imported from abroad or produced in clandestine workshops. The new handguns and handgun possessors would blend in with the existing handguns and their possessors. The moral coherence of this form of prohibition would be weak; tens of millions of owners would be allowed lawfully to possess guns, while younger people would be treated as criminals for doing the same thing.

## CP – Vice Model

#### CP is worse for police militarization – since they must regulate sale instead of ownership they must catch you in the act.

Kaplan 81. The Wisdom of Gun Prohibition Author(s): John Kaplan Source: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 455, Gun Control (May, 1981), pp. 11-23 Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science. NP 4/5/16.

The means that the police would have to use to enforce such laws are already familiar to us because of their use in the drug area. Preventing a sale between a willing buyer and a willing seller requires intrusive techniques. Indeed, even to inadequately enforce such laws, the police must use informants, undercover agents, methods that border on entrapment, searches and seizures, wiretapping, and a whole panoply of enforcement techniques that not only often transcend the borders of constitutionality, but that, even where they are legally permissible, tend to bring the police into disrepute. Use of such means against relatively small numbers of serious criminals may be worth this kind of cost. However, where the police are asked to enforce laws by such methods against large numbers of people who have public support, the consequences can be more serious.

#### This is silly

Jacobs ‘02: James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work? James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Proponents of handgun prohibition ought to see little point in banning the manufacture and sale of handguns without also banning possession. Failure to ban possession would leave the existing private sector stock of handguns intact. Moreover, if handgun possession was undisturbed, fol-lowing the model of National Alcohol Prohibition, there would be a tremendous opportunity for blackmarketeers to meet the demand for hand-guns with weapons imported from abroad or produced in clandestine workshops. The new handguns and handgun possessors would blend in with the existing handguns and their possessors. The moral coherence of this form of prohibition would be weak; tens of millions of owners would be allowed lawfully to possess guns, while younger people would be treated as criminals for doing the same thing.

## CP – Ban Bullets

#### Can’t solve

Kaplan 81. The Wisdom of Gun Prohibition Author(s): John Kaplan Source: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 455, Gun Control (May, 1981), pp. 11-23 Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

In this respect, the best analogy to alcohol would be prohibiting the sale of ammunition, which is moderately perishable, rather than the sale of guns. The problem here, however, is technical. First, handgun ammunition is basically the same as long-gun ammunition, so any attempt to control handguns by this method would involve the more difficult, costly, and stubborn problem of long-gun regulation as well. Second, serviceable ammunition is simpler to make than any of the illegal drugs being manufactured in the laboratories all over the United States. The difficulty of manufacturing ammunition lies somewhat closer to distilling liquor than to making phenyl-cyclohexyl-piperidine (PCP) or amphetamines.20 In other words, the likelihood is that by forbidding the sale or manufacture of handgun ammunition, we would be adding yet another major substance-abuse problem to our already crowded inventory.

# 1AR – Theory

## T – 50 States

#### Aff can choose 50 states as the actor

#### Net benefits

#### 1] Topicality - Rez doesn’t specify an actor – so it’s a question of what’s normal means – that’s the states.

BRIEF FOR NEW YORK, HAWAII, MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW JERSEY, AND PUERTO RICO, January, 11, 2008, DC. V Heller

Amici states file this brief in support of their Traditional authority to protect the safety of their Residents by enacting laws governing the possession and Use of firearms. The amici states do not defend The specific handgun ban at issue in this case and do not As a matter of public policy endorse it, preserving state Sovereignty in this area is of paramount importance to The states. For more than two centuries, as contemplated By the ¢onstitution’s framers, the states have been the Primary regulators of firearms. Preserving that role was a fundamental purpose of the second amendment. Accordingly, this court has consistently held that the Second amendment limits only the authority of the Federal government to regulate weapons in the states. If that rule were now called into question[ed], the states would confront federal litigation over every detail of their Statutory schemes, depriving them of authority over policy decisions that have always been reserved to them.

#### 2] Debate about actor is key part of literature –we should get to pick an actor, research, and defend it. You can’t force me to defend a sub-par actor because you can’t win without the federalism disad. Moreover, our ev proves states conclusively win, and USFG has crap solvency - which means we’d always lose to the States CP.

#### 3] Fiat abuse is non-unique – congress working together to pass a gun ban is equally implausible. There’s also no impact to this arg – this debate is about the desirability of the rez. --- empirically we don’t claim any advantages to coordination separate from the rez.

## T – Extra-T

## T – Door to Door

#### Counterinterp: The aff does not have to defend police door to door confiscation, if they defend a mandatory buy back scheme and possession as a criminal offense and have a solvency advocate.

**Etzioni ’92:** [Amitai Etzioni and Steven Hellend, “The Case for Domestic Disarmament”, The Communitarian Network, 1992] VM

PROPOSED HANDGUN LEGISLATION Prohibits the importation, exportation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns. Establishes a "grace period" during which time handguns may be turned into any law enforcement agency with impunity and for reimbursement at the greater of either $25 or the fair market value of the gun. Allows an exception for: \* agencies of federal, state, or local government (military and law enforcement) \* collectors of antique (nonserviceable) firearms \* federally-licensed handgun sporting clubs; the clubs must be founded for bonafide target or sport shooting; must maintain possession and control of the handguns used by its members; must have procedures and facilities for keeping the handguns secure when not in a local law enforcement facility; and may not have as members persons whose membership would violate state of federal law \* federally-licensed professional security guard services [operating with similar conditions as those set for handgun clubs] Sets up penalties of up to $5,000, or up to 5 years imprisonment, or both, for violation of the provisions of the Act. We suggest the following friendly amendment to Senator Chafee's proposed legislation: Extend the above prohibitions to ammunition for handguns, allow for the exceptions to apply also to ammunition, and establish a "grace period" during which those who turn over ammunition to any law enforcement agency would be reimbursed at the fair market value.

#### Solves and turns your offense –

#### 1] we defend that possession is criminal which gives you links to criminal justice disads like Gourevitch – no reason why this one disad is key neg ground

#### Turns:

#### 2] Buy back is literally the only other mechanism – we have a solvency advocate in the context of the U.S – which means no explosion of limits - Moreover, we turn predictability which is the impact to limits – literally our aff is the most common.

#### Aff flex outweighs – your interp is literally aff must defend this ONE plan – we need to heg against PICs of the enforcement and a reactionary 1NC – also good for developing the best possible advocacy

#### Their interp lets the neg cherry pick the worst possible aff so they can skirt question of a gun ban for enforcement we all agree is terrible.