OFF 1 – CP

**A: Counterplan Text**

The United States federal government will institute the Civilian Marksmanship program to affirm a worldview of solidarity.

**Kopel:** David B. Kopel & Christopher C. Little. *Communitarians, Neorepublicans, and Guns: Assessing the Case for Firearm Prohibition*. 1997.

One easy starting point for the promotion of a well-regulated militia—because it exists already—is **the C**ivilian **M**arksmanship **p**rogram. The Director of Civilian Marksmanship program (DCM), created through the efforts of Theodore Roosevelt, **is the** federal government's **attempt to educate the public about gun safety** and marksmanship.263 DCM training takes place according to congressional directive and receives federal financial and resource support.264 Most training is conducted at gun clubs that have been certified as DCM participants.265 The DCM training program involves rifles only.266 One purpose of the program is to provide the armed forces with recruits that have firearms training upon enlistment.267 Nevertheless, the fraction of the civilian population (including the DCM population) that joins the military is small enough that the DCM may not be cost-effective from a purely military perspective. Enhancing the standing army, however, is not the only purpose of the DCM. The DCM serves another purpose. Because the American people constitute, as the Supreme Court states, "the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States,"268 the DCM is one of the key ways (pg.491) in which the federal government carries out Article I, Section 8, Clause 16 of the Constitution, which authorizes Congress "[t]o provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States."269 Of course, other benefits are reaped from the program as well: **Americans learn how to handle firearms safely** and competently**, and the program is an implicit affirmation of every American's responsibility to further the common good**. The real opposition to the DCM comes not from deficit hawks, but from the most determined congressional allies of the antigun lobbies.270 From their viewpoint, the DCM does send the wrong message—civilians are not only entitled, but they are encouraged to become proficient users of rifles such as the M-1 Garand.271 From the viewpoint of persons (including **communitarians**) that **want a genuine well-regulated militia**, however, the **DCM sends the message that American[s]** gun owners should be educated in the safe and **responsible use of firearms and in** their duty to **assist in the common defense**.2

**B: Competition**

1. The counterplan is mutual exclusive; handguns are not banned because, they are a necessary part of the program, otherwise people would just resent them ore
2. Net benefits

**C: Net Benefits**

1. The CP makes society more interdependent and reduces crime, turns back all your arguments about capitalism and individualism. **Kopel on Reynolds:** David B. Kopel & Christopher C. Little. *Communitarians, Neorepublicans, and Guns: Assessing the Case for Firearm Prohibition*. 1997. (Glenn Harlan Reynolds)

In the days prior to the invention of professional police forces in the early part of the nineteenth century, responding to crime was not seen as vigilantism, but as a civic duty—one backed by sanctions. The cry of "Stop Thief!" was not simply a cartoon cliche, but had the legal consequence of compelling all within its hearing to aid in arresting a thief. Individuals took turns on the "watch and ward," patrolling cities and towns at night. Everyone was seen as having a real stake in the maintenance of public order. **Today**, with the increasing professionalization of law enforcement, **the stock phrase is not "Stop Thief!" but "Don't get involved."** People, often encouraged by law enforcement professionals possessing a natural desire to protect their professional turf, have followed that advice with a vengeance.... **Reversing this trend would** probably **do more to address our crime problem than either compulsory handgun licensing,** or anti-assault weapon legislation. Of course, unlike those legislative options it would require work from citizens, and from politicians, and that may be my suggestion's biggest flaw. I have no doubt that if all able-bodied citizens were required to put in a few days per year walking the streets of their neighborhoods, crime would drop substantially. Citizens could be called together for training and equipment inspection ("mustered") and could be required to provide themselves with the necessary equipment, (pg.496) whether that included firearms or not. **This would produce direct results**—in terms of law enforcement on the streets—light-years beyond current proposals to add additional professional police, and at far lower cost. However, I wonder whether politicians will be willing to endorse such a requirement, in a society that struggles to get people to show up for jury duty. This difficulty in securing public service is one reason why the militia system initially declined. Everyone wants to be a free rider, and I have no illusions about the enthusiasm of the average citizen for tramping about the streets in midwinter in search of crime. But the burden is not that great, and the statutory authority for imposing it is already on the books, both at the state and federal levels .... .... We have spent the last hundred years or so expecting steadily less from citizens in terms of public involvement and citizen responsibilities. Not surprisingly, most citizens have managed to live down to these expectations. **Instead of trying to find new ways to protect** people, and **society**, from irresponsibility **through regulation**, perhaps **it is time to** start **expect**ing **more from people**: more involvement, more responsibility, more simple goodness. We might find that people will live up to these expectations, as they have lived down to the current ones. The framers of our constitutions, at both the state and federal levels, certainly thought so, and the state of our society today suggests that they may have known something that we have forgotten

1. Private ownership of handguns has been proven to deter crime within the community; the counterplan saves lives and prevents violence

**Kopel (2):** David B. Kopel & Christopher C. Little. *Communitarians, Neorepublicans, and Guns: Assessing the Case for Firearm Prohibition*. 1997.

There is copious evidence that a significant number of crimes are deterred every year by gun-wielding Americans. One of the first measurable pieces of evidence that criminals are deterred by the mere perception that potential victims may be armed dates back to the late 1960s, when **the Orlando Police Department sponsored firearms safety training for women**.345 The police instituted this program when it became evident that many women were arming themselves in response to a dramatic increase in sexual assaults in the **[in] Orlando** area in (pg.505) 1966.346 The year **following** the well-publicized safety **training program[s] [we]** **witnessed an 88% drop in** the number of **rapes** in Orlando.347 As Gary Kleck and David Bordua note: "It cannot be claimed that this was merely part of a general downward trend in rape, since the national rate was increasing at the time. No other U.S. city with a population over 100,000 experienced so large a percentage decrease in the number of rapes from 1966 to 1967 ...."348 Furthermore, that same year, rape increased by 5% in Florida and by 7% on the national level.349 According to Kleck and Bordua, the gun training program "affected the behavior of potential rapists primarily because it served to inform or remind them of widespread gun ownership among women, and thereby increased the perceived riskiness of sexual assaults."350 The rape rate, after plummeting, did increase during the next five years, but this may be because the safety training courses no longer received the same degree of media attention as when first initiated.351 Nonetheless, at the end of that five year period, the Orlando rape rate was still 13% below the 1966 level, when the classes were first publicized.352 The rate of sexual assault increased 96.1% in Florida and 64% nationwide during that same five-year period.353 It is also interesting that rape in the area immediately surrounding Orlando increased by 308% during the same period.354 Having heard about the Orlando experience, Detroit Chief of Police Bill Stephens began a similar program in 1967, in the face of an epidemic of armed robberies.355 Within months of the Detroit program's initiation, which like the Orlando program was widely publicized, the rate of armed robberies had dropped by 90%.356 In 1982, the **Atlanta** exurb of Kennesaw passed an ordinance—in symbolic response to the handgun ban of Morton Grove, Illinois—**requir[ed] all residents** (with certain exceptions, including conscientious (pg.506) objectors) **to keep firearms in their homes**.357 **In** the **seven months following enactment** of the ordinance **there were only five burglaries, compared to forty-five in the same period the preceding year**, constituting an 89% decrease in residential burglary.358 Kleck and Bordua maintain that "the publicized passage of the ordinance may have served to remind potential burglars in the area of the fact of widespread gun ownership, thereby heightening their perception of the risks of burglary."359 Studies of prison inmates confirm that criminals are deterred when they believe their potential victims are armed. Criminologists James Wright and Peter Rossi, who at one time had been proponents of severe gun control, concluded that an armed citizenry functions as an important deterrent to crime.360 **Of** the **prison inmates interviewed**, nearly 37% had encountered an armed victim during their criminal careers.361 Approximately the same percentage (**40%**) **reported** that they **had not committed a particular crime because they feared their potential victims were armed**.362 One form of deterrence is termed "confrontation deterrence," whereby a criminal actually confronts a potential victim and is thwarted by that victim. Gary Kleck has conducted the most thorough criminological studies regarding confrontation deterrence. Dr. Kleck's initial research, based upon a 1981 Peter Hart survey conducted for a gun control group, suggested that **there are** roughly **645,000** instances of confrontation **deterrence[s] involving handgun-wielding citizens every** **year.**363 That figure climbs to about 740,000 when all types of firearms are considered.364 The figures are broadly consistent with data from several other state and national surveys.365 As Kleck stated: Much of the social order in America may depend on the fact that millions of people are armed and dangerous to each other. The availability of deadly weapons to the violence-prone may well contribute to violence by increasing the (pg.507) probability of a fatal outcome of combat. However, it may also be that this very fact raises the stakes in disputes to the point where only the most incensed or intoxicated disputants resort to physical conflict, with the risks of armed retaliation deterring attack and coercing minimal courtesy among otherwise hostile parties. Likewise, rates of commercial robbery, residential burglary injury, and rape might be still higher than their already high levels were it not for the dangerousness of the prospective victim population. Gun ownership among prospective victims may well have as large a crime-inhibiting effect as the crime-generating effects of gun possession among prospective criminals .... [T]he two effects may roughly cancel each other out.366 "The failure to fully acknowledge this reality," Kleck concluded, "can lead to grave errors in devising public policy to minimize violence through gun control."367 If Kleck is correct, and if attempts to implement drastic gun control policies, such as domestic disarmament, are ever successful, the result will likely only harm America's communities. Although Kleck's research was consistent with nine other studies of the same topic,368 he was subjected to intense attack by gun control proponents.369 Kleck responded by conducting a much more thorough survey that took into account every criticism directed at his finding of 645,000 instances of confrontation deterrence involving armed citizens per year. For example, respondents who indicated that they had used a gun for self-defense were queried in detail about the actual use in order to sort out persons who might label as self-defense merely grabbing a gun when something went bump in the night, even if there were no confrontation with a criminal. The new survey did show that Kleck had been wrong. The most thorough study of defensive gun use found that **firearms are used for protection approximately 2.5 million times a year**.370 Shots were usually (pg.508) not fired; merely drawing the gun apparently drove off many would-be assailants.371 Notably, Marvin E. Wolfgang, one of the most eminent criminologists of the twentieth century, and a strong supporter of gun control, reviewed Kleck's findings. Announcing that he found Kleck's implications disturbing, Wolfgang wrote that he could find no methodological flaw, nor any other reason to doubt the correctness of Kleck's figure.372 One public policy aimed at crime control that an increasing number of states are exploring and adopting is the liberalization of concealed carry laws.373 Data suggest that concealed carry laws may reduce homicide and aggravated assault rates.374 The data are clear that liberalized concealed carry does not lead to gunfights on the streets between licensees.375 This is because those who go through the rigorous background check[s] usually required under the liberalized law are precisely those most apt to use guns responsibly in the first place. The predictions of those who oppose concealed carry have been proven false in every state where the law has been liberalized: concealed carry does not a John Rambo make.376 Because many criminals avoid victimizing people they think may be armed, what might happen to the violent crime rate if more people were armed and possibly carrying a firearm under their coat or in their purse as they walked down the street? Domestic violence would not likely be affected by concealed carry reform (except for stalking cases), but the incidence of "outdoor" crime would likely diminish. In (pg.509) situations in which a high fraction of the population is armed (in contrast to the one to four percent typical today in states that issue concealed handgun permits), predatory crime is virtually nonexistent.377 **Gun ownership provides a crime-inhibiting force** of some magnitude, although the exact size is subject to legitimate dispute. **If domestic disarmament is adopted** and is largely obeyed, **it will destroy** that socially beneficialforce. Criminals will generally not disarm, and the perception will be created among them that there is less of a chance of encountering an armed victim. This will embolden many criminals to commit crimes they would have been deterred from committing when gun ownership was legal. Accompanying the plainly false presumption of Domestic Disarmament that guns in the right hands make absolutely no positive contribution to public safety is the assumption that "all people"—not just people with felony records, or alcoholics, or other troubled individuals—"kill and are much more likely to do so when armed than when disarmed."378 There exists thorough criminological refutation of this assumption that the average citizen is a walking time-bomb, a potential murderer kept in check only by the absence of a firearm.379 In (pg.510) truth, the vast majority of gun owners handle their firearms responsibly.380 If, on the other hand, Etzioni is right, and a huge fraction of the American population would commit murder at some point—given the combination of an upsetting event and a murder instrument—it is hard to imagine how such a population could be considered fit for self-government. The argument that Americans (or people in general) are too hot-tempered, clumsy, and potentially murderous to be trusted with dangerous objects such as firearms might be a good argument for an elitist (of the left-wing or right-wing variety) who believes that "the masses" need to be controlled by the firm hand of a powerful government of their betters. Whatever else might be said about that type of argument, it is thoroughly out-of-place coming from a **communitarian**, whose philosophy presumes that the American people are fully capable of **virtue, responsibility, and self-government**.

Allowing the government to confiscate weapons further disconnects citizens from responsibility for their own safety, leaving them at the mercy of violent criminals; this leads to learned helplessness, alienation, and moral degeneration within the community

***Ginsberg:*** *Heather Ginsberg, Obama’s New Executive Order Will Kill 110 Year-Old Civilian Marksmanship Program. Townhall. August 31st, 2013.*

***The CMP tightly controls the distribution of obsolete military weapons****. The program was created by the U.S. Congress as part of the 1903 War Department Appropriations Act with the purpose of allowing civilians to hone their marksmanship skills, should they later be called into military service.* ***Participants*** *receiving firearms through the CMP* ***must comply with all state and federal firearm laws and undergo a background check conducted by a dealer holding a Federal Firearms License*** *in order to receive the gun. Additionally,* ***they must also be a member of a CMP affiliated shooting club****,* ***making participating*** *in the program* ***more difficult than*** *anyone trying to purchase a firearm through* ***usual retail channels****. The Civilian Marksmanship Program was administered by the United States Army from 1916 through 1996 when it was changed to the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice & Firearms Safety, a 501(c) (3) organization federally chartered by the U.S. Congress. There are no data indicating any of the weapons involved in homicide were imported surplus military rifles. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s homicide crime statistics, rifles accounted for only 323 deaths out of 12,664 homicides in 2011, the most recent data set provided by the FBI. “Apart from a donation of surplus .22 and .30 caliber rifles in the Army’s inventory to the CMP, the CMP receives no federal funding,” the CMP website states, adding that they have been overwhelmed by requests and orders are taking 30-60 days to ship product.*

OFF 2 – Counter Plan:

1. **Counterplan Text:** The aff actor will remove all restrictions on private ownership of handguns.
2. **Competition:** Mutually exclusive- a) aff bans handguns, CP allows them
3. **Net Benefits:**

Capitalism is close to collapse-only a violent revolution will solve. Gun control prevents the working class from achieving the necessary weaponry. **LRP** 94 League for the Revolutionary Party “Gun Control Is No Answer to Crime” Proletarian Revolution No. 46 (Spring 1994) <https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/socialistvoice/guncontrol.html>

For months **the ruling class has subjected the American** **people** **to an unrelenting propaganda barrage about the dangers of** crime and especially **guns in U.S.** cities. Right-wing politicians and tabloid media have been in the forefront—not surprisingly, since a major purpose of the campaign is to scapegoat Blacks for the ills of the system and justify increasing repression. But liberal leaders, starting from Bill Clinton with his vindictive crime legislation, have gone along, as have Black spokesmen from Jackson to Farrakhan. Crime in the cities is indeed mounting, bred by the miseries of decaying capitalism. The ruling class, society’s biggest criminals, foster misery and the plagues of drugs and violent crime in poor communities. The favorite panaceas of liberals of all hues is gun control: **take weapons away from everyone but the cops and the military**, plus a handful of “respectable” (i.e., upper middle-class) types. At the time of its revolutionary origins, the U.S. had to grant its citizens the right to bear arms. Now in its epoch of imperialist decay, it tries to remove that right. By using the crime campaign to hide its own, far greater violence, it denies the right of the oppressed masses to defend themselves. In the absence of proletarian leadership that provides a real answer, the initiative has been handed to reactionaries. The National Rifle Association, a right-wing outfit, takes the lead in defending the Second Amendment, while left, union, and Black leaders go along with the gun-control mania. **Working-class revolutionaries recognize the need for measures of self-defense**—not only **against cr**ime in the streets but also against **the violence of the ruling class. It will take revolution to achieve a socialist world, the only answer to capitalism’s horrors**. Yet the working class needs to survive today to fight in the mass struggles on the horizon. For starters, **we say to working people: defend your constitutional right to bear arms!** The NRA says that individual gun ownership is the answer. But what’s needed is organized, mass, self-defense. Another article in this issue, “**Black Struggle Arms Itself,” sketches the history of Black self-defense efforts** and details the reasons why a class-based strategy is **crucial. At the moment the U.S. ruling class is trying to build support for a major attack against the working class at home**. But unable to take on the whole class frontally yet, it uses the old divide-and-conquer tool of racism. **It first heats up its crusade against Blacks and Latinos who have fought capitalist** immiseration through rebellions against **capitalist police** and property from Los Angeles to Washington Heights. It is no surprise that the anti-gun campaign in New York originated against the rebellious Dominican neighborhood of Washington Heights and then moved to the seething Black community in Brooklyn. The media hero of the day is a Dominican businessman, Fernando Mateo, who started the “Toys for Guns” program. Owners of illegal guns were encouraged to bring them in to the local police station in exchange for a $100 gift certificate at their local “Toys ’R’ Us” store. That program has become a permanent “Goods for Guns” program across the country. A few facts show that the program is pure deception. The $100 incentive will obviously not persuade big-time criminals to throw down their guns and adopt pacifism. Nor will it attract the drug gangs who shoot bystanders in the streets. Sure, some will turn in a spare peashooter or two, but they know the value of real weapons. According to the New York press, many gun traders admitted to owning other guns; some even planned to use the cash reward toward the purchase of better weapons! Even Mateo, the founder of Goods for Guns, said that he had no intention of giving up his gun. People with legal connections can get guns; people with illegal connections can, too. But not if you are a working woman or man liable to be mugged on the street, robbed at home or subject to unprovoked attacks by the cops (see our article on the James Frazier case). The media won’t admit that many people who are not criminals need to keep guns for self-protection. At the other end of the scale, Clinton, accurately described by the Boston Globe as the “Earth’s top pusher of arms,” has no intention of surrendering his guns. Those he needs for future mass slaughters, as in Panama and Iraq. Nor do the capitalists’ cops and National Guard ever disarm themselves. The gun-control program is not about protecting the honest working person. Clinton and his cops and phony programs like “Toys for Guns” do nothing to deter the petty criminals who plague us. That is not their intention. The aim is to reinforce the lie that working and oppressed people must rely not on themselves but on the cops to protect them. That way we will be deluded into supporting a further buildup of the state’s armed forces. The cops say they will protect us. But as the ruling class has itself documented, cops more often than not protect (and join) the drug dealers and do nothing to protect ordinary people, especially Blacks and Latinos, from petty criminals. (See “Race, Class and Cop Brutality,” [PR 45](https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/socialistvoice/Back_Issues.html#pr45). Armed Self-Defense: A Working-Class Policy The capitalist classes of all countries defend their power through their states, institutions holding a legal monopoly of armed force. The liberal’s remedy for crime is to rely on the state to prevent it. Most working people know that doesn’t work--especially Blacks and Latinos, who more often than not see the state’s agents, the cops, fighting against them. The far right-wingers have a different answer. They see Blacks, Latinos and other militant workers as the real (or at best potential) criminals and don’t trust even the bosses’ state to keep them down. They will look to armies of fascists when the time is ripe. Even with gun-control laws, these thugs will get weapons (plus quite a few members) from the cops. This has always been the case when fascism rises. For all sections of the bourgeois class, the notion of working people, especially Blacks and Latinos, arming themselves is a great threat. Capitalism wouldn’t last a moment if working people were armed and organized. That is why the right to armed self-defense today is a working-class demand. Certainly t**he working class is concerned to get rid of** the **criminal elements** in our communities **once and for all. We will stop these elements most effectively through a mass struggle to build a revolutionary movement and leadership to do away with the criminal system altogether.**  
Class analysis resolves the case better than the AC . **Cole**

Cole, Centre for Education for Social Justice @ Bishop Grosseteste U College Lincoln, ’12 (Mike, “Critical race theory in education, Marxism and abstract racial domination,” British Journal of Sociology of Education, 33:2, p. 167-183)

What then are the implications for educational practice? Preston’s pedagogical solutions are the abolition of both ‘whiteness’ and capitalism, of which the former, according to Preston, is perhaps capitalism’s ‘weakest link’ (2010, 123). **There are** three **major problems with ‘the abolition of whiteness’**. First **it is too vague to have any practical implications** (hardly surprising given the abstract theorizing that preceded its announcement).12 Just **how are white people to be persuaded to ‘abolish their whiteness’**, and **what would follow** such abolition? Second, given its vagueness, **it is** seriously **open to misinterpretation.** While Preston clearly does not propose the abolition of white people, his advocacy of the abolition of ‘whiteness’ is clearly open to being interpreted as such. Third, and following on from the first and second problems, the **abolition of ‘whiteness’ is useless as a** **unifier and counter-productive as a** political **rallying point**. Indeed, **were the abolition of whiteness to be** routinely **promoted in educational establishments, it would** most likely **cause severe confusion** and indeed mayhem. **Unproductive divisions** on grounds of ‘race’, class and culture **would** undoubtedly **accelerate**.13 As far as the abolition of capitalism is concerned, by its very nature, **abstract** academic **Marxism**, as developed by Postone and **not linked to practice, is not appropriate for** Marxist **pedagogy**. Rather the urgent need is to partake in Marxist **praxis**. This **must entail a concrete engagement** **with the real** **possibilities of** twenty-first-century **socialism** (for example, Lebowitz 2006; Martinez, Fox, and Farrell 2010; Motta and Cole 2013, **forthcoming**). **Rather than abolish ‘whiteness’**, however perceived, **it is more appropriate to unite around a common purpose.** **Central should be** a **theoretical exploration** of the concept of participatory democracy, but **linked to concrete practice**, such as in the communal councils and communes of Venezuela – a country where people are directly involved in decision-making and where Marxism, in the form of twenty-first-century socialism, is being considered seriously as a viable alternative to capitalism.

Capitalism causes inevitable crises, inequality, and dehumanization—the alternative is a class-based critique of the system—pedagogical spaces are the crucial staging ground for keeping socialism on the horizon. **McLaren ‘04** McLaren, Distinguished Fellow – Critical Studies @ Chapman U and UCLA urban schooling prof, and Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, associate professor of Communication – U Windsor, ‘4 (Peter and Valerie, “Class Dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of ‘difference’,” Educational Philosophy and Theory Vol. 36, Issue 2, p. 183-199)

McLaren: Mitja, I like the way that you framed that question. The obviousness of conservative culture is precisely why it is so hidden from view. Much like those who controlled the paradis articificels of everyday life in the film, The Truman Show. I am struck each day by the manner in which predatory **capitalism** anticipates forgetfulness, nourishes social amnesia, smoothes the pillows of finality, and **paves the world with a sense of inevitability** and sameness. I am depressingly impressed by what a formidable opponent it has proven to be, how it fatally denies the full development of our human capacities, and inures us to the immutability of social life. In other words, it naturalizes us to the idea that capital is the best of all possible worlds, that it may not be perfect, but it certainly is preferable to socialism and communism. Many **leftists have** unwittingly **become apologists** for capitalist relations of domination **because they are overburdened by the** seeming **inability** of North Americans **to imagine a world in which capital did not reign** supreme. To address this situation, I have turned to critical pedagogy. Mitja: You are very much identified with the field of critical pedagogy. How would you define critical pedagogy? What is your position within this field today? McLaren: As you know, Mitja, critical pedagogy has been a central **liberatory** current in **education** of the last two decades. Critical pedagogy has served as a form of struggle within and against the social norms and forces that structure the schooling process. Most approaches to critical pedagogy are limited to disturbing the foundations upon which bourgeois knowledge is built, placing the term ‘schooling’ itself under scrutiny. Questions that arise in critical pedagogy often have to do with the relationship among schooling and the broader array of publics constructed by the marketplace and brought about by the secularization and the internationalization of the politics of consumption. In other words, critical pedagogy most often deals with cultural manifestations of capital, and the norms and formations that are engendered by means of relations of exchange. This is a good strategy as far as it goes. However, the **revolutionary pedagogy** that I advocate, that I have built from the roots of Freire’s and Marx’s work and the work of many others, such as the great revolutionary Che Guevara, **involves** the **uprooting of** these seeds of **naturalization** – planted through the reification of social relations and the subsumption of difference to identity by means of the law of value – and this means undressing the exploitative, sexist, racist, and homophobic dimensions of contemporary capitalist society. But it also means **more than simply ‘uncovering’** these relations, or laying them bare in all of their ideological nakedness. It stipulates – and here it is important not to mince words – the **total uprooting** of class society in all of its disabling manifestations. Revolutionary pedagogy refers to taking an active part in a total social revolution, one in which acting and knowing are indelibly fused such that the object of knowledge is irrevocably shaped by the very act of its being contemplated. That is, **the very act of contemplation** (I need to emphasize that this act of contemplation is collective and dialogical) **shapes** – and is shaped by – **the object under** **investigation**. The knowers are shaped – through dialogue – by the known. **Revolutionary pedagogy attempts to** **produce an excess of consciousness** over and above our conditional or naturalized consciousness, **to** **create**, as it were, **an overflow that outruns** the **historical conditions that enframe it** and that seek to anchor it, so that we might free our thought and, by extension, our everyday social practices from its rootedness in the very material conditions that enable thinking and social activity to occur in the first place. In other words, revolutionary pedagogy teaches us that we need not accommodate ourselves to the permanence of the capitalist law of value. In fact, it reveals to us how we can begin to think of continuing Marx’s struggle for a revolution in permanence. A number of thinkers have helped to unchain the revolutionary implications of Freire’s thought in this regard – Donaldo Macedo, Henry Giroux, Ira Shor, Peter Mayo, among others. I have attempted to do this by iterating the protean potential of his work for social revolution and not just the democratizing of capitalist social relations. So much contemporary work on Freire has inflated its coinage for transforming classroom practices but devalued its potential for revolutionary social change outside of the classroom in the wider society. Revolutionary pedagogy requires a dialectical understanding of global capitalist exploitation. Freire is often brought in to illuminate **debates over** school reform that are generally structured around the conceit of a dialogue over equality of opportunity, which rarely go beyond momentous renunciations of corporatism or teeth-rattling denunciations of privatization. But such debates studiously ignore the key contradictions to which history has given rise – those between labor and capital. Such debates **are engineered** in the United States **to avoid** addressing **these contradictions.** Mitja: What do you see as the most important challenge in the future for educational researchers? McLaren: The key to see beyond the choir of invisibilities that envelope us, and to identify how current calls **for** establishing **democracy are** little more than half-way house policies, a smokescreen for neo-liberalism and for making capitalism governable and regulated – a “stakeholder” capitalism if you will. I do not believe such a capitalism will work, nor am I in favor of market socialism. **We need to chart out** a type of **positive humanism that can ground a genuine socialist democracy without market relations**, a Marxist humanism that can lead to a transcendence of alienated labor. Following Marx, Eagleton claims that we are free when, like artists, we produce without the goad of physical necessity; and it is this nature which for Marx is the essence of all individuals. Transforming the rituals of schooling can only go so far, since these rituals are embedded in capitalist social relations and the law of value. There are signs that research in the social sciences might be going through a sea-shift of transformation. I think **we need to take the focus away from how individual** **identities are commodified** in postmodern consumer spaces, **and put more emphasis on** creating possibilities for a **radical reconstitution** of society. I like the new public role of Pierre Bourdieu – a role that sees him taking his politics into the streets and factories of France, fighting the structural injustices and economic instabilities brought about by capitalism and neo-liberalism – fighting what, in effect, are nothing short of totalitarian practices that are facilitating the exploitation of the world’s workers. Bourdieu realizes that we haven’t exhausted all the alternatives to capitalism. If that is the case**, we need, as researchers, to bring our work to bear on** the **seeking** out of **new social relations around which everyday life can be productively** and creatively **organized**. In my view, this is social science – and politics – the way it should be practiced.

OFF 3 – Theory:

A: Interpretation- If the aff advocates for a handgun ban, the must have a solvency advocate who advocates the entirety of the advocacy and may only garner offense from that interpretation of the advocacy.

B: Violation- You do not have a advocate who advocate and all your solvency evidence is talks about why guns in general are bad not specifically handguns. Even if you have some solvency you may not garner any solvency from a gun ban.

C: Standards-

1) Strat Skew- The 1ac advocacy and solvency is all over the place which makes it impossible to form a coherent negative strategy because your offense isn’t internally coherent. I have no clue how you will reinterpret the ac in the 1ar to exclude DA’s, links etc. Also clarification or having advocacy text doesn’t solve because it is a problem with your carded offense. Key to substantive engagement, if you have no offense specific to handgun bans the neg has to defend that we don’t ban any guns. 2) Ground- It is unclear where his ground stops and where my ground ends. For example the fact that he only advocates a handgun ban and all his solvency evidence is about gun control means he can leverage that to take out DA’s and Turns destroying negative ground. In addition your solvency advocate does not even advocate for your advocacy so it is very unclear whose ground is whose. Controls the internal link to predictability, which is an independent voter because the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote off an irresolvable aff. Key to substantive engagement to ensure both debaters have even ground to engage.

D: Voter:

Substantive engagement is a voter- if I cannot engage in the aff, the substance debate becomes impossible to win. Drop the argument a) It is a problem with his evidence that is specific to a ban **Use** **competing interps** because **a)** what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and **b)** reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory.

OFF 4 – On Case:

#### 1. Turn/ Banning firearms increases crime, a meta-analytic review of over 200 studies proves. Kates and Mauser: Kates, Don. B, and Mauser, Gary. (Kates has a B.L. from Yale, criminologist, constitutional lawyer; Mauser is a criminologist and university professor at Simon Fraser University). "Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A Review of International and Some Domestic Evidence." Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy. Fall 2006. Web. 9 Dec. 15.  <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No2_KatesMauseronline.pdf>

The same pattern appears **when comparisons of violence to gun** **ownership are made within nations**. Indeed, "data on fire‐ arms ownership by constabulary area **in England**," like data from **[and] the United States, show "a negative correlation,"**10 that is, "where firearms are most dense violent crime rates are lowest, and **where guns are least dense violent crime rates are highest**."11 Many different data sets from various kinds of sources are summarized as follows by the leading text: ~There is no consistent significant positive association be‐ tween gun ownership levels and violence rates: across (1) time within the United States, (2) U.S. cities, (3) counties within Illinois, (4) country‐sized areas like England, U.S. states, (5) regions of the United States, (6) nations, or (7) population subgroups . . . . 12 A second misconception about the relationship between fire‐ arms and violence attributes Europe's generally low homicide rates to stringent gun control. That attribution cannot be accurate since murder in Europe was at an all‐time low before the gun controls were introduced.13 For instance, virtually the only English gun control during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the practice that police patrolled without guns. During this period gun control prevailed far less in England or Europe than in certain American states which nevertheless had—and continue to have—murder rates that were and are comparatively very high.14   In this connection, two recent studies are pertinent. In 2004, **the U.S. National Academy of Sciences released** its **evaluation** from a review **of 253** journal **articles**, 99 books, 43 government publications, and some original empirical research**. It failed to identify any gun control that had reduced violent crime, suicide, or gun accidents**.15 The same conclusion was reached in 2003 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control's review of then‐ extant studies.16

2) America is a field of death—their insistence that banning guns will lead to peace only entrenches a system of anti-black violence. Black people should have guns and use them as self defense against a system that never ceases to attack them. **Memnon: 15**. (Ras Memnon, writer for Black Star News. Magazine that exposes political and financial scandals, reports on civil rights conditions in the United States and fosters black activism. Police Brutality And Black Self-Defense. August 13, 2015. <http://www.blackstarnews.com/blog/police-brutality-and-black-self-defense.html.> MMG)

And since **we** have yet to see any serious indication the “powers that be” are invested in attending to **the racist way police treat Black people** then we can expect means more radical responses from young Black people. One example, is **a group that emerged since the Ferguson protests echoing** images from another **time of conflict in America between police and Blacks** is called the Huey Newton Gun Club. The Huey Newton Gun Club, which utilizes legal gun possession laws like the “open carry” statute, **promotes the carrying of guns by Black people**, to exercise their Second Amendment right, like many White Americans do. The group’s advocates something the Black Panther Party, and others did: defense of Black people against the forces of oppression who operate inside the police force and within law enforcement. In the 60’s, the Black Panther Party arose to defend the interests of Black people that were being ignored by the system. At the time, **police**, just **like now**, **were** often **busy** **harassing and killing Black people**. The response of the police— with much help from J. Edgar Hoover’'s FBI —was to orchestrate frame-ups and assassinations, and to destroy this great organization for Black progress. Charismatic Panther leader Fred Hampton was murdered while he slept. Police attacked Panther headquarters nationwide, with the clear intent of destroying this movement being built to fight for the rights of Blacks. The Panthers and **Black** guerilla **freedom groups** **were** **destroyed** **by the machinery of the American government. Within the current context, we'’ve not seen the level of radical resistance that** defined those fighting for Black liberation during the time of the Panthers. But with groups like the Huey P Newton Gun Club springing up, and the rage and sentiment that is on the streets, if these police killing continue, that may change. Blacks, especially the young, are faced with the daunting reality that their lives lack value in this society that has been against the interests and welfare of Black people since we were brought to the American plantations of hell. Some are now debating why we saw gunplay on Sunday in Ferguson. But since we’ve been taught “hate produces hate” the answer should be obvious. And since **America believes in settling issues by violence**, why do some pretend this is so strange? Most Americans worship those who have helped Americans kill those deemed enemies of America. Former Black Panther Geronimo Pratt, a decorated Vietnam veteran with —two Purple Hearts, two Bronze Stars and a Silver Star was praised for his military prowess in foreign wars. But when Pratt came home and decided to use his military knowledge to protect Blacks he was framed by the FBI and LAPD, for a murder authorities knew he didn'’t commit, and was imprisoned for decades, “neutralized,” in the language of the FBI'’s COINTELPRO, so he could not protect his people. Unfortunately, Blacks have also forgotten the legions of brave Blacks still languishing in jail, as political prisoners, because they dared fight for Black self-determination. America has no problem pinning medals on Black men when they are engaged in mass murder under the banner of the U.S. Army. **The political hypocrites**, **who tell young Black people to be "“non-violent"” are often the same ones sending Black people to kill others in** the foreign “**theaters of war**; **but expect them to meekly accept the violence police project on Blacks.** This double-standard is unsustainable, especially when the extreme violence police mete out on Blacks is condoned and coddled by unprincipled political phonies. America is a nation not of peace, but of war. We are faced with the absurdity of a political class that constantly clamors for military intervention everywhere overseas, who promote violence as the ultimate form of conflict-resolution, while giving Black people grandstanding morality speeches. **The pretense, that America’'s government is** basically a **peaceful one, is undercut by the dark dossier of bloody deeds** this nation is guilty of. America'’s war machinery of death and destruction has been one of the main enemies of peace among mankind for decades. The savage treatment of Black people must be stopped. Black people have been backed into a corner. They will protect the lives of their children and people. **If** the political **elite refuse to do anything about the violence** acts **perpetrated by law enforcement soon no one will listen to those who still talk about peaceful means.**

#### 3) Gun control laws will be enforced only to increase police brutality and disproportionate treatment of black individuals—it will develop just like drug criminalization.

**Gourevitch 15**

Alex Gourevitch, 6-24-2015, "Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power," No Publication, www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun\_controls\_racist\_reality\_the\_liberal\_argument\_against\_giving\_police\_more\_power.

As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations. Once individuals find themselves arrested gun control reappears as a reason for increasing punishment. Gun possession can be used to enhance sentences for other crimes and even functions as a kind of double punishment when that possession becomes the reason for also tacking on an extra criminal charge. Gun charges are also a part of the excessive and racially unequal over-charging practices that not only contribute to rising incarceration rates but also ends force numerous individuals away from trial and into plea bargains. Poor Blacks and Latinos are easily intimidated by charge-happy prosecutors into accepting plea deals, meaning they never see their day in court. Some even end up admitting to crimes they did not commit just to avoid the possibility of more severe punishments. More criminal gun laws would only feed this deeply unjust system. There is an unrecognized gap between the justification for gun control and its most likely effect. There is no reason to expect fair enforcement of gun control laws, or even that they will mainly be used to someone prevent these massacres. That is because how our society polices depends not on the laws themselves but on how the police – and prosecutors and courts – decide to enforce the law. Especially given how many guns there are in the U.S., gun law enforcement will be selective. That is to say, they will be unfairly enforced, only deepening the injustices daily committed against poor minorities in the name of law and order. It is hard to imagine any feasible gun control laws doing much to decrease mass shootings. But it is easy to see how they will become part of the system of social control of mostly black, mostly poor people. There are already too many crimes, there is too much criminal law, and there is far too much incarceration — especially of black people. To the degree that all that is part of the “dark chapter in our history,” given the deep injustice of our society, and especially its policing practices, the actual practice of gun control will continue that dark chapter, not resolve it.2

Outweighs on **magnitude** – it expands the power of an entity that has the greatest strength on controlling minority populations and **probability** – you are strengthening the violence committed on a daily basis towards people of color that we know for sure it will happen because incidences happen in the squo

The Prision Industrial Complex is rooted in Capitalism and rentrenches violence- Turns the Case. **Schlosser** 98. Eric Schlosser, A contributor to The Atlantic since 1994, ERIC SCHLOSSER is the author of Fast Food Nation, Reefer Madness, and Chew On This. He has also written for The New Yorker, Rolling Stone, and others., 12-1-1998, "The Prison-Industrial Complex," Atlantic, <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1998/12/the-prison-industrial-complex/304669/>, accessed 1-15-2016

In the hills east of Sacramento, California, Folsom **State Prison stands beside a man-made lake, surrounded by granite walls built by inmate laborers**. The gun towers have peaked roofs and Gothic stonework that give the prison the appearance of a medieval fortress, ominous and forbidding. For more than a century Folsom and San Quentin were the end of the line in California's penal system; they were the state's only maximum-security penitentiaries. During the early 1980s, as California's inmate population began to climb, Folsom became dangerously overcrowded. Fights between inmates ended in stabbings six or seven times a week. The poor sight lines within the old cellblocks put correctional officers at enormous risk. From 1984 to 1994 California built eight new maximum-security (Level 4) facilities. The bullet holes in the ceilings of Folsom's cellblocks, left by warning shots, are the last traces of the prison's violent years. Today Folsom is a medium-security (Level 2) facility, filled with the kind of inmates that correctional officers consider "soft." No one has been stabbed to death at Folsom in almost four years. Among its roughly 3,800 inmates are some 500 murderers, 250 child molesters, and an assortment of rapists, armed robbers, drug dealers, burglars, and petty thieves. The cells in Housing Unit 1 are stacked five stories high, like boxes in a vast warehouse; glimpses of hands and arms and faces, of flickering TV screens, are visible between the steel bars. Folsom now houses almost twice as many inmates as it was designed to hold. **The machine shop at the prison, run by inmates**, manufactures steel frames for double bunks—and triple bunks—in addition to license plates. Less than a quarter mile from the old prison is the [California State Prison at Sacramento,](http://www.cdc.state.ca.us./facility/instsac.htm" \t "outlink) known as "New Folsom," which houses about 3,000 Level 4 inmates. They are the real hard cases: violent predators, gang members, prisoners unable to "program" well at other facilities, unable to obey the rules. New Folsom does not have granite walls. It has a "death-wire electrified fence," set between two ordinary chain-link fences, that administers a lethal dose of 5,100 volts at the slightest touch. The architecture of New Folsom is stark and futuristic. The buildings have smooth gray concrete façades, unadorned except for narrow slits for cell windows. Approximately a third of the inmates are serving life sentences; more than a thousand have committed at least one murder, nearly 500 have committed armed robbery, and nearly 200 have committed assault with a deadly weapon. Inmates were placed in New Folsom while it was still under construction. The prison was badly overcrowded even before it was finished, in 1987. It has at times housed more than 300 inmates in its gymnasiums. New Folsom—like old Folsom, and like the rest of the California prison system—now operates at roughly double its intended capacity. Over the past twenty years the State of California has built twenty-one new prisons, added thousands of cells to existing facilities, and increased its inmate population eightfold. Nonviolent offenders have been responsible for most of that increase. The number of drug offenders imprisoned in the state today is more than twice the number of inmates who were imprisoned for all crimes in 1978. California now has the biggest prison system in the Western industrialized world, a system 40 percent bigger than the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The state holds more inmates in its jails and prisons than do France, Great Britain, Germany, Japan, Singapore, and the Netherlands combined. [The California Department of Corrections](http://www.cdc.state.ca.us./" \t "outlink) predicts that at the current rate of expansion, barring a court order that forces a release of prisoners, it will run out of room eighteen months from now. Simply to remain at double capacity the state will need to open at least one new prison a year, every year, for the foreseeable future. **Today the United States has approximately 1.8 million people behind** **bars**: about 100,000 in federal custody, 1.1 million in state custody, and 600,000 in local jails. Prisons hold inmates convicted of federal or state crimes; jails hold people awaiting trial or serving short sentences. The United States now imprisons more people than any other country in the world—perhaps half a million more than Communist China. The American inmate population has grown so large that it is difficult to comprehend: imagine the combined populations of Atlanta, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Des Moines, and Miami behind bars. "We have embarked on a great social experiment," says Marc Mauer, the author of the upcoming book *The Race to Incarcerate.* "**No other society in human history has ever imprisoned so many of its own citizens** for the purpose of crime control." The prison boom in the United States is a recent phenomenon. Throughout the first three quarters of this century the nation's incarceration rate remained relatively stable, at about 110 prison inmates for every 100,000 people. In the mid-1970s the rate began to climb, doubling in the 1980s and then again in the 1990s. The rate is now 445 per 100,000; among adult men it is about 1,100 per 100,000. During the past two decades roughly a thousand new prisons and jails have been built in the United States. Nevertheless, America's prisons are more overcrowded now than when the building spree began, and the inmate population continues to increase by 50,000 to 80,000 people a year. The economist and legal scholar Michael K. Block, who believes that American sentencing policies are still not harsh enough, offers a straightforward explanation for why the United States has lately incarcerated so many people: "There are too many prisoners because there are too many criminals committing too many crimes." Indeed, the nation's prisons now hold about 150,000 armed robbers, 125,000 murderers, and 100,000 sex offenders—enough violent criminals to populate a medium-sized city such as Cincinnati. Few would dispute the need to remove these people from society. The level of violent crime in the United States, despite recent declines, still dwarfs that in Western Europe. But the proportion of offenders being sent to prison each year for violent crimes has actually fallen during the prison boom. In 1980 about half the people entering state prison were violent offenders; in 1995 less than a third had been convicted of a violent crime. The enormous increase in America's inmate population can be explained in large part by the sentences given to people who have committed nonviolent offenses. Crimes that in other countries would usually lead to community service, fines, or drug treatment—or would not be considered crimes at all—in the United States now lead to a prison term, by far the most expensive form of punishment. "No matter what the question has been in American criminal justice over the last generation," says Franklin E. Zimring, the director of the Earl Warren Legal Institute, "prison has been the answer. On January 17, 1961, President Dwight D. Eisenhower used his farewell address to issue a warning, as the United States continued its cold war with the Soviet Union. "In the councils of government," Eisenhower said, "we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by **the** military-industrial complex." Eisenhower had grown concerned about this new threat to democracy during the 1960 campaign, when fears of a "missile gap" with the Soviet Union were whipped up by politicians, the press, and defense contractors hoping for increased military spending. Eisenhower knew that no missile gap existed and that fear of one might lead to a costly, unnecessary response. "The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist," Eisenhower warned. "We should take nothing for granted." **Three decades after the war on crime** began, **the United States has developed a prison-industrial complex**—**a** **set** **of** bureaucratic, political, and **economic interests that encourage increased spending** on imprisonment, regardless of the actual need. The prison-industrial complex is not a conspiracy, guiding the nation's criminal-justice policy behind closed doors. It is a confluence of special interests that has given prison construction in the United States a seemingly unstoppable momentum. **It is composed of politicians**, both liberal and conservative, who have used the fear of crime to gain votes; impoverished rural areas where prisons have become a cornerstone of economic development; **private companies that regard the roughly $35 billion spent each year** on corrections not as a burden on American taxpayers but **as a lucrative market**; and government officials whose fiefdoms have expanded along with the inmate population. Since 1991 the rate of violent crime in the United States has fallen by about 20 percent, while the number of people in prison or jail has risen by 50 percent. The prison boom has its own inexorable logic. Steven R. Donziger, a young attorney who headed the [National Criminal Justice Commission](http://www.igc.org/ncia/ncjc.html" \t "outlink) in 1996, explains the thinking: "If crime is going up, then we need to build more prisons; and if crime is going down, it's because we built more prisons—and building even more prisons will therefore drive crime down even lower." **The raw material of the prison-industrial complex is its inmates**: the poor, the homeless, and the mentally ill; drug dealers, drug addicts, alcoholics, and a wide assortment of violent sociopaths. About 70 percent of the prison inmates in the United States are illiterate. Perhaps 200,000 of the country's inmates suffer from a serious mental illness. A generation ago such people were handled primarily by the mental-health, not the criminal-justice, system. Sixty to 80 percent of the American inmate population has a history of substance abuse. Meanwhile, the number of drug-treatment slots in American prisons has declined by more than half since 1993. Drug treatment is now available to just one in ten of the inmates who need it. Among those arrested for violent crimes, the proportion who are African-American men has changed little over the past twenty years. Among those arrested for drug crimes, the proportion who are African-American men has tripled. Although the prevalence of illegal drug use among white men is approximately the same as that among black men, black men are five times as likely to be arrested for a drug offense. As a result, about half the inmates in the United States are African-American. One out of every fourteen black men is now in prison or jail. One out of every four black men is likely to be imprisoned at some point during his lifetime. The number of women sentenced to a year or more of prison has grown twelvefold since 1970. Of the 80,000 women now imprisoned, about 70 percent are nonviolent offenders. About 75 percent have children.

Turn/ case study proves handgun bans in the United States lead to a militarized police state and increase violence.

**Krey:** Patrick Krey, *Gun Control Leads to Militarized Law Enforcement*. New American. Tuesday, May 11th, 2010.

If you needed another example of public officials woefully unaware of restraints on government power, look no further than **the city of Chicago**. The [Austin Weekly News](http://www.austinweeklynews.com/main.asp?SectionID=1&SubSectionID=1&ArticleID=2761" \t "_blank) reported on April 28th that State Representative LaShawn Ford (D) **is calling for the deployment of [the] National Guard units** on the streets of the Windy City to deal with escalating gang violence. Ford wants the military **to augment the 13,400 strong Chicago Police Force**, which is already the [second largest in the nation](http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/lpd03.pdf" \t "_blank). Ford, along with fellow State Rep. John Fritchey (D), is encouraging Illinois Governor Pat Quinn to work with Chicago Mayor Richard M. Daley **to militarize the streets** of the nation's third-largest city. In a press release, **Ford reasoned that local law enforcement should be backed up with armed forces because “we cannot accept it as a normal situation that someone is shot and killed** in Chicago **almost every day**, with the West Side citizens whom I represent being affected at a much greater rate.” Sadly, based on Ford’s press release, it is apparent that he is not familiar with the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 that strictly prohibits the deployment of federal armed forces from exercising normal state law enforcement functions. Proponents argue that the Posse Comitatus Act does not apply to Ford’s suggestion because the Act only prohibits National Guard units from direct involvement in local law enforcement when they are federalized, and Ford is requesting it be done solely under state authority. Such an argument overlooks the obvious fact that state national guards units are already federalized. For a long time, “state” National Guard units have been “state” entities in name only. Between the huge portion of federal funding for state guard units and the fact that units are actively deployed under federal direction in foreign war zones, the Founders’ ideas of state militias of old are as dead as the dodo bird. Ironically, the state authority defense is clearly disingenuous, as supporters of the initiative specifically cite the foreign combat training of the Guard, under federal direction, as [a chief reason](http://www.necn.com/04/25/10/Ford-cites-Iraq-in-call-for-National-Gua/landing_nation.html?blockID=222990&feedID=4207" \t "_blank) to deploy them domestically. Rep. Ford actually believes the fact that these units will be coming back with war experience from the battle field is a good thing. “We know the U.S. troops have been winning the hearts and minds in Iraq, they stabilized those communities, those communities are safe and that's what we want right here in Illinois for the National Guard to come in and help stabilize the community with the Chicago police department.” Ford’s like-minded associate and former assistant attorney general, Rep. Fritchey, repeated [similar sentiments](http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/04/26/lawmakers-military-quell-chicago-violence/" \t "_blank). “As we speak, National Guard members are working side-by-side with our troops to fight a war halfway around the world. The unfortunate reality is that we have another war that is just as deadly taking place right in our backyard.” Yes, you read that correctly! The top **advocates for deployment of National Guard units to conduct law-enforcement** in a major U.S. city **actually cite the war tactics of National Guard units as a benefit**. Can these two actually want the same occupation strategy of “[clear and hold](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clear_and_hold" \t "_blank)” used on Iraqis and Afghanis to be used for Americans? In the [Chicago Tribune](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2010-04-29/news/chi-100429hampton_briefs_1_posse-comitatus-act-police-officers-police-duties" \t "_blank), The National Black Police Association (NBPA) reacted with outrage at Ford’s suggestion in an April 29th op-ed piece written by a member of NBPA who also served in the U.S. Marines: A police department's officers are trained to enable Constitutional due process safeguards. Armies are not designed with this purpose — **armies are trained to kill**.… [O]ur members know that there is stark difference between military duties and police duties. Chicago Police Superintendent Jody Weis [weighed in](http://www.suntimes.com/news/metro/2199050,national-guard-gun-violence-chicago-042510.article" \t "_blank) on Ford’s suggestion by reminding the people that the military does not operate under the same constitutional restraints as local law enforcement and mentioned the Kent State shootings in 1970 where National Guardsmen fatally shot four student protesters and seriously injured others (which, ironically, was [just revealed by declassified FBI records](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/04/new-light-shed-on-kent-state-killings/?page=2" \t "_blank) to be instigated by a federal provocateur ). “[W]hen you mix military functions with law enforcement functions, there is sometimes a disconnect.” Weis then went on to display the same mindset that has contributed to the increasing violence by calling for “tougher gun control laws” which have been echoed by the Mayor of the city and other public officials. Already **referred to as the** **“[U.S. gun control capital](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/06/guns-needed-to-stop-chicago-murders/" \t "_blank),” Chicago has banned the private ownership of handguns** and rifles since 1982 **with some of the most stringent gun laws in the country**. The city’s excessive gun ban is currently under fire in the top Second Amendment case in the country, [McDonald v Chicago](http://www.chicagoguncase.com/" \t "_blank), which is presently before the Supreme Court. **And now, with nearly 30 years of failure and violence rising to astronomical proportions, local residents are left longing for the pre-gun control days with lower levels of violence**. Even with such blatant facts plainly staring them in the face, officials are ratcheting up their anti-gun rhetoric and renewing calls for more drastic efforts to strip citizens of the right to bear arms. Mayor Daley even [advocated](http://www.examiner.com/x-1417-Gun-Rights-Examiner~y2010m4d28-Daleys-hatred-for-right-to-keep-and-bear-arms-takes-dangerous-globalist-turn" \t "_blank) that globalist institutions like the World Court allow “plaintiffs” to sue U.S. gun manufacturers for exorbitant amounts during the Global Cities Forum at the University of Illinois-Chicago on Monday, April 26. Daley's end goal being to effectively ban the production of guns for civilians globally. Not only does Mayor Daley refuse to face the obvious facts about his own city’s abysmal failure with gun control, he seeks to spread his misery around to the entire planet. **The unfortunate occupants of Chicago have a bleak future**, indeed, as one public official after another seems committed to a policy of more government and fewer individual rights. The ideas of Daley, Ford, and their ilk for possible solutions are the “pick-your-poison” variety of more gun control or a police state lockdown on the city — with the strong likelihood that both scenarios will come to pass if they get their way. Could Chicago be only a glimpse of what the rest of America will eventually look like**: a hyper-violent, militarized region constantly under martial law and plagued with civil unrest**? If America continues to follow the same draconian policies as Chicago, then, regrettably, it seems the answer may be "yes."

Outweighs the aff offense **a)** this evidence is empirical, not just an assertion about how physical actions can affect cultural realities, **b)** specific to a handgun ban in the United States means it’s the most reliable evidence, **c)** 30 years of data proves causation means we have no reason to doubt its true

#### Turn/ the plan reentrances rape culture by not allowing for self-defense; it is not only about empirics but also about empowerment. Charles: Charles, Lindsey K. "Feminist and Firearms: Why are so many women Anti-Choice?" 2011

Some women’s issues affect only a particular class of women: maternity leave and parental benefits affect only women who choose to become mothers, access to abortion affects only women of child-bearing age, and pay discrepancies affect only women in the work force. However, **the fear of violence affects all women**.27 **Some** women **may respond** to this fear **with** denial or **a pacifist determination** to succumb rather than fight back, and that is their choice. **Others** may **decide**, after careful consideration, **that their bodies and lives are worth defending.** These **women** **must have a full range of self-defense tools in order for their choice to be meaningful. Pervasive acceptance of women’s armed self-defense could help change the current rape culture** and encourage women to take responsibility for their own safety, while working for equality and an end to patriarchy. **Guns are** safe when used by responsible adults, and are the **most effective tool for self-defense.**28 Furthermore, **removing restrictions on women’s choices increases individual freedom** and can lead to greater personal autonomy.

This is definitely relevant under the aff role of the ballot **a)** notions of military valor emphasize hyper-masculinity so re-entrenching this norm is bad, **b)** rape is domination and condoning rape condones interp-personal violence in America, only allowing for self-defense disrupts this notion