We mostly read fw-heavy truth testing affirmatives so we didn’t care about CPs too much.

# \*\*\*AT CPs\*\*\*

## AT: Monism PIC

[Their text: Endorse the affirmative but reject the affirmative’s monism arguments. No permutation – the counterplan is plan-minus, so doing both would mean severing from your advocacy.]

#### 1. The problem with your PIC is that it’s poorly worded – it says endorse the affirmative first, THEN, after that reject the affirmative’s monism arguments.

#### 2. This means perm: do both – it doesn’t sever AND it solves, because your PIC is basically do the aff and then reject a part of it after the fact.

#### We can do the aff and then reject the monistic arguments later.

#### 3. That answers the argument after the text because it’s actually plan, then another action that runs contra to an argument for the plan later on, so it’s plan plus because a second action of rejection is taken.

#### 4. And, hold them to the text of their PIC – it’s the only way to protect the 2AR against shady 2NR collapses and key to aff ground – it’s the only basis for my 1AR arguments.

#### 5. Also, perm do both doesn’t sever from my advocacy – it’s just kicking arguments in the AC but I still defend the resolution.

#### 6. A is the interpretation: The negative may not advocate a counterplan or alternative involving an action whose object would vary depending upon the content of 1AC arguments other than the advocacy. To clarify: the negative may not read a PIC that says “Endorse the affirmative but reject the affirmative’s monism arguments.”

#### B – violation: What “reject the affirmative’s monism arguments” entails depending upon which aff arguments they identify to be ‘monistic’ so it begs the question and what their PIC entails changes based on what they say on case.

#### C – standards:

#### 1. Resolvability – leaves it up in the air what parts of the aff they still do since it’s fluid, also muddies other flows because I can’t extend certain arguments depending on whether or not they identify them as monistic.

#### Also I could concede to a different framework and go for turns and you’d vote aff if I had offense, but you don’t know how to resolve that because the differential between the PIC and the aff is a substantive argument that I could extend defense on – you can’t consistently identify the differences between the aff and the PIC.

#### Resolvability is key to your role as the judge to determine the better debater.

#### It’s also key to fairness because if you resolve wrong it’s unfair to the person who should’ve won.

#### It’s key to education because resolving incorrectly rewards arguments that aren’t true over ones that are due to vagueness on the flow.

#### 2. Perm Ground Stability – I can’t have stable perm ground because how your PIC competes is dependent upon the case flow and which arguments we deem monistic – means I can never do confident net benefit determination on the perm debate.

#### This means you give me hella leeway on the perm debate.

#### Also, perm ground is also key to fairness because it’s the best way for the aff to deal with counter-advocacies – without perms affs would always have to straight turn to overcome the risk of offense which skews the 1AR a ton.

#### It’s key to innovative comparative education because it’s a question of combining and compromising things in academia.

#### D is the voter:

#### Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity based on wins and losses, AND, you are supposed to determine the better debater, not the better cheater. AND, TAB’s function is to maintain tournament fairness and they are the origin of the round.

#### Education is a voter because debate is an educational activity – that’s why it’s funded. It’s also portable to other settings so it’s key to our life skills and life chances.

#### Resolvability is an independent voter because your role as the judge is to resolve the round.

#### Drop the debater on abusive counterplans – they uniquely skew the 1AR which is the hardest speech because of timeskew.

#### I have to cover all of my bases for the 2NR collapse which only has to cover one – that also means neg abuse outweighs aff abuse and you should be skeptical of a 2NR RVI because they only had to collapse to one thing anyway whereas I have to cover a ton of stuff.

#### You can’t evaluate any other flow because this has skewed my abilities on the CP flow and all the other flows as well.

## AT: States CP

#### First: Solvency deficits:

#### 1. CP can’t solve because of loopholes. Johnson 2k13:

Johnson, Fawn. "Why Gun Control Can't Eliminate Gun Violence." National Journal. National Journal, 03 Sept. 2013. Web. 02 Jan. 2016. <http://www.nationaljournal.com/s/70320/why-gun-control-cant-eliminate-gun-violence?mref=scroll>.

**Stopping that is like a game of WhackaMole**. For **each way that a crim­in­al gets a gun**, **you need a different rule to stop it**. Back­ground checks at gun shows are an ob­vi­ous way to get rid of one of a crim­in­al’s op­tions for get­ting a gun. But that doesn’t stop him or her from buy­ing a gun privately from straw pur­chasers. There are oth­er ways to pre­vent that kind of gun traf­fick­ing, **but those laws inevitably will have loopholes**. **Stopping gun trafficking is even harder if it has to happen state by state**. A now expired Vir­gin­ia law that only al­lowed people to buy one gun per month dra­mat­ic­ally re­duced the num­ber of Virginia purchased guns re­covered at crime scenes. That’s be­cause “crime guns” are of­ten pur­chased il­leg­ally by someone who buys them in bulk from a le­git­im­ate deal­er. But even when Vir­gin­ia’s law was in place (it ex­pired in 2012), the num­ber of “crime guns” from oth­er states in­creased. And then there are the mass shoot­ings, which are even harder to pre­vent. “A de­ranged crazy per­son, largely in sui­cid­al range, de­cides to take out as many people as pos­sible — that’s the most dif­fi­cult of all,” said Richard Feldman, president of the Independent Firearm Owners Associ­ation.

#### 2. 50 states acting at the same time isn’t any better than the federal government - it’s just as homogenous. KLR 99:

KANSAS LAW REVIEW, 1999 (November, p. 1322) (PDBF939)

Examining this list, it becomes apparent that different institutional features of the federal structure are more or less important for securing these different values. Some of the values - **diversity, competition, and experimentalism** - appear to **depend significantly on the existence of many states pursuing unique regulatory agendas. If all of the states pursued identical** regulatory **strategies**, or were prevented from instituting meaningful agendas altogether, **these** values, as a logical matter, **could not be promoted**. Obviously there would be no regulatory diversity, because **all of the states would structure the lives of their citizens in the same way**. Moreover, this uniformity would prevent state competition and experimentation: people would have no incentive to "vote with their feet" if each state provided the same package of public goods, and experimentation by definition requires that different states attempt different solutions to the same social problems.

#### 3. Double bind - either they implement largely the same thing state by state in which case the perm solves, or it’s very diverse, in which case a portion of the states will actually solve but the others will do suboptimal things and won’t solve - the aff will always solve better by appealing to a median strategy.

#### Now perms:

#### Perm: do the aff. The resolution is in passive voice and has no actor. The counterplan is an instance of handguns being banned in the US.

#### Perm: do both. Cooperation is best and still involves the states enough. Raymond 2k12:

US leader at Capital Projects and Infrastructure PwC (Peter, “Investing in transportation Doing more with less,” January 2012, http://www.pwc.com/en\_US/us/capital-projectsinfrastructure/publications/assets/infrastructure-investing-dot.pdf)

In several of the countries surveyed, **a national body sets infrastructure investment policy and provides guidance to federal, state, and local governments**. **This body can** incorporate various considerations such as **research and develop**ment **needs**, **private sector investment requirements, and social considerations**. **With guidance** from this national body, **the government is able to prioritize projects and funding across various competing sectors**. The activities of this body are typically transparent, **allowing the public—especially residents of the affected areas—to see how priorities are identified and investment decisions made**. Infrastructure UK, established in 2010, creates long-terms plans in the UK to help address national infrastructure needs, coordinating future investment in research, development and innovation. The advisory body works with public- and private-sector stakeholders to develop and shape policy that encourages infrastructure investment within the UK. It also serves as a liaison between public- and private-sector stakeholders. In response to funding and financing challenges, the UK aims to collaborate with a diverse investor base (both geographically diverse and by type of investment) for large, complex projects

## AT: Disarmament CP

#### Aff solves the CP but starting with public gun reduction is key:

#### (a) Industry backlash means once handguns are banned, government and police will be cut off from them as well. It’s a new trend amongst the major companies. Sherfinski 2k13:

David Sherfinski. Gunmakers fire back at Big Brother by pulling firearms from police, paychecks in gun-control states. 2013, Washington Times,<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/mar/4/gun-laws-spur-backlash/>

**In** a **protest against new gun laws**, more than 100 **firearms dealers say they will stop selling guns to government and law enforcement officials** in New York and other states **unless those same firearms are also available to average citizens. It’s part of a backlash from the industry to new gun control**s, and it follows **major** firearms **companies, such as Beretta and Magpul**, that **have threatened** to bolt **Maryland and Colorado**, respectively, if those states enact legislation to restrict military-style semiautomatic weapons or high-capacity ammunition magazines. **In** early **February, Texas-based LaRue Tactical changed its policy to “limit all sales to what law-abiding citizens** residing in their districts **can purchase or possess” because it did not want to risk** triggering **lawsuits** with new gun laws either passed or pending. “**If you write the law, you live under the law**, no special category of people just because you’re a government employee,” said Sean Sorrentino, a gun-rights advocate who keeps a tally at ncgunblog.com of companies that are adopting those kinds of policies. The National Shooting Sports Foundation, the firearms industry trade association, said companies are free to independently decide the customers and markets they want to serve, but agreeing with others to boycott certain customers or markets raises serious legal questions concerning antitrust laws and may be illegal. “Due to these antitrust concerns, NSSF is unable to promote this protest,” the group said. “We are also concerned that members of law enforcement are not made less safe due to the ill-advised decisions of antigun politicians.” **Gun owners tend to be fiercely loyal and** the **firearm companies are responsive to their clients**. Owners launched a boycott of Smith & Wesson after the company signed an agreement with the Clinton administration voluntarily limiting some sales. This year, **companies are being proactive** in defending their clients’ firearms rights — and their own markets. New York has become a chief target after Gov. Andrew Cuomo in January signed the strictest gun control measures of any state in the country, including a beefed-up ban on so-called assault weapons and a prohibition on gun magazines that hold more than seven bullets — a law praised by New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, a major gun control advocate, as protecting the Second Amendment while making the state’s residents safer. Olympic Arms Inc. subsequently followed up with a policy specifically in regard to New York, saying that the state’s new gun controls have “caused a division of the people into classes.” Going beyond mere sales policies, **Magpul and Berretta have threatened to simply pack up and move** because of proposed laws. Richard Fitzpatrick, founder and president of Magpul, announced that the company would relocate if a Colorado bill banning ammunition magazines holding more than 15 rounds, or what he called “standard-capacity magazines,” becomes law. Maryland-based Beretta, meanwhile, has been courted by multiple states after the company expressed dissatisfaction with that state’s push to pass gun controls, including bans on so-called assault weapons and high-capacity magazines. At least one business — Shield Tactical — isn’t waiting. The company announced on its Facebook page last month the relocation of its retail division from California to Texas, though it did say in the announcement it plans to keep its training division in California “until the legislature outlaws everything.”

#### (b) Public armament drives the police state. Reducing civilian owned guns leads to common-sense and *willing* reduction in police force – Britain proves. Studebaker 2k14:

Benjamin Studebaker. (PhD student in Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge. BA in Politics from the University of Warwick and MA from the University of Chicago). Demilitarization of the Police Requires Demilitarization of Civilians, <http://benjaminstudebaker.com/2014/08/15/demilitarization-of-the-police-requires-demilitarization-of-civilians/>, 8/15/2014

This escalated **after** the **September 11th** attacks. **Police forces feared** a nightmare scenario in which **heavily armed, organized terrorists** staged assaults on major cities. And **with** the **increased** incidence of **mass shootings** in the United States, **police forces have become increasingly fearful** of extraordinarily heavily armed individual killers. Unsurprisingly, **once the police have special weapons and tactics, they** are like the proverbial man **with a hammer–everything starts to look like a nail**. And **so we have seen a tremendous rise in the incidence of police forces using military tactics** in seemingly trivial situations, such as no-knock searches of suspects homes for drugs and other contraband, or containing peaceful demonstrators. Yet **police defend these operations on the grounds that they cannot know if the suspects or demonstrators are** heavily **armed**. They claim they are taking precautions for the safety of officers and for the surrounding community. **As long as there is a substantive chance that criminals or demonstrators will be** heavily **armed, police forces will want to be armed** yet **more heavily so that they can sustain an intimidating power advantage** over potential perpetrators and remain confident in their ability to defeat them in combat without sustaining losses. So the question is, how do we make police officers feel more secure with less? **If we reduce the threat citizens pose to police officers, we will correspondingly alleviate the police’s siege mentality**. If criminals carried no weapons, police would merely need nightsticks. In Britain, it is against the law for civilians to manufacture, sell, lend, give, or import batons. It is even illegal to carry batons in public. **In Britain, most police officers do not even carry firearms**–only “authorized firearms officers” may have them. Only 5% of British police officers are authorized to carry firearms. In effect, **Britain’s special units are like ordinary American cops. Not only do British officers not carry firearms, but most have no desire to do so–a full 82% of British police** federation members **are against arming the police more heavily**. How is it possible for police officers to not even carry firearms but nonetheless feel confident they will be able to handle perpetrators? **Britain has way**, way **fewer guns** per capita **than the U**nited **S**tates does. As a result, **British police** officers **do not have to worry** anywhere **near as much** about being attacked and killed with guns. **Americans** often despair of doing anything about the number of guns in the country, **claim**ing that **it would be impossible to successfully regulate them, but Britain’s history shows that this** reasoning **is wrong. After World War I, Britain was inundated with surplus weapons. Yet, over the past century, Britain has taken** a series of **effective steps** to take these guns back from citizens and criminals alike: 1920 Firearms Act–Required certificates to purchase firearms, these lasted three years, and specified both the type of gun that could be purchased and the amount of ammunition. Allowed police constables discretion as to who could have the certificate. Made the right to bear arms, dated from 1689, conditional on permission from the police and the Home Secretary. Crime to own a firearm without a certificate, punishable by £50 fine (equivalent to at least £1,700 pounds today, and possibly as much as £13,000) and 3 months in prison. In dollars, that’s roughly $2,800 to $21,700 in today’s money. 1933 Firearms and Criminal Use Act–Cannot possess a firearm unless the bearer can prove to the officer that it is being used for a lawful purpose. Crime to use a firearm to resist arrest, punishable by 14 years in prison. 1937 Firearms Act–Raised minimum gun age from 14 to 17, total ban on automatic firearms, “self-defence” no longer considered an acceptable justification to apply for a certificate, more police liberty to fix conditions on certificates, extended certificates to more weapons left out of earlier laws. 1968 Firearms Act–Codified in a single document all extant firearm regulation. 1988 Firearms Amendment Act–Applicants must provide good reason for possessing a firearm (self-defence considered invalid), firearms must be locked up, ammunition must be locked up separately from the firearm, full ban on guns for people with criminal backgrounds, firearms amnesties were declared in which guns were handed in to the police. **1997 Firearms Amendment No.2 Act–Handguns banned with few exceptions**. We know from the British experience that this kind of serious legislation would be effective, but there is insufficient public support for it in the United States. So long as civilians insist on their right to bear extremely lethal weapons, police forces will continue to demand weapons still more lethal and equipment still more protective, and the militarization of our police forces will continue. In effect, American civilians and American police officers are engaged in an arms race that too often ends in tragedy for both sides.

#### Thus perm do both – aff is key to CP solvency, and there’s no net benefit differential if they have the same solvency. Also err aff – Arkles doesn’t give you a way that the CP would actually solve whereas the aff causes a supply *and* a demand based shift in dynamic with the people and the government on guns.

## AT: Background Checks CP

#### 1. Background checks don’t solve. Sullum 2k15, 3 warrants:

Sullum, Jacob. "4 Reasons Universal Background Checks for Buyers Are a Bad Idea." Reason.com. Reason.com, 8 Oct. 2015. Web. 3 Dec. 2015. <https://reason.com/blog/2015/10/08/4-reasons-universal-background-checks-ar>.

Senate Democrats plan to ingratiate themselves with voters by introducing a new package of gun controls. In a letter to fellow Democrats, Sens. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) and Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) said they hope gun control advocacy "will be a rallying point for a public that is eager for congressional action and will be the basis for future legislation that we will demand," although there is zero chance that such legislation will actually pass. Schumer and Stabenow's wish list includes a requirement that everyone who acquires a firearm, whether from a private seller or a federally licensed dealer, undergo a background check. That particular change, unlike stricter gun control in general, does indeed poll well, but that does not mean it's a good idea. Here are four major problems with requiring background checks for private gun transfers as a policy, as opposed to a political stunt: 1. Expanding **the background check** requirement **makes no sense as a response to mass shootings** (even though that is how it has been presented), **because the perpetrators** of these crimes, **including last week's massacre in Oregon**, **typically** either **have** actually **passed background checks or could do so because they do not have disqualifying criminal or psychiatric records**. 2. Expanding the **background check** requirement **makes little sense** as a response to more common forms of gun violence, **since criminals with felony records can always obtain weapons on the black market**, through buyers with clean records, **or by theft**. 3. Expanding the background check requirement, especially if it is coupled with "improved" databases, compounds the injustice of disarming millions of people who pose no threat to others but are nevertheless forbidden to own guns because they use illegal drugs, overstay a visa, were once subjected to court-ordered psychiatric treatment, or have felony records, even if they have never committed a violent crime. 4. **Expanding the background check** requirement **is not the same as** actually **compelling people to perform background checks for private gun transfers. Many gun owners will balk at the** inconvenience and **expense of finding and paying a licensed dealer who is willing to facilitate a transaction**. In Oregon, which expanded its background-check requirement in August, some local law enforcement officials have publicly stated they do not plan to enforce the new rule, either because they do not have the resources or because they view it as an unconstitutional intrusion. The Oregonian notes that "there is no centralized registry of guns in Oregon...that could be used to track a gun found in a criminal's possession." **The federal government has no** such **registry** either, **so how can it possibly hope to track transfers and make sure background checks are performed**? Even with hefty criminal penalties, widespread noncompliance is a certainty. Consider: Does the theoretical prospect of a 10-year prison sentence deter gun owners from smoking pot or pot smokers from owning guns?

#### This means: (a) The CP solves nothing since criminals can still have easy access to guns even with background checks, and (b) The AC is a unique net benefit to the perm, so perm do both.

## AT: Collectors PIC

#### Perm do both, it’s normal means. Banning private ownership doesn’t affect licensed collection, collection of long guns solves regardless, the crime benefits outweigh, and collectors are usually affluent so no impact. Dixon 93:

Nicholas Dixon (associate professor of philosophy, Alma College). “Why We Should Ban Handguns In The United States.” Saint Louis University Law Review. 1993.

**Many recreational uses of handguns are compatible with a ban on private ownership**. For instance, target shooting can still be enjoyed at licensed facilities. Shooters would be allowed to own or rent handguns that would be permanently stored at the shooting ranges.' **Licensed** gun **collectors would be allowed to keep hanguns of recognized antique value-say fifty years old or more--on the strict condition that no ammunition be kept**. Another cost of a ban would be that gun dealers would lose the profits they currently make from the sale of handguns and their ammunition. However, **they would be able to recoup some of these losses by diversifying their stock of long guns**, which would be **unaffected by my proposal. The reduction in violent crime that would result outweighs whatever loss of profits may- occur for this relatively affluent sector of our society**.

## AT: Gun Show CP

#### 1. Closing the gun show loophole will solve almost nothing. Crafft 2k11, 2 warrants:

Crafft, Bruce W. "Gun Show Loophole? What Gun Show Loophole? - The Truth About Guns." The Truth About Guns. Thetruthaboutguns.com, 06 Dec. 2011. Web. 04 Dec. 2015. <http://www.thetruthaboutguns.com/2011/12/bruce-w-krafft/gun-show-loophole-what-gun-show-loophole/>.

“U.S. Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand announced legislation on Sunday that would limit the flow of illegal firearms into New York City by closing the gun show loophole and giving authorities more power to prosecute gun trafficking rings,” theepochtimes.com reports. “The legislation comes on the heels of 10 arrests made by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman’s office on Nov. 30. The arrests were the result of an eight-month, gun show investigation that uncovered serious violations by several New York gun dealers.” Ah, yes, the eeeee-vil gun-show loophole. Time for a reality check . . . 1. There is no such animal as a gun show loophole 2. **Fewer than one percent of criminals obtain their guns at gun shows** 3. If there were such an animal, New York state closed it eleven years ago **Every law that applies outside gun shows applies inside the doors**. Federal Firearms Licensees (a.k.a., **gun dealers** or FFLs) at a gun show **must fill out their ATF Form** 4473s and **do their FBI background** (NICS) **checks** just **as if they were at their shops** (or their homes for that matter). The purported loophole that Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand seeks to close: private firearms sales between private individuals. Not dealer to customer, or customer to dealer. Private citizen to private citizen. A transaction which does not require a Form 4473 or a NICS background check. Another part of the loophole myth: a large percentage of people with tables at gun shows—somewhere between 25 and 50 percent—are **unlicensed dealers** and traders. They’re unlicensed because they **aren’t selling guns**. **They sell ammo, accessories or books** or memorabilia. Expanding on Point 2, according to the ATF, 93% of criminals obtain their guns – wait for it – illegally! Yes that’s right, criminals don’t obey the law. Who’d-a thunk it? According to On the Front Line: Making Gun Interdiction Work, a **Center to Prevent Handgun Violence** (a.k.a. The Brady Campaign) **survey of 37 police departments in large cities conducted in February 1998** (by way of Gun Facts ver. 6.0), **ninety-five percent of metropolitan police departments do not believe gun shows are a problem**. I think we can take it as a given that the Brady bunch did not try to inflate that number. Expanding on Point 3) New York General Business Law – Article 39-DD – § 895-§ 897 (which took effect August 9, 2000) required NICS checks by all sellers on all purchases. In other words, New York has no gun show loophole! In fact, the current version of the law requires gun show operators to post signs at all entrances, all ticket sale locations and at least four places within the show to make sure that everyone knows the law. Unfortunately there were about ten people out there who weren’t paying attention. A quick perusal of the interwebz showed me 35-plus gun shows scheduled from early-November 2011 to early-July 2012 (which, for the mathematically challenged among us, is 8 months…don’t laugh, I had to do it on my fingers). So **after an eight month investigation, covering 35 or more gun shows, with hundreds of dealers and thousands of private sellers, Eric’s investigator**s, after spending who knows how much money and who knows how many investigative hours, **found ten private individuals who sold a gun without a NICS check**. And not a single dealer or show promoter who broke the law. Translation: the Attorney General’s office turned up less than a dozen poor yutzes who were trying to offload grandpa’s rifle for a couple of bucks.

#### This means: (a) Less than 1 percent of guns are obtained at gun shows, voting for the CP is functionally just voting for the status quo, and (b) the people who sell the guns at gun shows are licensed, so the CP solves nothing.

#### 2. Perm- do both.

#### (a) Opportunity cost - If we are functionally both trying to achieve the same goal; removing guns, we might as well ban them all together instead of just some.

#### (b) Making guns illegal in all instances would be the same as making them illegal at guns shows, the CP is not mutually exclusive since the CP is an assumed part of the aff.

#### (c) The AC is a unique net benefit since the CP doesn’t solve.

## AT: Hunters PIC

#### Hunters are way more likely to shoot people than non-hunters. Johnson 2k15:

Johnson, Kim. "Whats Wrong with Hunting." Peta2 Free for All. Peta2.com, 29 Jan. 2015. Web. 5 Dec. 2015. <http://www.peta2.com/blog/hunting-facts/>.

Like other forms of casual or “thrill” violence, **hunting leads to a dangerous desensitization to the suffering of others. Research in psychology and criminology shows that people who commit violent acts against animals rarely stop there, as many move on to target their fellow humans**. **A study conducted by Northeastern University and the Massachusetts SPCA found that people who abuse animals are five times more likely to commit violent crimes against humans. The majority of inmates who are scheduled to be executed for murder at California’s San Quentin State Prison “practiced” their crimes on animals**, according to the warden.

#### Because hunters are 5 times more likely to shoot someone, guns should be banned, *especially* for hunters – every 1AC argument disproportionately applies to hunters.

## AT: Inner Cities CP

#### Just banning in inner cities is racist and doesn’t solve due to indeterminacy and alt causes. Johnson 2k13:

Nicholas J. Johnson, 2013, law professor, Fordham, Connecticut Law Review, 2013, July, Gun Control Policy and the Second Amendment: Lead Article: Firearms Policy and the Black Community: An Assessment of the Modern Orthodoxy, http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1534&context=faculty\_scholarship DOA: 12-3-15, p. 1587

Under the banner of civil rights, **this policy would brand the entire community with a badge of inferiority through a race-coded deprivation of an established prerogative of American citizenship. It resonates** disturbingly **with early racist claims "that colored men were unfit for citizenship"** n558 and rationalizations of Black Code gun restrictions targeting Freedmen. n559 The results from Washington D.C. already show that this prescription only bars legal guns and does little to block illegal guns from the violent micro-culture. So, for a negligible impact on the real target, **the policy stigmatizes entire urban enclaves as untrustworthy**. n560 This irony invites questions that suggest the true appeal of the modern orthodoxy. The promise of an easy answer-gun bans-to the exceptional rate of violence among Blacks and especially among young black men is politically appealing because it offers a seemingly straightforward solution to a far deeper problem that in reality has no easy answer. Consider the more serious attempts to explain the exceptional rate of Black male violence summarized by William Oliver: **There exists very little consensus among criminologists and other crime scholars regarding "the causes" of black male violence. Numerous explanations** have been offered, **includ**ing acquired biological causes (e.g., head injuries); social disorganization and inadequate **socialization**; poverty and economic **inequality**; **racial oppression** and displaced aggression; adherence to the norms of **a subculture of violence**; **joblessness and family disruption**; the cheapening of black life as a result of the imposition of lenient sentences against blacks who assault or murder blacks; and involvement in self-destructive lifestyles centered around heavy drinking, drug abuse and drug trafficking, and street gangs. Theoretical explanations of black male violence have generally emphasized the significance of structural factors or cultural factors. n561

#### Perm do the aff. If it’s true that most handguns are owned by inner city people then there’s no difference between the CP and the aff.

## AT: Militias CP

#### Perm: do both. And, militias are an exception to the aff anyway because the government does not view them as ‘private’. MacAvity 96:

"On the private ownership of firearms", Cassiel C. MacAvity © 1996 Cassiel C. MacAvity, a writer http://thecuria.com/guns.html

So that this scenario may come to pass, what must be done is to ban all private ownership and use of firearms by banning all sales of firearms and by requiring that all firearms owners turn in all their weapons. In the meantime, to help protect the general populace, all sales of firearms and ammunition must be heavily taxed, because this will result in fewer sales to criminals, making things much safer for everybody. **When firearms are banned**, there will be none available to commit any crimes, so that the police, and if need be, the militia, will then protect everyone from crime and violence, because **only the police and the militia will have firearms**, and most importantly, because that is why they exist. The militia, of course, will only have firearms **because the** second amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that the **militia is an extension of the** national **army**, which in itself is completely unrelated to crime.

#### Militias are ineffective and produce more tyranny. They are the antithesis of democracy. Domestic and international empirics prove. DeFilippis 2k13:

DeFilippis, Evan. "MILITIA MYTHS: WHY ARMED POPULATIONS DON’T PREVENT TYRANNY, BUT OFTEN LEAD TO IT." Armed With Reason. Armedwithreason.com, 18 Sept. 2013. Web. 5 Dec. 2015. <http://www.armedwithreason.com/militia-myths-why-armed-populations-dont-prevent-tyranny-but-often-lead-to-it/>.

Blasphemy, I know. Yet **the idea that Militias are** in anyway **necessary or good for a free State has no historical justification, especially in the modern era**. **Militias (especially unregulated ones) are overwhelmingly detrimental to the existence of a free society, and at best are impotent in its defense**. **A historical analysis reveals that Militias are typically the gateway to tyranny, not the safeguard against it. A heavily armed population has little to no bearing on preventing tyranny**. Pro-gun arguments typically follow at least one of four paths: Our own Revolutionary War shows militias are effective at protecting liberty. Militias promote liberty. Armed populations deter tyrants while unarmed populations are defenseless. Disarming a population is the gateway to genocide. All of these arguments are false. Let’s first look at our own Revolutionary War. The idea that militias are the bulwark against tyranny typically begins in a faulty reading of American History. **The Revolutionary War was not won by Militias, but rather the Continental Army with considerable help from the French**. While it is probably an exaggeration to suggest that the Militia was completely worthless during the War, that is far closer to reality than the myth promulgated by some pro-gun advocates. And the Militias that did significantly contribute to the cause were organized by the states and represented a well-disciplined, cohesive fighting force that mirrored the Continental Army, not the minutemen of lore. Moving to the modern era, **Militias have a terrible history of creating tyranny**, even when fighting against foreign powers. **Militias that have been successful in warding off foreign aggression overwhelmingly opposed democratic rule**. **A few examples are Vietnam, Afghanistan, Cuba, Somalia, Iraq, and southern Lebanon; in none of these countries did the militias promote a free State**. Add to this list countries where militias have ripped apart society in tribal states or civil war (such as Pakistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, Colombia, and the Palestinian Territories) and we can form an even clearer picture of militias. For a more immediate example, **one only has to look at** the bewildering array of **militias** (more than “1,000” according to Robin Wright) **currently fighting in Syria to see how little they promote democratic values and how ineffective they tend to be on the battlefield**. While there may be an example of victorious militias replacing tyranny with freedom since the industrial age hiding somewhere in an obscure footnote of history, the rule that militias are detrimental to preserving freedom holds. An astute reader will note that all of the examples I am providing are from poor countries or societies that never had a well-established democratic tradition. And this is true. While it is typically wise to refrain from comparing countries in different socio-economic strata, **there** simply **aren’t any wealthy, free societies that use militias** for self-defense. Every democratic country, with the exception of Costa Rica, has a standing army to defend it, not militias. **For examples closer to home**, we can easily see that **the Klu Klux Klan, Neo-Nazi elements**, and the Black Panthers (all of which are or were unregulated militias) **have done little to promote a free society**. Perhaps the best example in America of the influence militias have on society is “Bloody Kansas” during the 1850s. Pro-Northern and Southern settlers, armed to the teeth, streamed into Kansas in order to sway whether the state became free or slave. The constant skirmishes killed 56 settlers, out of a total population of 8,000. It is safe to conclude that the sudden explosion in the number of armed men did not contribute to a democratic process.

#### That’s a turn and a solvency takeout. Perm, do both. If militias can’t solve and cause more harm then there’s only a risk of a net benefit to the perm. At worst the CP and the perm come out the same at which point the AC is sufficient and there’s no opportunity cost to voting aff.

#### And, gun ownership creates a cynical worldview that promotes intellectual and social vices, causes racism, kills compassion, and inhibits communal bonds. Trivingo 2k13:

Franco, philosophy professor at Marquette University, "Guns and Virtue: The Virtue Ethical Case against Gun Carrying," Public Affairs Quarterly Vol. No. 4 October 2013,

In this section, I turn my attention to the core belief that underlies the willingness to use a gun in self-defense, namely, that becoming the victim of a violent crime is likely enough to warrant and to maintain the habit of gun carrying. **A complex set of beliefs seems to be involved, which amount to a** kind of **worldview. On this worldview, violent crime is likely because the world is a dangerous place filled with unscrupulous people**. As I mention above, **arguments for increased gun carrying** often **use anecdotes of crime in order to put the audience in the “proper” emotional position. The cognitive purpose of these anecdotes is to generate the “proper” account of the world**, that is, **as a fundamentally unsafe place in which responsible people need to carry a gun** in order to protect themselves from dangerous criminals. As with the emotions, **the habit of gun carrying will** build on and **reinforce these thoughts about the world repeatedly and non-consciously**. As I will show, **this worldview hinders one’s ability to develop virtues and to obtain objective goods** necessary Eudaimonia. Habitual, repeated non-conscious mental representations involving aspects of **this worldview may encourage the development of both moral and intellectual vices**. This is because **the beliefs one has about the world affect one’s dispositions toward other people in a way that affects one’s judgement**s about them one way or the other. In a recent study, **it was found that people who wield guns are more likely to perceive that other people are wielding guns**; the authors conclude that “by virtue of affording a perceiver the opportunity to use a gun, he or she was more likely to classify objects in a scene as a gun and, as a result, to engage in threat induced behavior”. In short, **carrying a gun may produce a perceptual bias that verifies and reinforces previously held ideas about the dangerousness of the world**. To the extent that one’s adherence to the worldview is inflexible and lacks nuance, **one will lack intellectual virtues, which are**, very roughly, those **dispositions that enable us to track the truth**. This worldview is warranted or justified only under certain conditions, namely, those in which the worldview accurately portrays the state of the world. Accurately construing an area as unsafe requires, at minimum, that there be a relatively high likelihood that one will become the victim of violent crime. But if carrying a gun increases the chances that on will perceive others as threats, then the gun carrier seems to subject to a kind of self-reinforcing illusion. **Gun carriers** do seem to **believe that crime is above average in their neighborhoods**, is always warranted. Consider that, unlike typical criminals or crime victims, permit holders tend to be “married, well educated, middle aged, upper-middle-class Whites”. **Their perceptions of the level of crime seem to rely on racial biases**: “Perceived crime… responds to the proximity of blacks”. In other words, it seems that **the closer one is to an African American neighborhood, the greater one perceives the risk of crime**, even for who is not likely to find oneself in that neighborhood. Thus, **carriers may be using a morally dubious heuristic** device (about African Americans) that serves to overstate the degree to which they are in danger. Prior victimization, which is clearly relevant to the question of safety, seems also to produce a bias, that is, it leads one to *overstate* the crime rate in one’s surroundings. To the extent that the repeated representation of aspects of this worldview makes it impervious to contravening evidence, one develops certain intellectual vices. In the grip of the worldview, evidence, **one develops** a kind of **intellectual rigidity**, or narrow-mindedness, **about the feasible options for understanding safety-relevant evidence**. One may exhibit prejudice or partiality in interpreting evidence about, for example, certain people’s typical motivations. In short, one becomes intellectually blind to contravening evidence. **To the extent that the worldview encourages anti-social dispositions, one may** lack moral virtues and **develop moral vices**. For example, **one may become suspicious when encountering strangers, cynical about their motives, scornful about their concerns, insensitive to their suffering, and contemptuous** of them **in general**. Empirical evidence on the attitudes of gun owners reveals that they are more likely to endorse on the attitudes of gun owners reveals that they are more likely to endorse punitive beliefs about criminals, including support for the death penalty, and gun carriers “were more likely [than non-carrying owners] to believe that the courts are not harsh enough”. Furthermore, the use of “the proximity problematic racial attitudes, suggesting that African Americans are particularly dangerous. It is not difficult to see how certain **moral virtues will be harder to develop, given these beliefs**. Take, for example, the virtue of compassion, which with the motivation to alleviate it, **someone with punitive views will have a harder time seeing** the **suffering** of a criminals **as a cause for concern**, much less a cause for action. This is problematic, since the suffering of criminals should, at least sometimes, be a cause for both concern and action. If one is blind to this suffering, and to the suffering of African Americans on the highly problematic assumption that they might be criminals, the one will not be able to embody the virtue of compassion. In addition to hindering virtue, this worldview may cut off, or seriously diminish, the possibility of Eudaimonia by blocking one’s access to certain objective goods. One may, of course, be right that she lives in a dangerous neighborhood in which crime is likely; and one may, of course, avoid the biases and stereotyping that seem to be associated with these views (though the bias research suggests that this is harder than one think). **Even if one is right about one’s neighborhood and living conditions, the profound insecurity and alienation from one’s community would seem to make virtue extremely difficult and flourishing impossible**. Indeed, having strong community bonds seems crucial both for one’s willingness to act virtuously to benefit others and for one’s overall sense of well-being. In addition (as I will show in the next section), this worldview seems to serve to weaken trust and the community bonds that help to make a society flourish.

#### Three implications: (a) when everyone has a gun, there’s no social cohesion, meaning militias can’t function – it’s try or die for the government to provide sufficient order, (b) that’s an epistemological indict on the NC – gun ownership promotes circular epistemology that self-verifies external threats, such as tyranny or misconduct, and (c) since gun ownership promotes racism, militias would likely be extremely racist and produce just as much suffering as the government ever could.