# A2 College Campuses

## 1

**Interp: *Ownership*** means having the right to control something while ***possession*** just means having physical control of something. **Charley 11**

Charley 5/6/2011, “Legal Definitions: Ownership versus Possession, Conservatorship, Bailment, Intent, Violent Crimes and Gun Laws,” The Just Call Me Charley Blog https://justcallmecharley.wordpress.com/2011/05/06/legal-definitions-ownership-versus-possession-conservatorship-bailment-intent-violent-crimes-and-gun-laws/

**Ownership is the state** or fact **of exclusive rights and control over property, which may be an object**, land/real estate or intellectual property. Ownership involves multiple rights, collectively referred to as title, which may be separated and held by different parties. The concept of ownership has existed for thousands of years and in all cultures. Over the millennia, however, and across cultures what is considered eligible to be property and how that property is regarded culturally is very different. Ownership is the basis for many other concepts that form the foundations of ancient and modern societies such as money, trade,debt, bankruptcy, the criminality of theft and private vs. public property. Ownership is the key building block in the development of the capitalist socio-economic system. The process and mechanics of ownership are fairly complex since one can gain, transfer and lose ownership of property in a number of ways. To acquire property one can purchase it with money, trade it for other property, receive it as a gift, steal it, find it, make it orhomestead it. One can transfer or lose ownership of property by selling it for money, exchanging it for other property, giving it as a gift, being robbed of it, misplacing it, or having it stripped from one’s ownership through legal means such as eviction, foreclosure,seizure or taking. Ownership is self-propagating in that the owner of any property will also own the economic benefits of that property. POSSESSION: DEFINED The concept of possession developed from a legal system whose principal concern was to avoid civil disorder. The general principle is that a person in possession of land or goods, even as a wrongdoer, is entitled to take action against anyone interfering with the possession unless the person interfering is able to demonstrate a superior right to do so. **Possession refers to the exercise of dominion over property, holding** or having property **in one’s power.** It is the right under which a person can exercise control over something to the exclusion of all others. It is a continuing exercise of a claim to the exclusive use of **a material object.** In Civil law, possession refers to detention or use of a physical thing **with the intent to hold it as one’s own.** Possession means holding property in one’s power or the exercise of dominion over property. By having possession one exercises control over something to the exclusion of all others. In law, possession is the control a person intentionally exercises toward a thing. In all cases, to possess something, a person must have an intention to possess it. A person may be in possession of some property (although **possession does not always imply ownership**). Like ownership, the possession of things is commonly regulated by states under property law.

They’re distinct – you can possess things you don’t own – i.e. carrying around someone else’s gun. You can own things you don’t possess – i.e. you lend your friend your gun, but you’re still the gun’s owner.

To clarify, the aff may not restrict where one can *take* or *carry* guns (like a college campus) but may restrict *conditions* on owning guns – i.e., not being a felon. They can’t say “ban ownership in a specific place” because ownership doesn’t depend on where an object is taken. Restricting the carrying of a weapon in a specific place is a restriction on possession.

**Violation:**

Banning guns on college campuses is a ban on possession, not ownership –

A. They allow me to own handguns as long as I don’t bring them on campus

B. They restrict possession of guns that aren’t owned – ie I can be punished for bringing a friends gun onto campus even if I don’t own it

**Standards:**

**1. Legal Context –** My interp is most consistent with legal interpretations. **West’s Law 08**

West's Encyclopedia of American Law, edition 2. Copyright 2008 The Gale Group, Inc. All rights reserved. Retrieved from The Free Dictionary [http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Possession+versus+Ownership](http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Possession%2Bversus%2BOwnership)

Although the two terms are often confused, **possession is not the same as ownership.** No legal rule states that "possession is nine-tenths of the law," but this phrase is often used to suggest that someone who possesses an object is most likely its owner. Likewise, people often speak of the things they own, such as clothes and dishes, as their possessions. However, **the owner** of an object **may not always possess the object. For example, an owner of a car could lend it to someone** else to drive. That driver would then possess the car. However, **the owner does not give up ownership simply by lending the car** to someone else.

Prefer this evidence – legal context is key since government is the only cooperative venture that has the power to enforce gun control. West’s Law is a reputable legal dictionary and distinguishes two legal terms of art, which makes it more precise and better divides ground that ensures we maximize quality of discussion.

It’s also consistent with common usage – if I ask whether you own a BMW, you wouldn’t say yes because your friend lent it to you, you’d say no, it’s my friend’s – my interp is key to division of ground by comparing legal restrictions – ensures we equally engage on issues to maximize discussion.

**2. Limits –** Their interp explodes AFF ground – they can advocate for tiny restrictions on gun carrying, such as not being able to bring guns on planes or at conventions – also avoids key neg args like property rights and self-defense that require restrictions on *ownership.* It also makesthem extra T since they ban possession of guns people don’t own, which kills clash by allowing infinite affs outside the scope of the topic with unpredictable offense – key to advocacy skills by ensuring they defend their position against objections.

Advocacy skills is a voter – there are a lot of messed up things in the world and we need to defend advocacies to learn how to fix them – it’s also the most important skill we develop from debate since it helps us outside the round

Drop the debater on T:

A. The round is already skewed from the beginning because their advocacy excluded by ability to generate NC offense– letting them sever doesn’t solve any of the abuse

B. Drop the arg on T is the same thing as drop the debater since T indicts their advocacy – turns have to link back to an advocacy so kicking case doesn’t solve

Use competing interps since reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.

No rvis:

**A.** They force the round to be decided on theory—kills all substantive clash on other flows since there’s no topical debate.. **B.** RVIs devolve into infinite regress because if we can run RVIs, we can also run reverse RVIs: we can never reach the end of the chain. Logic comes first because it indicts the assumptions behind their arguments. **C.** They can run theory on me too if I’m unfair which means 1) theory is reciprocal because we’re both able to check abuse and 2) also cures time skew because they can collapse in the 2ar to their shell.

## 2

**Counterplan text: \_\_** AFF actor \_\_ ought to ban the private ownership of handguns on college campuses for all individuals except for professors that receive a concealed carry permit, a certificate from a local law enforcement academy, psychiatric evaluation, and take tri-annual shooting courses. **Murdock 16**

 “This Town Is Encouraging Teachers To Carry Guns. Here’s Their Reasoning,” The Huffington Post, Sebastian Murdock, 02/05/16.

At the beginning of the current academic year, the Okay Public School Board of Education instituted a policy laying out how teachers with a concealed carry permit could obtain permission to bring a gun to school. On Monday, the policy drew a little more public attention. The old “Gun Free School Zone” signs were replaced with new signs warning that armed staff members “may use whatever force is necessary to protect our students,” the Muskogee Phoenix reports. “No specific incident caused us to pass this policy,” McMahan said. “But with everything that’s going on in the world, we’ve heard that you may possibly see more attacks from radical groups looking for children.”¶ The town of Okay has a population of roughly 650 people and only one local police officer. Law enforcement officers from nearby Wagoner take about 10 minutes to respond to any given situation, McMahan said.¶ “If a shooting situation were to happen, which we pray it never will, seconds matter,” he said.¶ Along with having a concealed carry permit, teachers participating in the program must have a certificate from Oklahoma’s Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training, receive a psychiatric evaluation and take a shooting course three times a year. ¶ Participating teachers must have their weapon on them or secured in a lockbox, according to the policy. The guns must be .45 caliber or less. And McMahan said they must be “name brand” guns. But what if an angry or upset student gets hold of a teacher’s firearm? What if a gun is lost on school grounds? What if a teacher accidentally discharges the weapon?¶ “The risks are outweighed by the threats that are out there,” McMahan said. “The chances of a student getting ahold of one of the guns would be very, very slim.”

Arming teachers ensures a safe space for academia – solves the AFF and solvency deficit for the AFF. **Siebold 13**

“Every Teacher in America Should Have a Gun,” Steve Siebold, 2013, Huffington Post.

Then there was the Pearl High School shooting in 1997 when a student killed two classmates and injured seven others at his high school. An assistant principal, who was armed, intervened and held the shooter at gun point until police arrived, and most probably prevented more people from being killed.¶ I believe that very shortly, carrying a firearm will become a requirement for all teachers and school administrators. It’s the way it has to be and if teachers aren’t comfortable with that they’re going to have to find a new profession.¶ In a perfect world we wouldn’t need to take such measures. But until that happens, critical thinking suggests that we all exercise our second amendment rights, arm our teachers and school officials to ensure the safety of our children, voice our support and keep a close eye on anti-gun crusaders who want to make our decisions for us. A school should be a safe haven where children can learn and grow. And right now, arming teachers is the only practical solution.

Violence prevention is key to ensuring a safe learning environment for students to grow. **NDPC 16**

“Safe Learning Environments,” National Dropout Prevention Center/Network, Clemson University, 2016.

Violence has become part of the fabric of our society. It is pervasive on television, in sports, music, video games, and even in our schools and workplaces. Schools are no longer safe havens for children. The Educational Development Center (1996) found that only half of the children felt safe in school. Approximately 160,000 students per day miss school because they fear physical harm (Educational Development Center, 1996). Students cannot learn in an unsafe environment. A welcoming environment is particularly important for those students who are struggling in school and need extra support.¶ Safe Learning Environments Are Needed¶ The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) gathered statistics for the 1999-2000 school year and reported:¶ approximately 5,000 instances of rape or other types of sexual battery;¶ about 12,000 incidents of physical attacks or fights involving weapons;¶ around 23,000 robberies;¶ approximately 806,000 fights or physical attacks not involving weapons;¶ about 218,000 thefts; and¶ around 211, 000 acts of vandalism (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003).¶ It is important that social and behavior problems be identified in the lower elementary grades. Antisocial and aggressive behaviors are strong predictors for dropping out of school. Early intervention is important to head of future problems (Duttweiler and Smink, 1997). It’s obvious that violence prevention and conflict resolution are important for all students, not just those at-risk of dropping out. A comprehensive safe school plan is vital to the well-being of the students. Approximately 30 states have passed legislation recommending that every school develop a safe school plan. The No Child Left Behind Act provides for identifying and labeling “persistently dangerous” schools. Students in these schools have the option of transferring to a safe school within their district.¶ What Is A Safe Learning Environment?¶ It is difficult to create a balance between a safe school and a welcoming, caring environment. It is important to create a school climate that does not tolerate bullying, intimidation, and terrorism. Students who are afraid often stay away from school. A safe learning environment is focused on academic achievement, maintaining high standards, fostering positive relationships between staff and students, and encouraging parental and community involvement.¶ Resolving conflict and preventing violence are important factors in creating a safe learning environment. Students respond to conflict by confronting it, usually in a violent manner, or avoiding it. Neither of these responses helps them to learn how to deal with conflict in an appropriate way. Students need to learn effective interpersonal skills to cope in group situations (Hamby, 1999). It is important for students to know how to deescalate conflict, manage it, and resolve it (Schargel & Smink, 2001).¶ Safe school planning is an ongoing, comprehensive process which should involve the entire community. The plan should cover behavioral and property aspects of crime prevention. There are seven basic steps in the planning process:¶ Identify your safe school planning committee members;¶ Assess data on school crime;¶ Identify school safety strategies and programs;¶ Ensure that school procedures comply with existing laws related to schools;¶ Hold a public meeting before your school adopts the plan;¶ Make the plan available for public review; and¶ Amend the plan once a year, as needed (Stephens, 2004, p. 80).¶ Expected Benefits¶ For students to learn, they must attend school. A welcoming and accepting environment motivates students to attend school. Research has shown that school violence also has an impact on the community. Forty percent of boys identified as bullies had three or more convictions by age 24 (Fight Crime, 2003, p. 5).¶ Impact of Safe Learning Environments¶ Anti-bullying and anti-aggression programs have proven to be effective in reducing misbehavior, vandalism and general delinquency (Fight Crime, 2003). Students dropout of school for many reasons, but violence and conflict are contributing factors to placing students at-risk.

### **IMPACT – Gun Free Zone**

Students fear school shootings, causing increases in homeschooling – O/W on loss of discussion. **HSLDA 99**

“Public School Failures,” National Center for Home Education (of Home School Legal Defense Association), 1999.

While politicians and pundits debate the cause of the recent shooting tragedy in Littleton, Colorado, parents have decided to take matters into their own hands by considering home schooling their children.¶ Phone call inquiries to various state home school associations throughout the country have jumped since the Columbine shootings on April 20. ¶ Due to fear of a similar situation many students fear going back to the public schools. There is some consensus among home schooling advocates that the Columbine incident has caused an rise in interest of home education as an alternative to public education. Joe Adams co-director of the Christian Home Educators of Kentucky is expecting a 25% increase in attendance for this years state convention.¶ Christian Home Educators of Colorado (CHEC) have been swarmed with inquiries. Calls have increased fivefold, from about 60 a month to over 300. CHEC holds monthly workshops to explain home schooling laws, curriculums and philosophies to curious parents. Participation grew from 15 in February to 45 in May to 500 for the June session.¶ In Colorado, in the month after the Columbine shootings, the state education department fielded 68 calls about home schooling, about 60 percent more than usual, said Suzie Parker, who oversees home schooling for that agency. (excerpts from “Brave New Schools,” Paul Chesser, World Net Daily 1999, “Home School Queries Spike After Shootings,” by Lynn Schnaiberg, Education Week, June 9, 1999)¶ Public School Students Fear Violence¶ Many American teenagers believe a shooting rampage like the one last week in Littleton, Colo., could happen at their school and think they know students -who might be troubled enough to carry one out, according to a new Wash-ington Post-ABC News poll of teenagers and parents ...¶ About a third of the teenagers have heard a student threaten to kill someone, and few of them reported the threats to a teacher or other adult. Four out of 10 say they know students troubled enough to be potential killers. (from “Teens Nationwide See Signs of Potential¶ School Violence,” by Hanna Rosin and Claudia Deane, Washington Post, April 27, 1999, p.A1)¶

Declaring schools entirely gun-free zones encourages assailants to target schools. **Johnson 13**

“Stop School Shootings By Letting Teachers and Principals Carry Guns,” Johnson Family Writings, 2013.

Gun control laws do not protect good people; they disarm good people. Bad people are encouraged, not intimidated, by gun control laws. Criminals, by definition, break the law – how is a new law going to prevent them from carrying a gun when they’re breaking a law to use it in a crime in the first place? A placard outside of a school or hospital is not going to prevent a criminal from carrying a gun onto the property. The placards may make the criminals more likely to use their gun, however. Criminals prefer a disarmed population. Defenseless people are easier to victimize. Criminals aren’t stupid - “gun-free zones” are the safest places to kill people and that’s why most of the mass murders in our nation take place at these locations. The gun control policies of the public school system are almost as deadly as their Planned Parenthood-sponsored sex education classes.

Gun free zones increase the amount of violent crime because citizens are unarmed and have no means of protecting themselves. **Blackwell 15**

Blackwell, Ken. "Ban Gun-free Zones." Washington Times. October 7, 2015. Accessed January 4, 2016. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/oct/7/ken-blackwell-ban-gun-free-zones/>. NBP

“Gun-free” zones are purported to forestall gun violence, but in practice they attract deranged gunmen like porch lights attract moths. Why? Because deranged gunmen are crazy, not stupid. An identified gun-free zone literally advertises the ideal environment for committing mass murder. Mass shootings are committed by mentally ill people to achieve a form of immortality, or by political zealots to terrorize the public. They know the more they kill, the more publicity they’ll get.s They also know the only way they will be stopped is by a good guy with a gun, so they choose to attack in places where they know nobody else will be armed. Most mass shootings don’t end until the police arrive. Killers typically have several minutes to slaughter as many victims as they can without fear of interference. At least one mass murderer explained in his “manifesto” that he took armed resistance into account when choosing his target. According to[CPRC](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/crime-prevention-research-center/), California killer Eliot Rodger, who murdered six University of California-Santa Barbara students in 2014, wrote, “I figured this would be the perfect day to attack Isla Vista, but after watching YouTube videos of previous Deltopia parties, I saw that there were way too many cops walking around on such an event. It would be impossible to kill enough of my enemies before being dispatched by those damnable cops.”

Almost all mass shootings that took place in Europe and America have been in “gun-free areas” where citizens can’t fight back. **Lott 15**

Lott, John. "A Look at the Facts on Gun-Free Zones." National Review Online. October 20, 2015. Accessed January 4, 2016. [http://www.nationalreview.com/article/425802/gun-free-zones-don't-save-lives-right-to-carry-laws-do](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/425802/gun-free-zones-don%27t-save-lives-right-to-carry-laws-do). NBP

But it is getting hard to ignore that mass public shooters keep choosing to attack locations where victims can’t defend themselves. It’s little wonder that gun-control advocates resort to desperate tactics. There have been a series of articles from Politico, the Huffington Post, Slate, and the New York Daily News with similar titles meant to cast doubt on defensive gun use, such as “the myth of the good guy with the gun.” Since at least 1950, all but two public mass shootings in America have taken place where general citizens are banned from carrying guns. In Europe, there have been no exceptions. Every mass public shooting — and there have been plenty of mass shooting in Europe — has occurred in a gun-free zone. In addition, they have had three of the six worst K–12 school shootings, and Europe experienced by far the worst mass public shooting perpetrated by a single individual (Norway in 2011, which from the shooting alone left 67 people dead and 110 wounded).

### **A2 Concealed**

Concealed weapons don’t harm the learning environment. **SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. IP

Ask anyone in a ‘right to carry’ state when he or she last noticed another person carrying a concealed handgun. The word ‘concealed’ is there for a reason. Concealed handguns would no more distract college students from learning than they currently distract moviegoers from enjoying movies or office workers from doing their jobs.¶ In most states with ‘shall-issue’ concealed carry laws, the rate of concealed handgun licensure is between 1% and 3%. Therefore, statistically speaking, a packed 300-seat movie theater contains between three and nine individuals licensed to carry concealed handguns, and a shopping mall crowded with 1,000 shoppers contains between 10 and 30 individuals licensed to carry concealed handguns. Students who aren’t too afraid to attend movies or go shopping and who aren’t distracted from learning by the knowledge that a classmate might be illegally carrying a firearm shouldn’t be distracted from learning by the knowledge that a classmate might be legally carrying a firearm. To emphasize the point once more, these same students carry responsibly and without distracting others when they go to the movies and malls on the weekends. What changes when they step onto a college campus?

## 3

[If neolib, which it probably is.]

Guns are key to resistance against the total system of capitalism. **Lee 13**

Daniel Lee (Writer on Civil Rights, Gun Control, and Culture), A Marxist-Leninist response to Gun Control, Daily Kos, 2013. NS

In a recent editorial piece published by Peoples World, the newspaper of the CPUSA, titled “Guns, profits and Sandy Hook” – the article started by opening with the need for the country to “get serious about regulating guns.” It pontificates further, giving a perfunctory nod to universal health access as “a piece of the puzzle” to preventing the epidemic of gun violence. The editorial then issues a call for a “broad enough coalition to confront and curb those who profit from manufacturing and dealing in these individual weapons of mass destruction”. It places the blame squarely on the gun lobbyists, and the corporations that profit from the sale of guns. The article ends finally in demanding a “Ban [of] assault weapons and high capacity bullet clips”. This article, which could have been written by any bourgeois Democrat or liberal group from Nancy Pelosi to Moveon.org, buys into the reactionary “liberal” approach of treating the symptom without curing the disease. Certainly those profiting off of the sale of weapons through the promotion of violence and racism must be made accountable for their exploitation and oppression of our fellow workers – and let us not forget that the US Government is one of the largest gun runners in the world, fueling instability, murder, and genocide of the proletariat around the globe, a fact PW conveniently leaves out. The article fails to mention that nearly 2,000 civilians were wounded in our War of Imperialism in Afghanistan , Pakistan, and Iraq during the first six months of 2012. About 1,145 civilians were killed in that same time period, according to U.N. totals. James Holmes’, Adam Lanza’s, and other serial killers’ crimes are dwarfed by this monstrosity in comparison, making the US government by far the most psychotic killer, still at large and continuing to slaughter men, women and children by the thousands. These figures don’t even take into account the hundreds of unarmed civilians slaughtered by uniformed bourgeois Police gangs across the country. Where is PW’s outrage to this crime? Where is the demand to confiscate the government’s guns? As Marxist-Leninists, we must approach the issue of gun control as we do any other issue – under the scientific principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and practice. We affirm first and foremost the absolute supremacy of the interests of the working class, and the necessity of revolution for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat to completely overthrow the oppression of the Bourgeois state and its minions. As Marx and Engels famously wrote at the end of the Communist Manifesto, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.” When we talk about gun ownership then, we must talk about the rights of the workers to bear arms. One way or another, the bourgeois will exert their will through force either directly or indirectly, and usually through the cats-paw of the government and its military and police institutions to repress the working class and protect their own property interests. How then shall the workers protect their interests? As Marx writes, "The arming of the whole proletariat with rifles, guns, and ammunition should be carried out at once [and] the workers must ... organize themselves into an independent guard, with their own chiefs and general staff. ... [The aim is] that the bourgeois democratic Government not only immediately loses all backing among the workers, but from the commencement finds itself under the supervision and threats of authorities behind whom stands the entire mass of the working class. ...As soon as the new Government is established they will commence to fight the workers. In order that this party (i.e., the democrats) whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the first hour of victory, should be frustrated in its nefarious work, it is necessary to organize and arm the proletariat." - Karl Marx, Address to the Communist League (1850). This quote sounds as if it were written for the times we are facing today! However, Dialectical Materialism teaches us that the issues and struggles of history are cyclical, and though taking new forms, at the heart of the struggle remains the eternal war for class dominance. Moving forward to Lenin, the great leader of the October Revolution in Russia, we see that he too advocated arming the workers: “The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people. Most of the official Social-Democrats in Europe and most of our own Menshevik leaders, however, have “forgotten” or put aside the Party’s programme, substituting chauvinism (“defencism”) for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics. Yet now of all times, at the present revolutionary moment, it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would “not be enough” arms to go round, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organizing a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is “not enough” to go round, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army. The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should merge into a single militia consisting of all the people.” - A Proletarian Militia by VI Lenin Comrade Stalin, the fierce defender of the fledgling workers’ Soviet democracy and the Champion against Nazi aggression, said that the “most important countermeasure against counterrevolution is the arming of the workers and peasants.” Finally, from the writings of the revered leader and liberator of the Chinese people, Mao Zedong, we find this important commentary on the role of the Red Army: "The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations." Certainly, each statement above applies to a particular instance in time at that particular stage of revolution in each writer’s respective countries. However, the principle remains the same. The workers must be made able to protect and defend themselves. In some cases, such as in 1916 Russia, the bourgeois were even willing to finance a workers militia - to protect their own interests – which Lenin said should be paid for by the bourgeoisie, but that the militia must above all protect the workers both from external threats, and from the bourgeois within the gates. At this point in time, the bourgeois state is not in a state of flux which would necessitate them calling upon the workers to form militias – in fact, such a thing is considered a threat to the Imperialist State’s hegemonic domination. Thus we can expect no checks to be coming in the mail from the rich for the funding of workers’ protection. However, we must still encourage the exercising of such rights still granted to all people by the Bourgeoisie state for the protection of the working class and minorities. We can take a lesson from the Black Panthers, who encouraged black communities to arm and protect themselves instead of relying on the unpredictable and brutal police forces and judicial system for protection. We can encourage the formation of community defense groups which are founded along class lines, upholding and protecting the rights of oppressed minorities. We can encourage and sponsor gun safety training, and work to create the best conditions possible for working class neighborhoods to protect themselves. We can encourage organized labor to stand together in solidarity to help protect the schools and surrounding communities, creating a “thin red line” of our own which acts as a deterrent against crimes from any source. And in the center must be the party, directing, protecting, and organizing the workers defense. Lenin would do no less.

The rhetoric of democratic accountability is a Trojan horse for neo-liberal dominance by the U.S.

Evans, Southampton politics professor, 2001 (Tony, the Politics of Human Rights pg. 86-88)

Democracy and Global Order Why then have the generally held assumptions about human rights and democracy been so vigorously promoted in some quarters? The answer to this question is found by looking at the failure of development in the less developed world. According to this argument, the threat of social unrest, which would disrupt the supply of raw materials, restrict investment opportunities and severely damage prospects for exploiting low-cost labour, cannot be avoided by using coercive policing and military suppression, as it was during the Cold War period. During the Cold War such coercion was legitimated by the argument that the threat of communism justified support for any tyrannical government provided it was avowedly anti-communist (Mahbubani 1992). Violence was justified 'because the Third World people were being killed to protect them from the evil incarnate -communism' (Shivji 1999: 257). The collapse of the Soviet bloc removed this rationale for maintaining order at the expense of human rights and justice. Instead, policy makers turned to democracy as the moral justification for maintaining economic and political relations with governments known to violate human rights. This left those who trade with repressive regimes, or those who want to maintain cordial relations for political reasons, with the dilemma of promoting a new rationale that justified continuing economic and political relations. The distinction between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, which assumes that the former represents a transitory stage in the move to full democracy, while the latter does not, offers a well-known foundation for resolving this dilemma (Kirkpatrick 1982). The success of this move can be judged by the way that the democracy discourse increasingly replaces the human rights discourse in US foreign policy circles (Carothers 1994). Through this device, it remains legitimate to continue with economic relationships, to call for extended aid programmes and to develop new trade and business relations, unhindered by moral concerns, provided a country has created the institutions of democracy. However, the promotion of democracy was not necessarily concerned with social justice, human rights, human security or ideas of human worth, but the need to create an appropriate global order for the continued expansion of global capital. In support of this aim, powerful capitalist states sought to promote democracy in its procedural guise: as a set of democratic institutions rather than as a means of achieving social and economic transformation that would have empowered the poor and the socially excluded. This form of 'low-intensity democracy' may be understood as a component of 'low-intensity conflict', a policy that the US sought to promote as a means of securing anti-communist and antireformist support that avoided either unstable representative democratic systems or military dictatorship: Democracy was thus used as a form of intervention. Its intent was to pre-empt either progressive reform or revolutionary change.Beyond seeking to demobilise popular forces, it also sought to legitimise the status quo. Authoritarianism was thus discredited and delegitimised. The new 'democratic' regime, which temporarily enjoys increased legitimacy, can in fact undertake economic and social policies of 'adjustment' that impose new hardships on the general population and compromise economic sovereignty. The paradox of Low Intensity Democracy is that a civilianised conservative regime can pursue painful and even repressive social and economic policies with more impunity and with less popular resistance than can an openly authoritarian regime. From the point ofview of the US and conservative domestic elites in these countries, this quality must make it an interesting and useful alternative to traditional overt authoritarianism. (Gills, Rocamora & Wilson 1993: 8) This paradox does not escape the consciousness of citizens where low-intensity democracy operates. As incidents of resistance to globalization often remind us, the economic conditions suffered by many people, together with an absence of basic liberties, stimulates challenges to established systems of government, which are seen 'domestically as predatory and corrupt and internationally, servile executors of the economic agenda of ruling classes of the major OECD nations' (Cheru 1997: 164). By adopting a definition of democracy that places emphasis on the creation of formal institutions, which promises limited changes to civil and political rights but has little to say about economic and social reform, 'repressive abuses of human rights continue usually against the familiar targets of labour, students, the left and human rights activists' (Gills, Rocamora & Wilson 1993: 21). For those countries who adopt the institutions of low-intensity democracy, the economic support offered by international financial institutions and aid programmes, together with the promise of corporate investment, is conditional upon maintaining a particular type of democracy that plays a crucial role in maintaining the conditions of globalization. If reformist groups attempt to transcend the limitations imposed by low-intensity democracy, and instead promote a version of popular democracy that includes social reform and justice, then support is withdrawn and the spectre of military intervention surfaces (Chomsky 1998). In short, democracy often means little more than a 'thin veneer of Western parliamentary institutions and the 'rule of law', all of which are intended to subdue ethnic, cultural and religious tensions in the effort to secure an order fit for economic growth and development (Mahbubani 1992). For critics of democracy, however, the claim to have established a democratic form of government must rest upon something more than the introduction of formal institutions, which often do nothing to provide for social, economic and political reforms or the rights of the people. In countries where low-intensity democracy operates, governments give little attention to developing an open, rights-based culture. On the contrary, the governments of low-intensity democracies commonly work to ensure that trade unions are weak, wages are kept at a level beneath that necessary for a dignified life, non-governmental organizations are marginalized or declared illegal and the press and media are censored. The practice of offering fledgling democracies technical and training assistance to strengthen some state institutions -the police and the military, for example -can provide the means for maintaining a domestic order that pays little attention to human rights and social justice (Carothers 1994; HRW 1999). Furthermore, the social structures and traditions that support low intensity democracy often mean that in practice access to public office is restricted to particular groups. While the existence of the institutions of democracy may help to legitimate external relations, particularly where the established democracies of advanced technological states remain squeamish about trading with authoritarian governments, the protection of universal human rights is not necessarily guaranteed. Although some commentators defend the introduction of low-intensity democracy, arguing that it is the first stage in a journey that ends in full democratic participation and social reform, Gills, Rocamora and Wilson argue that it is more accurate to understanding it as an end in itself -as a way of maintaining an order that supports the interests of global and national capital.

Giroux’s critical pedagogy reinforces neoliberalism by emphasizing pedagogy of experience that denounces objective truths and commonality necessary to challenge capitalism. **Zavarzadeh 03**

Mas'ud Zavarzadeh, “The Pedagogy of Totality,” Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition (U.S.). JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory, Volume 23, Number 1, 2003. UNT Digital Library.

**The** pedagogy of appearance focuses on cultural representation and the role of representation in constructing the represented. By centering teaching in the machinery of "representation," it obliterates the objective. Reducing pedagogy to lessons in cultural semiotics, it makes "experience" of the pleasures of "depth less" surfaces the measure of reality and thus obscures the social relations of production that are the material conditions of that experience. However, "This 'lived' experience is not a given, given by a pure 'reality,' but the spontaneous 'lived experience' of ideology in its peculiar relationship to the real" (Althusser 223). The ideological value of the concept of "experience" in de-conceptualizing pedagogy will perhaps become more clear in examining the way bourgeois radical pedagogues, such as Giroux, deploy experience as an instance of spontaneity to eviscerate class as an explanatory concept by which the social relations of property are critiqued. In his Impure Actsa book devoted to marginalizing explanatory concepts and popularizing "hybrids" and that, in effect, justifies political opportunism in pedagogy-**Giroux repeats** the claims of such other cultural phenomenologists as Stuart Hall, Judith Butler, and Robin Kelley **that** "class" is "lived through race**"** (28). Class, in other words, is an affect. He represents this affective view of class as epistemological resistance against class which, he claims, is a universal category that takes the "difference" of race out of class. As I have already argued, epistemology is used in mainstream pedagogy as a cover for a reactionary class politics that does several things, as Giroux demonstrates. First, it segregates the "black" proletariat from the "white" proletariat and isolates both from other "racial" proletariats. In doing so, Giroux's pedagogy carries out the political agenda of capital-to pit one segment of the proletariat against the other and to turn the unity of the working class into contesting (race) "differences**."** Second, it rewrites the system of wage labor itself into a hybrid. Giroux's experience-ism obscures the systematicity of wage labor and argues that there is no capitalism operating with a single logic of exploitation. Instead, there are many, aleatory, ad hoc, local arrangements between employees and employers depending on the color of the worker not the laws of motion of capital. Third, it converts capitalism from an economic system based on the "exploitation" of humans by humans (wage labor) through the ownership of the means of production-into an institution of cultural "oppression" based on "power." Fourth, since class is lived through race, it is not an objective fact (the relation of the worker to ownership of the means of production) but a subjective experience. The experience of ("living") class through race, like all experiences, is contingent, aleatory, and indeterminate. Class (lived through the experience of race) is thus reconstituted as contingent-an accident not a necessity of wage labor. Fifth, since capitalism is not a system but a series of ad hoc arrangements of exchange with various workers of diverse colors, it does not produce an objective binary class system but only cultural differences. One cannot, therefore, obtain objective knowledge of capitalism. There are, in short, no laws of motion of capital; there are only "experiences" of work influenced by one's color. Consequently, to say-as I have said-that capitalism is a regime of exploitation is simply a totalitarian closure. We cannot know what capitalism is because, according to Giroux's logic, it is fraught with differences (of race) not the singularity of "surplus labor." In Giroux's pedagogy, there is no capitalism ("totality"), only cultural effects of capitals without capitalism ("differences"). Giroux represents his gutting of class as a radical and groundbreaking notion that will lead to liberation of the oppressed. However, he never completes the logic of his argument because in the end it will deground his position and turn it into epistemological nonsense and political pantomime. If class is a universal category that obliterates the difference of race, there is (on the basis of such a claim) no reason not to say that race is also a universal category because it obliterates the difference of sexuality (and other differences), which is, by the same logic, itself a universal category since it obliterates the difference of age (and other differences), which is itself a universal category because it obliterates the difference of (dis )ability (and other differences), which is itself a universal category because it obliterates the difference of class (and other differences). In short, the social**, in Giroux's** pedagogy is a circle of oppressions, none of whose components can explain any structural relations; each simply absorbs the other ("class is actually lived through race," paraphrasing Giroux) and thus points back to itself as a local knowledge of the affective, difference, and contingency. Class explains race; it does not absorb it as an experience (see Butler, "Merely"), nor does it reduce it to the contingencies of ethnicities (Hall, "New") or urban performativities (Kelley, Yo '). To put it differently**,** since in this pluralism of oppressions each element cancels out the explanatory capacity of all others, the existing social relations are reaffirmed in a pragmatic balancing of differences. Nothing changes, everything is resignified. The classroom of experience reduces all concepts (which it marks as "grand narratives") to affects ("little stories") and, instead of explaining the social in order to change it, only "interprets" it as a profusion of differences. Teaching becomes an affirmation of the singular-as-is; its lessons "save the honor of the name" (see Lyotard, Postmodern 82). Giroux's program is a mimesis of the logic of the ruling ideology: as in all pedagogies of affect, it redescribes the relation of the subject of knowledge with the world but leaves the world itself intact by reifying the signs of "difference" (see Rorty, Contingency 53, 73). The subject, as I will discuss later in my analysis of Cary Nelson's radical pedagogy, feels differently about itself in a world that remains what it was Giroux is putting forth a class-cleansing pedagogy: he erases class from teaching in the name of epistemology ("totalization"). But as I have already argued, epistemology is not an issue for Giroux; it is an alibi for hollowing out from class its economic explanatory power. Epistemology in bourgeois pedagogy is class politics represented as "theory"-whose aim is to turn class into a cultural aleatory experience. In Giroux's phenomenological experientialism, **lived experience is an excuse for advancing the cause of capital in a populist logic** (respect for the ineluctable "experience" of the student) so that the student, the future worker, is trained as one who understands the world only through the sense-able-his own "unique" experience as black, white, or brown; man or woman; gay or straight-but never as a proletariat: a person who, regardless of race, sexuality, gender, age, or (dis )ability has to sell his or her labor power to capital in order to obtain subsistence wages in exchange. Experience, in Giroux's pedagogy, becomes a self-protecting "inside" that resists world-historical knowledge as an intrusion from "outside"; it thus valorizes ignorance as a mark of the authenticity and sovereignty of the subject-as independence and free choice.

Left academia has fallen under the spell of pluralism. In the name of radical openness, necessary concepts of universal truth and fundamental commonality have been abandoned when they are most needed to challenge the totalizing system of capitalism. The irony is that these ideas have nonetheless resulted in closure, eliminating the hope for a politics of emancipation grounded in class struggle. **Wood 6**

Wood 6 (Ellen Meiksins, Author of “The Pristine Culture of Capitalism” and Ed. Monthly Review, in “In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda”, Ed. Ellen Wood and John Foster, p. 10-14)

In its defeatist submission to apparently uncontrollable forces combined with a surrender to, and sometimes even a celebration of, consumerism, the postmodernist current seems to represent an intellectual manifestation of Mills's robots. But where Mills appears to have held the elitist view that workers were more likely to be robots, leaving it for students and intellectuals to rise above the robotic condition, now it is those very intellectuals who have become, so to speak, the cheerful robot's theoretical consciousness. It would be easy after having said all this just to dismiss the current fashions. But for all their contradictions, their lack of historical sensitivity, their apparently unconscious repetition of old themes, and their defeatism, they are also responding to something real, to real conditions in the contemporary world in the current conditions of capitalism, with which people on the socialist left must come to terms. None of us would want to deny the importance of some postmodernist themes. For instance, the history of the twentieth century could hardly inspire confidence in traditional notions of progress, and those of us who profess to believe in some kind of "progressive" politics have to come to terms with all that has happened to undermine Enlightenment optimism. And who would want to deny the importance of "identities" other than class, of struggles against sexual and racial oppression, or the complexities of human experience in such a mobile and changeable world, with such fragile and shifting solidarities? At the same time, who can be oblivious to the resurgence of "identities" like nationalism as powerful, and often destructive, historical forces? Don't we have to come to terms with the restructuring of capitalism, now both more global and more "segmented" than ever before? For that matter, who is unaware of the structural changes that have transformed the nature of the working class itself? And what serious socialist has ever been unconscious of the racial or sexual divisions within the working class? Who would want to subscribe to the kind of ideological and cultural imperialism that suppresses the multiplicity of human values and cultures or disdains the particular "knowledges" of non-privileged groups, with their own wealth of experience and skills? And how can we possibly deny the importance of language and cultural politics in a world so dominated by symbols, images, and "mass communication," not to mention the "information superhighway"? Who would deny these things in a world of global capitalism so dependent on the manipulation of symbols and images in a an emancipatory universalism amounts to the same thing as capitalist expansionism or imperialism, and whether the fruits of "Western" science and technology must by definition serve the needs of capitalist exploitation, accumulation, and the destruction of nature that inevitably accompanies them. 7 At any rate, we are living in a historical moment that more than any other demands a universalistic project. This is a historical moment dominated by capitalism, the most universal system the world has culture of advertisement, where the "media" mediate our own most personal experiences, sometimes to the point where what we see on television seems more real than our own lives, and where the terms of political debate are set—and narrowly constricted—by the dictates of capital in the most direct way, as knowledge and communication are increasingly in the hands of corporate giants? We don't have to accept postmodernist assumptions in order to see all these things. On the contrary, these developments cry out for a materialist explanation. For that matter, there have been few cultural phenomena in human history whose material foundations are more glaringly obvious than those of postmodernism itself. There is, in fact, no better confirmation of historical materialism than the connection between postmodernist culture and a consumerist and mobile global capitalism. Nor does a materialist approach mean that we have to devalue or denigrate the cultural dimensions of human experience. A materialist understanding is, instead, an essential step in liberating culture from the stranglehold of commodification. Postmodernists reject Enlightenment universalism on the grounds that it denies the diversity of human experience, cultures, values, and identities; but this rejection of universalism on behalf of an emancipatory pluralism is contradictory and self-defeating. A healthy respect for difference and diversity, and for the plurality of struggles against various oppressions, does not oblige us to jettison all the universalistic values to which Marxism at its best has always been attached, or to abandon the idea of a universal human emancipation. On the contrary, even the mildest forms of "pluralism" have been unsustainable without appeals to certain universalistic values like the classic liberal principle of "toleration." The radical pluralism espoused by postmodernists—based as it is on denying any fundamental commonality, or even the possibility of mutual access and understanding, among plural identities—has fatally undercut its own foundations. As Aijaz Ahmad puts it later in this volume: "if in the constitution of your identity, I have no rights of cognition, participation, criticism, then on what basis may you ask for my solidarity with you except on the basis of some piety, some voluntaristic good will that I can withdraw at any moment?" In the end, it is hard to imagine how any of the diverse struggles that supposedly constitute the left postmodernist agenda can be sustained without some appeal to those dreaded "modernist" and Enlightenment values of democracy, equality, social justice, and so on. For that matter, it is difficult to understand how any kind of action is possible on the epistemological assumptions that postmodernists profess. Not only are their views on knowledge politically disabling, one cannot help wondering how they can conduct the normal business of everyday life without suspending their postmodernist disbelief. Either that, or postmodernist theories are guilty of more than a little bad faith. One of the ironies of postmodernism is that, while embracing—or at least surrendering to—capitalism, it rejects the "Enlightenment project," holding it responsible for crimes that would more justly be laid at the door of capitalism. This is, by the way, something that C. Wright Mills too might usefully have considered when outlining the failures of reason and freedom. Of course it would be foolish to maintain that capitalism has been responsible for all our modern ills or even to deny the material benefits that have often accompanied it. But it would be just as foolish to deny the destructive effects associated with capitalist imperatives of self-expansion, "productivism," profit-maximization, and competition. It is hard to see how these effects intrinsically belong to the Enlightenment. At the very least, we have to ask whether ever known—both in the sense that it is global and in the sense that it penetrates every aspect of social life and the natural environment. In dealing with capitalism, the postmodernist insistence that reality is fragmentary and therefore accessible only to fragmentary "knowledges" is especially perverse and disabling. The social reality of capitalism is "totalizing" in unprecedented ways and degrees. Its logic of commodification, accumulation, profit-maximization, and competition permeates the whole social order; and an understanding of this "totalizing" system requires just the kind of "totalizing knowledge" that Marxism offers and postmodernists reject. Opposition to the capitalist system also requires us to call upon interests and resources that unify, instead of fragmenting, the anticapitalist struggle. In the first instance, these are the interests and resources of class, the single most universal force capable of uniting diverse emancipatory struggles; but in the final analysis, we are talking about the interests and resources of our common humanity, in the conviction that, for all our manifold differences, there are certain fundamentally and irreducibly common conditions of human well-being and self-fulfillment which capitalism cannot satisfy and socialism can. For people on the left, and especially for a younger generation of intellectuals and students, the greatest appeal of postmodernism is its apparent openness, as against the alleged "closures" of a "totalizing" system like Marxism. But this claim to openness is largely spurious. The problem is not just that postmodernism represents an ineffectual kind of pluralism which has undermined its own foundations. Nor is it simply an uncritical but harmless eclecticism. There is something more serious at stake. The "openness" of postmodernism's fragmentary knowledges and its emphasis on "difference" are purchased at the price of much more fundamental closures. Postmodernism is, in its negative way, a ruthlessly "totalizing" system, which forecloses a vast range of critical thought and emancipatory politics— and its closures are final and decisive. Its epistemological assumptions make it unavailable to criticism, as immune to critique as the most rigid kind of dogma (how do you criticize a body of ideas that a priori rules out the very practice of "rational" argument?). And they preclude—not just by dogmatically rejecting but also by rendering impossible—a systematic understanding of our historical moment, a wholesale critique of capitalism, and just about any effective political action. If postmodernism does tell us something, in a distorted way, about the conditions of contemporary capitalism, the real trick is to figure out exactly what those conditions are, why they are, and where we go from here. The trick, in other words, is to suggest historical explanations for those conditions instead of just submitting to them and indulging in ideological adaptations. The trick is to identify the real problems to which the current intellectual fashions offer false—or no—solutions, and in so doing to challenge the limits they impose on action and resistance. The trick is to respond to the conditions of the world today not as cheerful (or even miserable) robots but as critics.

Violence is not a rare outbreak but rather constitutive of Western society – focus on gun control distracts from the larger underlying problem and turns case. **Esposito and Finley 14**

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

While recent mass shootings in the U.S., particularly in Newtown, have captured the attention of the nation and the world, it is important to remember that gun violence is not anomalous but rather a normative feature of American life. According to data published by the Centers for Disease Control, guns were used in 11,422 homicides in 2011—that is over 30 people in the U.S. being murdered with a gun every day (CDC 2012). And while it is undeniable that gun violence is related to weak gun controls and a lack of mental health services, what is too often missing from these discussions is a critical understanding of the institutional and ideological forces that create a context in which so many people are willing and ready to kill or harm one another. As this paper has made clear, since the early 1980s, neoliberalism has been a central factor in creating such a context. By encouraging attitudes and behavioral tendencies related to extreme individualism, hypermasculinity, competition, and self-gain, neoliberalism has promoted what Charles Derber (2004, p. 27) has described as a “sociopathic society”— one that is “marked by a collapse of moral order that results from the breakdown of community and the failure of institutions responsible for inspiring moral vision and enforcing robust moral codes.” It is precisely this breakdown of community that has also led to declining levels of empathy (particularly among young people) in the United States for the past 30 years (Zaki, 2012). Indeed, by emphasizing de-regulation and the pursuit of profit/personal gain as the linchpin of freedom, and by normalizing and rewarding self-centered behavior, neoliberalism breeds a society of alienated persons who (perhaps outside the few individuals closest to them) see others as little more than objects. Under these conditions, people become largely “incapable of loving” (Choi and Semm, 2011). As famously described by Erich Fromm (2005, pp. 15-31), when human beings are reduced to “things,” they lose the basic connection and sense of caring that sustains human communities. Furthermore, because materialism is exalted under neoliberalism, people living in a neoliberal market society are encouraged—through a host of institutions including the advertising industry and the entertainment industry—to embrace a hyper-consumer culture that, to a large extent, associates personal success, happiness, and well-being with the purchasing of material possessions. Thus, for example, driving a certain type of car, living in a certain type of house, or wearing a certain brand of clothes are commonly seen as indicators of a person’s worth and status. As discussed by Pérez and Esposito (2010, p. 89) “these things are supposed to tell others, as well as ourselves, whether or not we are successful, respectable, and desirable.” Attaining material things, moreover, involves a constant struggle whereby persons must “outdo’ one another to get the things that they want or need. Others, therefore, are either an impediment to one’s self-serving ends or a means towards fulfilling those ends. The point, however, is that largely because of this cut-throat materialization of social life, anything outside the material realm—including human life itself—is devalued. As discussed by Henry Giroux (2004), outside the most powerful/privileged individuals, human life under neoliberalism becomes largely disposable. It is within this sort of social context that various forms of gun related homicides—including mass shootings—and other forms of violence become predictable outcomes. Another issue to consider that is too often ignored in mainstream discussions of gun violence is how this violence might have a lot to do with a sense of powerlessness that many people feel in a neoliberal market society. Because social ties are weakened and citizens are typically reduced to “consumers,” too many people feel irrelevant and incapable of making any significant difference in the world. Therefore, incidents of gun violence, particularly those related to mass shootings, might be a way of reclaiming some modicum of control (what sociologists refer to as a “sense of mastery”) over events and outcomes. Jesse Roche (2012, online) astutely explains this as follows: In a world in which most of us live relatively isolated lives from our neighbors and families; in which we have little say or power to change the way our massive society operates; in which we feel fortunate just to have a job to pay the bills; in which most of us passively watch world events unfold like a football game, in such a world, taking a gun and shooting into society is a clear expression of trying to break through to some reality beyond what, for many, is a stifling vacuum chamber of everyday life. In short, incidents of gun violence—particularly mass shootings—might often be violent outbursts against a society that makes most people feel insignificant and impotent! It is also important to note, however, that the majority of gun related homicides in the U.S. do not involve random shooters killing strangers but rather individuals killing others they know. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, from 1980-2008, over 78 percent of homicides involved non-strangers—i.e., relatives, friends, or acquaintances—and over half of these homicides were gun related (Cooper and Smith, 2011). Of all females in particular killed with firearms, almost two-thirds were killed by their intimate partners (When Men Murder Women, 2004). Considering these figures, it seems intimacy is not an antidote to violence, and, under certain conditions promoted by neoliberalism, can actually make violence (including gun violence) more likely. As noted earlier, the hyper-masculinity endorsed by neoliberalism encourages men to see themselves as entitled to power and control, which is the basis of abusive relationships (Katz, 2006). Moreover, since the neoliberal restructuring of the U.S. economy in the early 1980s, there has been, among other outcomes, an erosion of decent paying jobs (mostly semiskilled manufacturing jobs that have been transferred overseas to cheaper labor markets), stagnant wages, loss of work benefits, and the cutting of public expenditure for social services, particularly for the needy (e.g., Klein 2012). These conditions are at least partly responsible for increasing levels of stress (Jayson 2012), financial insecurity (Rosen 2011), and worker dissatisfaction (Saad 2012), all of which has a significant effect on intimate/family relations, and has been closely correlated with domestic and other forms of interpersonal violence (e.g., Renzetti, 2009). Without taking all these factors into account, the issue of gun violence in the U.S. can never be thoroughly understood and hence minimizing this problem will be unlikely.

Neolib causes extinction and endless structural violence – try or die for the alt. **Farbod 15**

 ( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

There’s an ethical obligation to reject cap in every instance. **Zizek and Daly 04**

(Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture â€“ with all its pieties concerning â€˜multiculturalistâ€™ etiquette â€“ Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called â€˜radically incorrectâ€™ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost istic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite . That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizekâ€™s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marxâ€™s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose â€˜universalismâ€™ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded life chances cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the â€˜developing worldâ€™). And Zizekâ€™s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a glitch in an otherwise sound matrix.

Reps focus is a pre requisite to policy making. **Bleiker 03**

Bleiker, Roland. "Discourse and human agency." Contemporary Political Theory2.1 (2003): 25-47.

 ‘It is within discourse,’ one of Foucault’s much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, ‘that power and knowledge articulate each other.’ The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, discourses are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They determine the limits of what can be thought, talked and written **in a normal and rational way**. In every society the production of discourses is controlled, selected, organized and diffused by certain procedures. This process creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969, 1971, 1991, 59–60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rational F and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society. **They** cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, ‘all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.’

## 4

Colleges are modes of capitalism and serve as poor centers of traditional academia. **Bucheit 15**

“Higher Education: Capitalism At Its Most Despicable,” Common Dreams, 2015, Paul Buchheit.

Rating capitalist despicability is a daunting task with Big Pharma and High Finance in the running, but Higher Ed's betrayal of a century-old trust with young Americans vaults it toward the top of the list.¶ Since 1862 public colleges had been expected to serve primarily as a means for the American people to achieve an inexpensive college education, and to benefit from academic research. The 1980 Bayh-Dole Act changed it all. It freed public universities from releasing new research discoveries to the public, allowing them instead to patent the results and make licensing deals with private companies. The University of California, anticipating big agri-business subsidies, took full advantage in 2013, siding with Monsanto in a lawsuit against a farmer who was accused of stealing the company's seed. The farmer lost. And universities became more deeply entrenched in the capitalist world. There are other reasons for the continuing degradation of higher education:¶ The Rise of the All-Administrative University¶ That's the title of a 2011 book by Benjamin Ginsberg, who noted that administrators nearly doubled their numbers in twenty years while increasing their staff by 240 percent. That staff includes deanlets and deputies, provosts and vice-provosts, directors of community and communications and diversity and development, and various assistants and assistants to the assistants. The National Center for Education Statistics reported that "For every $1 spent on instruction, $1.82 is spent on non-instructional things such as 'academic support, student services, institutional support, public service' and a catch-all category called 'other.'" As administrators grew at ten times the rate of tenured faculty positions, much of the redirected money has gone for amenities like recreations centers, dining halls, and athletic centers. At New York University, condos and vacation homes were part of the package for administrators and business faculty. The city areas around elite tax-exempt universities are often filled with potholes and boarded-up houses due to the lack of property tax income.

Universities function as capitalist factories that exploit their students. **Chomsky 14**

Noam Chomsky (speaking in 2014 to the Adjunct Faculty Association of United Steelworkers) quoted in: “Noam Chomsky Explains How Capitalism Has Ruined American Universities” (Ben Cohen, 2015, The Banter).

But using cheap labor—and vulnerable labor—is a business practice that goes as far back as you can trace private enterprise, and unions emerged in response. In the universities, cheap, vulnerable labor means adjuncts and graduate students. Graduate students are even more vulnerable, for obvious reasons. The idea is to transfer instruction to precarious workers, which improves discipline and control but also enables the transfer of funds to other purposes apart from education. The costs, of course, are borne by the students and by the people who are being drawn into these vulnerable occupations. But it’s a standard feature of a business-run society to transfer costs to the people. In fact, economists tacitly cooperate in this. So, for example, suppose you find a mistake in your checking account and you call the bank to try to fix it. Well, you know what happens. You call them up, and you get a recorded message saying “We love you, here’s a menu.” Maybe the menu has what you’re looking for, maybe it doesn’t. If you happen to find the right option, you listen to some music, and every once and a while a voice comes in and says “Please stand by, we really appreciate your business,” and so on. Finally, after some period of time, you may get a human being, who you can ask a short question to. That’s what economists call “efficiency.” By economic measures, that system reduces labor costs to the bank; of course it imposes costs on you, and those costs are multiplied by the number of users, which can be enormous—but that’s not counted as a cost in economic calculation. And if you look over the way the society works, you find this everywhere. So the university imposes costs on students and on faculty who are not only untenured but are maintained on a path that guarantees that they will have no security. All of this is perfectly natural within corporate business models. It’s harmful to education, but education is not their goal.¶ In fact, if you look back farther, it goes even deeper than that. If you go back to the early 1970s when a lot of this began, there was a lot of concern pretty much across the political spectrum over the activism of the 1960s; it’s commonly called “the time of troubles.” It was a “time of troubles” because the country was getting civilized, and that’s dangerous. People were becoming politically engaged and were trying to gain rights for groups that are called “special interests,” like women, working people, farmers, the young, the old, and so on. That led to a serious backlash, which was pretty overt. At the liberal end of the spectrum, there’s a book called The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission, Michel Crozier, Samuel P. Huntington, Joji Watanuki (New York University Press, 1975), produced by the Trilateral Commission, an organization of liberal internationalists. The Carter administration was drawn almost entirely from their ranks. They were concerned with what they called “the crisis of democracy,” namely that there’s too much democracy. In the 1960s there were pressures from the population, these “special interests,” to try to gain rights within the political arena, and that put too much pressure on the state—you can’t do that. There was one special interest that they left out, namely the corporate sector, because its interests are the “national interest”; the corporate sector is supposed to control the state, so we don’t talk about them. But the “special interests” were causing problems and they said “we have to have more moderation in democracy,” the public has to go back to being passive and apathetic. And they were particularly concerned with schools and universities, which they said were not properly doing their job of “indoctrinating the young.” You can see from student activism (the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, the feminist movement, the environmental movements) that the young are just not being indoctrinated properly.¶ Well how do you indoctrinate the young? There are a number of ways. One way is to burden them with hopelessly heavy tuition debt. Debt is a trap, especially student debt, which is enormous, far larger than credit card debt. It’s a trap for the rest of your life because the laws are designed so that you can’t get out of it. If a business, say, gets in too much debt it can declare bankruptcy, but individuals can almost never be relieved of student debt through bankruptcy. They can even garnish social security if you default. That’s a disciplinary technique. I don’t say that it was consciously introduced for the purpose, but it certainly has that effect. And it’s hard to argue that there’s any economic basis for it. Just take a look around the world: higher education is mostly free. In the countries with the highest education standards, let’s say Finland, which is at the top all the time, higher education is free. And in a rich, successful capitalist country like Germany, it’s free. In Mexico, a poor country, which has pretty decent education standards, considering the economic difficulties they face, it’s free. In fact, look at the United States: if you go back to the 1940s and 50s, higher education was pretty close to free. The GI Bill gave free education to vast numbers of people who would never have been able to go to college. It was very good for them and it was very good for the economy and the society; it was part of the reason for the high economic growth rate. Even in private colleges, education was pretty close to free. Take me: I went to college in 1945 at an Ivy League university, University of Pennsylvania, and tuition was $100. That would be maybe $800 in today’s dollars. And it was very easy to get a scholarship, so you could live at home, work, and go to school and it didn’t cost you anything. Now it’s outrageous. I have grandchildren in college, who have to pay for their tuition and work and it’s almost impossible. For the students that is a disciplinary technique. And another technique of indoctrination is to cut back faculty-student contact: large classes, temporary teachers who are overburdened, who can barely survive on an adjunct salary. And since you don’t have any job security you can’t build up a career, you can’t move on and get more. These are all techniques of discipline, indoctrination, and control. And it’s very similar to what you’d expect in a factory, where factory workers have to be disciplined, to be obedient; they’re not supposed to play a role in, say, organizing production or determining how the workplace functions—that’s the job of management. This is now carried over to the universities. And I think it shouldn’t surprise anyone who has any experience in private enterprise, in industry; that’s the way they work.

Capitalism destroys education via focus on employability and efficiency – turns case. **Allsop 15**

“How capitalism is destroying education,” Bradley Allsop, Bright Green, 2015.

As Noam Chomsky once said: “If you burden students with large amounts of debt, they are unlikely to think about changing the world”. Most of the students I know quite readily admit that they came to university to ‘get a better job’, that they’re doing their degree because ‘it’ll pay well’, and that they’re going to their lectures because ‘they have to’. Very few people actually enjoy education anymore, and even less are thinking about how to change the world.¶ Not only is the loss of academic passion beset by the employability agenda of successive neoliberal governments, it also suffers from a psychological onslaught best captured by the phrase ‘lad culture’. Increasingly universities seem to be little more than chauvinistic playgrounds rather than critical paradises. This is partly due to the profound ways in which paying for your own education distorts the relationship between lecturer and student: no longer is the student humbly learning and being challenged by their tutor, they are a customer, and the customer is always right. On some unconscious level the enormous debt we are saddled with seems to give us our entitlement to a good grade in the place of hard work and academic rigour.¶ David Hartley foresaw this back in 1995 in his piece: ‘The McDonaldisation of Higher Education’, arguing that increasingly education would have a focus on “efficiency,” “calculability,” “predictability,” and “control”, and that in all probability teaching in classrooms would become a thing of the past. Why bother with lighting and heating a room and paying an hour’s wages to a lecturer when you can just put the slides up online for the student to peruse from the comfort of their own home? In many institutions now the priority is not on quality but quantity, with many online courses having dreadful pass rates but lovely profit margins.¶ The problems are not just limited to higher education either, far from it. One anonymous blogger describes the painful experiences of their adopted children who have come through abuse and neglect to be met with an inflexible curriculum. They talk passionately about an educational system devoid of that very thing: passion. Where arbitrary lines are drawn between successes and failures, where a ‘one size fits all’ and ‘teach to the test’ approach stifles creativity and erodes self-esteem, and constant assessment of students and staff alike breeds stress and anxiety. This is no system that can help their vulnerable children, instead it only adds to their problems.

There’s an ethical obligation to reject cap in every instance. **Zizek and Daly 04**

(Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture â€“ with all its pieties concerning â€˜multiculturalistâ€™ etiquette â€“ Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called â€˜radically incorrectâ€™ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost istic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite . That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizekâ€™s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marxâ€™s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose â€˜universalismâ€™ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded life chances cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the â€˜developing worldâ€™). And Zizekâ€™s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a glitch in an otherwise sound matrix.

Reps focus is a pre requisite to policy making. **Bleiker 03**

Bleiker, Roland. "Discourse and human agency." Contemporary Political Theory2.1 (2003): 25-47.

 ‘It is within discourse,’ one of Foucault’s much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, ‘that power and knowledge articulate each other.’ The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, discourses are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They determine the limits of what can be thought, talked and written **in a normal and rational way**. In every society the production of discourses is controlled, selected, organized and diffused by certain procedures. This process creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969, 1971, 1991, 59–60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rational F and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society. **They** cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, ‘all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.’

## Case

A handgun ban causes massive policing and incarceration of black people. **Gourevitch 15**

Alex Gourevitch [Brown University Assistant Professor of Political Science]. Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power. Salon. <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun_controls_racist_reality_the_liberal_argument_against_giving_police_more_power/> June 24, 2015. DD

The dead are buried, the murderer apprehended, and the shock has started to wear off. Now comes the public reaction to the massacre in Charleston. Soon after the shootings at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, the first black president of the United States offered some thoughts on Dylan Roof’s racist attack. First and foremost, President Obama said, recent events were about how “innocent people were killed in part because someone who wanted to inflict harm had no trouble getting their hand on a gun.” The killings were also about a “dark chapter in our history,” namely racial slavery and Jim Crow. Obama only suggested practical action regarding the first issue, namely gun control. He did not consider that such measures will make the persistence of the second problem even worse. It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice. 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.

The most direct accounts and empirical evidence prove handguns are key to self defense from IPV on college campuses. **Collins 15**

Amanda Collins, Counterpoint: A rape survivor argues why we need guns on campus, MSNBC, 2015. NS

Across the country, legislators are debating the right of law-abiding concealed carry permit holders to legally carry firearms onto university campuses. Just the other day, I was asked “Why do you need a firearm on campus? What’s so threatening about becoming educated?” Here’s my answer: Eight years ago, during my junior year at the University of Nevada-Reno, I was raped in the parking garage only feet away from the campus police office. As this stranger raped me while holding a pistol to my temple, I could see the police cruisers parked for the night, and I knew no one was coming to help me. Eventually the man who raped me, James Biela, was caught. He was tried and convicted for not only raping me at gun point in a gun-free zone, but also raping two other women and murdering Brianna Denison. So, I ask, “How does rendering me defenseless protect you against a violent crime?” At the time of my attack, I had obtained my Concealed Carry Weapons (CCW) permit for the personal choice of not wanting to be a defenseless target. In Nevada, permit holders are not allowed to carry firearms on campuses. As a law-abiding citizen, I left my firearm at home, which means that the law that is meant to ensure my safety only guaranteed the criminal an unmatched victim. I still wonder what would have been different if I’d been carrying my weapon that night. But here’s the truth: Had I been carrying my firearm, I would have been able to stop the attack. Not only that, but two other rapes would have been prevented and three young lives would have been saved, including my own. Any survivor of rape can understand that the young woman I was walking into the parking garage that night was not the same woman who left. My life has never been the same after my attack. Legalized campus carry would have saved my family, who happens to be the collateral damage in my story, and me a great deal of untold torment. My case is a perfect example that despite law enforcement’s best efforts to ensure our safety, they are unable to be everywhere at once. All I wanted was a chance to effectively defend myself. The choice to participate in one’s own defense should be left to the individual. That choice should not be mandated by the government. As a law-abiding citizen, I should not have to hand over my safety to a third party. Laws that prohibit campus carry turn women like me into victims by stripping away our Second Amendment rights. Unfortunately, legislators opposed to campus carry are more intimidated by law-abiding citizens like me sitting in class with a legal firearm, than the rapist waiting for me in the parking garage. Most people are unaware that one in four women will be raped while attending college and one-third of them occur on the campus they attend. Currently, seven states allow campus carry. Not a single one of those states has seen an increase in crimes committed with firearms. In fact, there has been a decrease in crimes committed on campus property. Still, law-abiding citizens are barred from exercising this fundamental freedom on our publicly funded university campuses, leaving them defenseless against gun-wielding criminals who disregard the laws. The laws need to change so that those who have a valid concealed carry permit can lawfully bring their firearms onto college campuses, just as they do elsewhere in their daily lives. I know from my personal experience that threats to personal safety don’t magically disappear in declared “safe-zones.” Some who oppose campus carry cite research showing that alcohol is involved in most sexual assaults, and that alcohol leads to impaired judgment about gun use. The solution to that is focusing on reducing underage drinking, not denying Second Amendment rights. Perhaps the weakest argument against campus carry was from a professor at Florida’s Eckerd College, who said that “proponents will argue that allowing concealed carry will protect female students from sexual assault. I will point out the obvious; you will be arming the assailants, too.” That statement ignores the fact that assailants are already armed, and there is nothing in place to keep them from coming onto our campuses. My attacker was armed, and as a law-abiding citizen I had more to lose than he did that night. If I’d had my firearm I would have faced expulsion from school, losing my permit and possibly jail time. My attacker was not a student nor did he have a CCW permit. I believe in empowering women with the choice to protect their bodies. Law-abiding concealed carry permit holders should not be denied their fundamental, constitutional right to protect themselves on college campuses.

The AFF creates information asymmetry between students and killers, making mass shootings far likelier. **Robinson 09**

Jason Robinson (BBA, Economics Loyola University New Orleans) and Scott Kjar (Econ Professor U Dallas), Foundation for Economic Education, Gun Control: An Economic Analysis, 2009. NS

When a school has an anti-firearm policy, the policymakers are not the ones who must suffer the negative consequences. If a would-be killer arrives at school and discovers everyone else unarmed—students, faculty, and staff—the would-be killer is likely to be successful at creating mayhem and death. Yet the policymakers are not the ones at risk. The school board passes the policy, but the school board is not on the front lines next to the students, faculty, and staff when the would-be killer arrives. This is an example of moral hazard. Information asymmetry occurs when one party to a transaction has more information than the other party and uses the difference to exploit the other party. Suppose, for example, I have a house for sale. I want to sell it because every time it rains, the basement fills with 3 feet of water. However, no one else knows this fact, and when you make an offer on the house I neglect to inform you of the problem. Had you been aware of it you would have acted differently in our negotiation, or perhaps you would not have made an offer at all. When an educational institution posts signs proclaiming a gun-free environment, they convey the message to students that they may have less fear of being shot. However, they convey the same message to the potential mass killer. The killers at Columbine and Virginia Tech had no fear of facing resistance by armed students or teachers because they were on gun-free campuses. The killers knew who had guns (they did) and who didn’t (everyone else), but no one else knew that. This information asymmetry allowed the killers to be far deadlier than they otherwise could have been. So suppose these campuses had been pro-gun zones instead of anti-gun zones. Suppose the killers had faced the prospect of confronting armed opponents instead of unarmed victims. Note that this policy difference does not change the killers’ ends. However, it makes clear that the killer is far less likely to achieve those ends, regardless of the means selected. At some point, as risk rises and reward falls, even a would-be killer chooses to substitute video games and animated carnage for a murderous rampage and real carnage.

The most comprehensive empirical evidence and lit reviews prove college guns deter crime. **SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry (Students for Concealed Carry on Campus is a national, non-partisan, grassroots organization composed of more than 43,000 college students, professors, college employees, parents of college students, and concerned citizens who believe that holders of state-issued concealed handgun licenses should be allowed the same measure of personal protection on college campuses that current laws afford them virtually everywhere else. SCCC has members in all fifty states and the District of Columbia.)Both the membership and the leadership of SCCC are made up of individuals with very diverse political backgrounds.), Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

Since the fall semester of 2006, Utah state law has allowed licensed individuals to carry concealed handguns on the campuses of Utah’s nine degree-offering public colleges (20 campuses) and one public technical college (10 campuses). Concealed carry has been allowed on the two campuses of Colorado State University (Fort Collins, CO, and Pueblo, CO) since 2003 and at 14 Colorado community colleges (38 campuses) since the fall semester of 2010. After SCC won a lawsuit against the University of Colorado system, the remaining public colleges (21 campuses) in Colorado—including those in the CU system—changed their policies (as of the fall semester of 2012) to allow campus carry. As of July 1, 2011, state law requires all Mississippi public colleges (42 campuses) to allow campus carry by holders of a Mississippi license with an enhanced training endorsement. As of July 1, 2014, state law requires all Idaho public colleges (30 campuses) to allow campus carry by holders of an ‘enhanced’ Idaho license. Counting Blue Ridge Community College (Weyers Cave, VA), which allowed campus carry from 1995 to 2012, that’s more than 150 U.S. college campuses allowing concealed carry for a combined total of almost 1,500 semesters (spring/fall) over the past twenty years. Not one of these campuses has seen a single resulting act of violence (including threats) or a single resulting suicide attempt. Likewise, no state has seen a resulting increase in gun violence as a result of legalizing concealed carry (all 50 states now allow some form of concealed carry), despite the fact that licensed citizens regularly carry concealed handguns in places like office buildings, movie theaters, grocery stores, shopping malls, restaurants, churches, and banks. Virtually every peer-reviewed study on the subject, including studies by the National Academy of Sciences\* and the Harvard Injury Control Research Center\*\*, has concluded that there is no evidence that licensed concealed carry leads to an increase in either violent crime or gun deaths. According to 2002-2006 statistics\*\*\* from the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas concealed handgun license holders were five and a half times less likely than members of Texas’s general population to commit manslaughter and four times less likely to commit murder.

Handgun bans lead to a substitution effect and makes criminals more violent. **Kopel 93**

\*\*Kopel is summarizing Kates and Benenson

David B. Kopel (American author, attorney, political science researcher, gun rights advocate, and contributing editor to several publications. He is currently Research Director of the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado), Peril or Protection: The Risks and Benefits of Handgun Prohibition, Saint Louis University Public Law Review, Volume 12, 1993. NS

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [177] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [178] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \* assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [183] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [185] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%.

Handgun bans strengthen organized crime through an illegal market. **Kopel 93**

David B. Kopel (American author, attorney, political science researcher, gun rights advocate, and contributing editor to several publications. He is currently Research Director of the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado), Peril or Protection: The Risks and Benefits of Handgun Prohibition, Saint Louis University Public Law Review, Volume 12, 1993. NS

The inevitable black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime. As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more. Dixon also acknowledges that illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders. [130] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year). [131]

No one will comply. **Kates 13**

Kates 13 (Don B, retired professor of constitutional and criminal law, research fellow with the Independent Institute, "Debate: Gun Control in the United States", 2013. NS

It is safe to assume that most law-abiding gun owners would not comply with a firearms ban. That is verified by actual behavior. Despite often ferocious penalties, gun owners will not register their firearms because they fear this paves the way for eventual confiscation. In his book, [10] Prof. James B. Jacobs, Director of the Center for Research in Crime and Justice at New York University School of Law, noted that efforts to ban or register assault weapons are overwhelmingly ignored. In Boston and Cleveland, the rate of compliance is estimated at 1%. Out of the 100,000 to 300,000 assault rifles estimated to be in private hands in New Jersey, 947 were registered, an additional 888 rendered inoperable, and four turned over to authorities. In California, nearly 90% of the approximately 300,000 assault weapon owners did not register their weapons [8].

### A2 College Suicides

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

Studies\* show that 90% of suicides are committed in the home. Because most college students over the age of twenty-one (the minimum age to obtain a concealed handgun license in most states) live off campus, allowing concealed carry on college campuses would have very little impact on the ability of college students to possess firearms in their homes and, therefore, little to no impact on the overall number of suicides by college students. Furthermore, we would caution anyone to be careful when evaluating studies that purport to show ‘prove’ that firearms increase the risk of suicide. Something can only be ‘proven’ if a randomized-controlled trial is completed; such a trial would be impossible to complete in this case.

### A2 Accidental Fires

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

Among the more than 150 college campuses that currently allow concealed carry, there have been three accidental/negligent discharges—two by faculty/staff and one by a student. Two of the negligent discharges were the result of the license holder carrying the gun in a pants pocket without a holster (both of these incidents resulted in non-life-threatening injuries to the license holder’s leg), and one was the result of the license holder showing a new gun—a gun with which she was not yet familiar—to her coworkers (this incident resulted in only minor abrasions that did not require medical attention). All three of these incidents could have been avoided through proper training and/or the implementation of appropriate policies (e.g., allowing colleges to require that licensed students, faculty, and staff keep handguns holstered or cased at all times) that do not restrict the ability of license holders to carry concealed handguns for personal protection. A quick glance at CDC data from 2007 (the last year for which records are available) reveals that individuals between the ages of 21 and 24, the age group most likely to carry concealed handguns on a college campus, accounted for fewer than 70 fatal gun accidents that year, nationwide. And based on consistent trends, it’s fair to assume that most (approximately 80%) of those were either hunting accidents or incidents of someone mishandling a firearm in the home. It’s highly doubtful that even one of those incidents was related to licensed concealed carry. From 1996-2007, the State of Texas had 1,754 convictions for ‘discharge of a firearm.’ Only three of those convictions were of license holders, and it’s not certain if any of those three convictions were related to concealed carry. Because the trigger of a properly holstered firearm is not exposed, because modern firearms are designed not to discharge if dropped, and because an applicant for a CHL must (in most states) pass a training course covering firearm safety, accidental discharges among concealed handgun license holder are extremely rare and represent, at worst, a statistically negligible risk. SCC feels that it is wrong to deny citizens a right simply because that right is accompanied by a minor risk. NOTE: Only about 2% of all firearm-related deaths in the U.S. are accidental, and most of those are hunting accidents and accidents involving firearms being openly handled in an unsafe manner. According to CDC statistics, a person is five times more likely to accidentally drown, five times more likely to accidentally die in a fire, 29 times more likely to die in an accidental fall, and 32 times more likely to die from accidental poisoning than to die from an accidental gunshot wound.

### A2 Arguments Escalate

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

Before shall-issue concealed carry laws were passed throughout the United States, opponents claimed that such laws would turn disputes over parking spaces and traffic accidents into shootouts. This did not prove to be the case. In fact, many of the law enforcement officials have since admitted that they were wrong to oppose concealed carry measures. Detroit Police Chief James Craig has even said that more CPL holders in the Motor City could further decrease violent crime in the city. The same responsible adults—age 21 and above—now asking to be allowed to carry their concealed handguns on college campuses are already allowed to do so virtually everywhere else. They clearly do not let their emotions get the better of them in other environments; therefore, no less should be expected of them on college campuses. Licensed concealed carry has yet to turn a debate into shootout on any of the 150+ college campuses where it’s allowed or in any of the legislative chambers where it’s allowed (i.e. the Texas Capitol, the Virginia Capitol).

### A2 Self Defense Shootouts are Dangerous

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

What is worse than allowing an execution-style massacre to continue uncontested? How could any action with the potential to stop or slow a deranged killer intent on slaughtering victim after victim be considered ‘worse’ than allowing the killer to continue undeterred? Contrary to what the movies might have us believe, most real-world shootouts last only three to ten seconds (according to law enforcement instructors). Even the real gunfight at the O.K. Corral, a shootout involving nine armed participants and a number of bystanders, lasted only about 30 seconds and resulted in only three fatalities (no bystanders were injured). It is unlikely that an exchange of gunfire between an armed assailant and an armed citizen would last more than a couple of seconds before one or both parties were disabled. Even if it lasted the full ten seconds, how could ten seconds of two people shooting at each other possibly be worse than ten minutes of an assailant walking up to victims and shooting them in the head (sometimes multiple times) at pointblank range, as occurred at Virginia Tech?

### A2 Not as Qualified as Police

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

Nobody is suggesting that concealed handgun license holders be charged with the duty of protecting campuses. What is being suggested is that adults with concealed handgun licenses be allowed to protect themselves on college campuses, the same way they’re currently allowed to protect themselves in most other unsecured locations. According to a U.S. Secret Service study\* into thirty-seven school shootings, ‘Over half of the attacks were resolved/ended before law enforcement responded to the scene. In these cases the attacker was stopped by faculty or fellow students, decided to stop shooting on his own, or killed himself.’ The study found that only three of the thirty-seven school shootings researched involved shots being fired by law enforcement officers. \*“Safe School Initiative: An Interim Report on the Prevention of Targeted Violence in Schools,” U.S. Secret Service National Threat Assessment Center in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education with support from the National Institute of Justice, Co-Directors Bryan Vossekuil, Marissa Reddy PhD, Robert Fein PhD, October 2000 Return to Arguments – Police officers typically spend four to five months in training; whereas, concealed handgun license holders usually spend one day or less. Police officers do not spend five to seven months learning to carry concealed handguns for self-defense; they spend five to seven months learning to be police officers. Concealed handgun license holders are not police officers; therefore, they have no need of most of the training received by police officers. Concealed handgun license holders don’t need to know how to drive police cars at high speeds or how to kick down doors or how to conduct traffic stops or how to make arrests or how to use handcuffs. And concealed handgun license holders definitely don’t need to spend weeks memorizing radio codes and traffic laws. “Contrary to what some opponents of concealed carry might claim, concealed handgun license holders don’t need extensive tactical training, because they are not charged with protecting the public—it’s not their job to act like amateur, one-man SWAT teams. All a concealed handgun license holder needs to know is how to use his or her concealed handgun to stop an immediate threat of death or serious bodily harm, and that type of training CAN be accomplished in a few hours.” NOTE: In Texas, for example, the shooting test that must be passed to obtain a concealed handgun license meets all but one of the minimum proficiency requirements for qualifying law enforcement officers (the one exception being that officers are also required to complete a timed reload).

### A2 First Responders Kill Kids

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

How are first responders supposed to tell the difference between armed civilians and armed assailants? This hasn’t been an issue with concealed handgun license holders in other walks of life for several reasons. First and foremost, real-world shootouts are typically localized and over very quickly. It’s not realistic to expect police to encounter an ongoing shootout between assailants and armed civilians. Second, police are trained to expect both armed bad guys AND armed good guys—from off-duty/undercover police officers to armed civilians—in tactical scenarios. Third, concealed handgun license holders are trained to use their firearms for self-defense. They are not trained to run through buildings looking for bad guys. Therefore, the biggest distinction between the armed assailants and the armed civilians is that the armed civilians would be hiding with the crowd, and the armed assailants would be shooting at the crowd. Finally, if all the above fail, I think we would all agree – we’d rather take our chances with the “good guys with guns” than succumb to the “bad guys with guns.”

### A2 Other Self Defense Methods (Taser/Spray/Fighting)

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

A Taser is as effective as a handgun against an armed assailant. If you’re going to attempt to use a Taser to defend yourself against an armed assailant, you’d better hope the assailant isn’t wearing thick clothing or standing more than fifteen feet away. You’d also better hope that you don’t miss with your first shot and that you aren’t facing more than one assailant. And you’d better hope that you can escape to safety before the Taser’s effects wear off. Like handguns, Tasers are banned on most college campuses. Return to Arguments – Defense Spray is as effective as a handgun against an armed assailant. If you’re going to attempt to use a defense spray to defend yourself against an armed assailant, you’d better hope you bought one of the concentrated formulas that doesn’t take ten to fifteen seconds to begin working. You’d also better hope that the assailant is standing in close proximity to you and that you are in a well-ventilated location where you won’t find yourself overcome by the effects of the spray before you can escape to safety. Like handguns, defense sprays are banned on most college campuses. NOTE: Most campus police forces tacitly approve of the use of defense sprays, or mace, despite their prohibition in almost every student handbook. We’ve often wondered why campus police departments agree that students need some method of self-defense beyond what the administration allows, but have decided to arbitrarily allow certain methods of self-defense. Return to Arguments – Self-defense training is as effective as a handgun against an armed assailant. If you’re going to try to manually disarm an assailant, you’d better be within an arm’s length of the assailant, be standing on firm ground, have no obstacles between you and the assailant, and be in relatively good physical condition. If the assailant is standing four feet away, you’re probably out of luck. If you’re sitting in a chair or lying on the floor, you’re probably out of luck. If there is a desk between you and the assailant, you’re probably out of luck. And if you’re elderly or disabled, you’re probably out of luck. Even a well-trained martial arts expert is no match for a bullet fired from eight feet away. Why should honest, law abiding citizens be asked to undergo years of training in order to master an inferior method of self-defense?

### A2 18 Year Olds can get guns

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

Among the forty-four shall-issue’ states\*—states where local authorities cannot require qualified applicants to “show a need” before the applicant is issued a concealed handgun license/concealed carry weapons permit—six states allow, without special provision, for any qualified person eighteen years or older to be issued a concealed handgun license. These states are Indiana, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and South Dakota. “Based on the FBI/Department of Justice violent crime statistics for the year 2006, the crime rates for these seven states, when ranked with all fifty states and the District of Columbia, rank as follows: Indiana – 30 Montana – 42 South Dakota – 47 New Hampshire – 48 North Dakota – 50 Maine – 51 “Not only are Maine, North Dakota, New Hampshire, and South Dakota four of the five\*\* U.S. states with the lowest crime rates, Montana has the tenth lowest crime rate, and Indiana isn’t even in the top 50%. Clearly, these states’ lenient concealed handgun laws are not breeding generations of young violent offenders. “The extraordinarily low crime rates in these six states, coupled with the fact that these states have a combined population of only about 10,900,000 (approximately 1.6 million less than the combined population of America’s two largest cities—New York, NY, and Los Angeles, CA—and at approximately 1/3 the combined violent crime rate of those two cities) has led Students for Concealed Carry to focus on the majority of ‘shall-issue’ states where the minimum age to receive a concealed handgun license is twenty-one.”

### A2 Brains don’t Mature

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

There is no scientific evidence that the brain function/decision making ability of a 21-year-old is substantially or even measurably different from that of a 25-year-old; however, there is a good deal of scientific evidence to the contrary. When scientists say that the human brain does not fully mature until the age of 25, the emphasis is on the word ‘fully.’ The \*vast\* majority of brain development is completed by age 20. The remaining development is, in essence, finishing touches. Saying that the brain of a 21-year-old is not fully developed is like saying that a construction crew hasn’t finished building a house, simply because they still haven’t put the covers on the light switches—the statement is technically true but highly misleading. Jay N. Giedd\*, M.D., writes, “Late maturation of the prefrontal cortex, which is essential in judgment, decision making and impulse control, has prominently entered discourse affecting the social, legislative, judicial, parenting and educational realms. Despite the temptation to trade the complexity and ambiguity of human behavior for the clarity and aesthetic beauty of colorful brain images, we must be careful not to over-interpret the neuroimaging findings as they relate to public policy.”

### A2 VPC

**SCC 15**

Students for Concealed Carry, Common Arguments Against Campus Carry, 2015. NS

The VPC’s frequently cited, regularly updated “Concealed Carry Killers” report blames the licensed concealed carry of handguns for vehicular homicides, premeditated murders, murders using weapons other than handguns, and murders and suicides committed in the home (not necessarily with a handgun). A thorough rebuttal is available HERE, but the short version is this: Even if each of the deaths cited by the VPC were actually a murder or suicide (they’re not), and even if each death were counted only once (they aren’t), and even if the licensed concealed carry of handguns were a factor in each of the deaths cited (it wasn’t), that would mean that the Violence Policy Center had implicated the roughly 5% of U.S. citizens with a concealed handgun license in less than 0.2% of all murders and suicides committed in the U.S. during that time. The Violence Policy Center is one of America’s most radical gun-control organizations, and its “Concealed Carry Killers” report is propaganda, not science. According to the Violence Policy Center, twenty-nine concealed handgun license holders committed mass shootings between May 2007 and March 2015. An examination of those twenty-nine incidents reveals twenty-six in which licensed concealed carry played no part whatsoever, two in which it is highly unlikely that licensed concealed carry played any part, and one in which licensed concealed carry very well may have played a part. The one incident in which licensed concealed carry may have played a part resulted in only three murders (the minimum to qualify as a “mass killing”), took place during a confrontation at the home of the perpetrator’s ex-wife, and involved a perpetrator who should have been ineligible to own a gun, much less obtain a concealed handgun license, but still received a Pennsylvania license due to an error in the criminal database.

# Extra cards

CP solves 100% of the AFF while protecting students with gun users trained more than police officers who are closer to campus shootings. **Chang 16**

“Okay Public Schools Now Allowing Staff To Carry Guns On Campus,” Oklahoma’s Own, 02/02/16, Annie Chang.

Robert Weller, who has a grandson at Okay Junior High, agrees, "If someone wants to come in and start shooting, someone should be able to interrupt it."¶ The district started drafting the firearm policy last summer based on Oklahoma House Bill 2014.¶ As it stands, teachers and staff who want to bring guns on campus must first be approved by the school board, go through rigorous armed security training and pass several tests per year.¶ McMahan says the district has higher standards than most Oklahoma police officers face.¶ It's all to prepare the schools for a worst-case scenario.¶ "Whether these people realize it or not, all of these kids are our kids," McMahan says. "I treat every one of these kids as though they're mine."¶ McMahan says several other Oklahoma school district superintendents have approached him for guidance, as they'd like to implement similar policies in their districts.

### Alt Colleges Cap

Thus, the alternative is to engage in student rebellion against universities to reclaim voice and creativity. **Allsop 15**

“How capitalism is destroying education,” Bradley Allsop, Bright Green, 2015.

Whether it be ever-escalating marketing wars, a customer mentality, or obsession with efficiency and employability, all have their roots in capitalist ideology, an ideology aggressively expanding into the education sector. The inevitable logic of ‘austerity’ as well, leading to cuts to students support and higher education funding and the tripling of tuition fees is the only real answer capitalism has to the deficit, an answer clearly not in the interests of students or anyone else without a Swiss bank account.¶ Capitalism has not killed education in the obvious senses that its proponents attempt to highlight—more and more attend university each year. What it is slowly doing is a much more subtle and lamentable death—it has ripped the heart out of its fundamental principles. It is confining the imaginations and the aspirations of a generation. It is offering a bleak and debt-ridden future to millions.¶ Education must respond to profound challenges, unimaginative governments and technological innovation, but it must be a response that is driven by its foundational principles. Every student and teacher must join the fight to ensure it is creativity, expression and critical thinking that is dominating our schools and universities, not efficiency or profit. If all stake holders are given a voice in education we have a real chance to craft something that is engaging and exciting, a system that makes children not want to leave the classroom, that challenges the status quo and transforms society. It is a fight that is coming to the Ivy League campus and the old polytechnic classroom alike, but though separated by space we are bonded by cause.¶ Students are the life blood and the driving force of at any level of education. Occupations, collective effort and solidarity have worked in the past and can work again. As long as there is an engaged and determined student population within our various institutes of learning, there is no limit to what can be achieved- a denial of this is simply a lack of imagination.