### Turns

A national gun ban would cause a massive increase of government militarization. **Mehta 15**

Varad Mehta [GWU History department, pursuing Doctorate], "The Australia Gun Control Fallacy," Federalist, http://thefederalist.com/2015/06/25/the-australia-gun-control-fallacy/, June 25, 2015. CC

New York and Connecticut authorities so far have shown no inclination to enforce their laws by going door to door to round up unregistered guns and arrest their owners. But that’s what would be necessary to enforce the law. A federal law, therefore, would require sweeping, national police action involving thousands of lawmen and affecting tens of millions of people. If proponents of gun control are serious about getting guns out of Americans’ hands, someone will have to take those guns out of Americans’ hands. Australian-style gun control, in other words, would require government force and coercion on a massive scale. Now, progressives don’t understand the nature of coercion, so maybe they would not see police action to enforce gun confiscation as coercion. Or, perhaps, they actually do understand that their ideal form of gun control requires it, which is why they keep speaking in code and talk about “Australia” and not “wholesale confiscation.” Let there be no doubt. Gun confiscation would have to be administered by force of arms. I do not expect that those who dismissed their fellow citizens for clinging bitterly to their guns are so naive that they imagine these people will suddenly cease their bitter clinging when some nice young man knocks on their door and says, “Hello, I’m from the government and I’m here to take your guns.” As though somehow those who daily espouse their belief that the purpose of the Second Amendment is to allow citizens to resist government oppression and tyranny will not use the Second Amendment to resist what they see as government oppression and tyranny. Or maybe they are so naive. Many on the Left—and for this they are to be commended—have voiced their opposition to the increasing militarization of America’s police. Yet only a militarized police could enforce an Australian gun-control scheme in the United States. To take arms from men requires men with arms. There’s no other way to do it. Yet because of the numbers of guns and men with guns in this country, any policy to remove those guns will inevitably depend on some measure of coercion, quite possibly a heavy measure. Does anyone honestly believe this country has the will or resources to seize 60 to 105 million firearms from 105 to 160 million Americans? “Progressives believe it,” I hear you answer.

That outweighs

A. It maintains militarism but makes it one-sided – now largely only the government has the power to enforce their will on minorities and marginalized groups

B. Government oppression is harder to reverse because it feeds off of itself by making opposing movements weaker and weaker, so it outweighs on reversibility.

C. Government oppression is systematic and concentrated since the government is in a unique position to maintain power, so it’s more severe.

America’s culture of violence is disconnected from gun ownership – history and current policy values prove. **Kuznicki 15**

Jason Kuznicki [research fellow at the Cato Institute and editor of Cato Unbound], "Cowen on Gun Control and Militarism," Ordinary Times, December 10, 2015. CC

Tyler Cowen writes: Chris Blattman cites a recent estimate that Americans own 42% of the civilian guns in the world. You’ll also see estimates that America accounts for about half of the world’s defense spending. I believe those numbers are a misuse of purchasing power parity comparisons, but with proper adjustments it is not implausible to believe that America accounts for… about 42% of the defense spending. Or thereabouts. I see those two numbers, and their rough similarity, as the most neglected fact in current debates about gun control. I see many people who want to lower or perhaps raise those numbers, but I don’t see enough people analyzing the two as an integrated whole. I hate to be a downer, but I’m going to make the case for coincidence on this one. I don’t really think that gun culture is at work here. Or if it is, it’s certainly not in the driver’s seat. American history is long, and the eras in which the above correlation did not hold seem much longer than those in which they did. Consider the entire nineteenth century, during which the United States was – if I am not mistaken – nowhere near the world’s leader in defense spending. (True, the Civil War may be an exception. It often is.) Meanwhile per capita we surely owned way, way more guns back then. Just as surely: Per capita gun ownership must be the correct metric for considering the influence of gun ownership on American values, rather than the silly estimate of our share of world gun ownership. The latter has nothing to do, so far as I can tell, with how the American public feels about guns and/or militarism. The latter barely registers in the public mind at all, I would think. So I see very little case for correlation in the longer term. I also see a pretty big counterexample in the present day, namely the pro–gun control center-left constituency that nonetheless is fairly militarist abroad: They may not be a majority, but the share of people who have supported every single one of Obama’s foreign interventions, and who also support strict gun control, is likely larger than the share of people whom Tyler takes to task for not considering that gun culture and militarism are supposedly linked. Moreover, if we had had a stronger antiwar left throughout the Obama administration, it seems doubtful to me that Obama could have been as militarist as he was. The decisive constituency here, the one that has enabled American military intervention, has been made up of leftists who support gun control, but whose antiwar sentiment dissolves whenever a Democrat is in the White House. (I take it for granted that right-wing parties will be militarist in their foreign policy. I don’t consider this to be a special feature of American politics, and still less one that depends on America’s love affair with the gun.) Acting over time, the same constituency of pro–gun control center-left militarists has been decisive in shaping our bloated defense budgets, which tempt us into doubtful military adventures in the first place.

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%.

The AFF is not reverse causal – guns don’t cause militarism, militarism exists and justifies gun use – military attacks and racism existed before handguns.

Cultural change is empirically disproven – even modest gun proposals in liberal states had drastic backlash in America and low compliance which proves the AFF doesn’t change culture. **Mehta 15**

Varad Mehta [GWU History department, pursuing Doctorate], "The Australia Gun Control Fallacy," Federalist, http://thefederalist.com/2015/06/25/the-australia-gun-control-fallacy/, June 25, 2015. CC

When someone says the United States ought to adopt Australia’s gun laws, he is really saying that gun control is worth risking violent insurrection. The massacre in Charleston, South Carolina of nine members of a Bible study at a historic African-American church has horrified the entire country. Dylann Roof, a 21-year-old avowed white supremacist, has confessed to the shooting. As news of this cold-blooded murder spread, attention turned, as it inevitably (and understandably) does after such incidents, to the subject of the presence of guns in American society. Yet it quickly became apparent that America’s moribund gun control debate would remain moribund. President Obama’s declaration that the country “needs a change in attitude” had a rote quality to it, as did Hillary Clinton’s ringing endorsement of “common-sense gun reforms.” As for Rep. Carolyn Maloney’s (D-New York) exhortation to pass legislation she recently introduced to require gun owners to obtain liability insurance on the grounds that “[i]f you want to buy that Uzi, the thinking goes, you should also have to pay for the risk that gun poses to society as a result,” the less said the better. Calls for stronger background checks on gun purchases or a new ban on “assault weapons” have become formulaic. They’re like winding a Victrola: the record resumes spinning but it plays the same old song. Another tune in the gun-control songbook, however, is worth listening to. Not as many sing it, but nonetheless it is instructive as it shows the chorus of the media and gun-control advocates at their laziest and most uncurious, and at their most disingenuous if not dishonest. What song do I mean? I forget its name, but it goes something like this. What Australia Did After a 1996 Shooting After any mass shooting someone will invoke the name “Australia” and raise the question, “Can Australia’s gun-control laws be a model for the United States?” This time the honor belonged to CNN’s Laura Smith-Spark, who recounts the circumstances that led to Australia’s current gun-control laws and outlines their provisions. The laws were passed after the Port Arthur massacre, a 1996 mass shooting in which one man killed 35 people. Australia outlawed semi-automatic rifles, certain categories of shotgun, and implemented strict licensing and registration requirements. The cornerstone of its new gun-control scheme, however, was a massive gun buyback program. The Australian government purchased 650,000 to one million guns with funds raised via a special tax. The Australian paradigm became popular in the wake of the Newtown, Connecticut, school shootings in 2012. USA Today, ABC News, Slate, the Washington Post, and the Christian Science Monitor were among the outlets that published articles urging Americans to look closely at the actions their antipodean cousins took after a similar tragedy. Nor are Americans the only ones who think we should heed the Australian example. Numerous Australians have expressed pride in their country’s gun laws by penning columns beseeching Americans to transport America’s gun laws from Down Under. These articles all point to the reduction in the rate of gun deaths in Australia after the new system was established as its main achievement. But it is the policy that allowed that system to be established which holds the writers’ and consequently the reader’s attention. That policy is the gun buyback program, which removed up to one million weapons from Australians’ hands and homes. This was, depending on the estimate, a fifth to a third of Australia’s gun stock. The statistic does not seem remarkable as a raw number, but it is quite so when expressed as a percentage. No wonder commentators fixate on it. The problem is the way most of them tell that tale: when they describe Australia’s gun buyback program, almost none of them tell the truth about it. The Australian Law Banned and Confiscated Guns The crucial fact they omit is that the buyback program was mandatory. Australia’s vaunted gun buyback program was in fact a sweeping program of gun confiscation. Only the articles from USA Today and the Washington Post cited above contain the crucial information that the buyback was compulsory. The article by Smith-Spark, the latest entry in the genre, assuredly does not. It’s the most important detail about the main provision of Australia’s gun laws, and pundits ignore it. That’s like writing an article about how Obamacare works without once mentioning the individual mandate. Yet when American gun control advocates and politicians praise Australia’s gun laws, that’s just what they’re doing. Charles Cooke of the National Review shredded the rhetorical conceit of bellowing “Australia!” last year after President Obama expressed his admiration for gun control à la Oz: You simply cannot praise Australia’s gun-laws without praising the country’s mass confiscation program. That is Australia’s law. When the Left says that we should respond to shootings as Australia did, they don’t mean that we should institute background checks on private sales; they mean that they we should ban and confiscate guns. No amount of wooly words can change this. Again, one doesn’t bring up countries that have confiscated firearms as a shining example unless one wishes to push the conversation toward confiscation. Cooke, of course, is right. When gun control advocates say they want Australian gun control laws in the United States, what they are really saying is that they want gun confiscation in the United States. Democrat Leaders Support Gun Confiscation Not all gun control proponents prevaricate. Some are forthright about their intentions. After Sandy Hook, Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-California) stated she was considering legislation to institute a mandatory national buyback program. New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo also expressed an interest in confiscation, at least for assault weapons. “Confiscation could be an option. Mandatory sale to the state could be an option. Permitting could be an option — keep your gun but permit it.” Ultimately, New York did not institute confiscation, but did require registration of existing assault weapons and banned all sales of new and existing ones within the state. Gun buybacks remain a popular policy with the Left because it is the only way of achieving what the Left regards as the only acceptable gun-control solution: reducing the number of guns in America. Matt Miller of the Center for American Progress proposed such a program after Sandy Hook. Conceding that anything mandatory was unlikely to pass Congress, he pitched a gun buyback program as a form of economic stimulus: give people cash for guns, which they can then spend on other things. “Make gun owners an offer they can’t refuse. Instead of a measly $200 a gun, Uncle Sam might offer $500.” Why a gun owner would accept $500 for a gun that likely cost considerably more is a question Miller unsurprisingly does not ask, let alone answer. Posing it would puncture his balloon. Voluntary buyback initiatives are a waste of time and money. So those hostile to gun rights continue to demand mandatory confiscation. Earlier this year, the advisory commission appointed by Connecticut Gov. Dannel Malloy after Sandy Hook recommended banning the sale and possession of “any rifle or handgun that accepts a detachable magazine.” Commission members shrugged off suggestions that this would entail an unconstitutional prohibition on most firearms Americans own, saying it was not their job to take such niceties into account. The editorial board of the Newark Star-Ledger displayed similar “magical thinking” last September when it called for mandatory confiscation in New Jersey. Predictably, the board cited the Australian example, pointing to the drop in gun violence there as all the necessary justification for inaugurating such a program here. The editorial board concluded by bemoaning America’s “hysteria over ‘gun confiscation,’” which would keep their fantasy just that. How Would Government Get the Guns? On this point at least they are correct. Gun confiscation is not happening in the United States any time soon. But let’s suppose it did. How would it work? Australia’s program netted, at the low end, 650,000 guns, and at the high end, a million. That was approximately a fifth to a third of Australian firearms. There are about as many guns in America as there are people: 310 million of both in 2009. A fifth to a third would be between 60 and 105 million guns. To achieve in America what was done in Australia, in other words, the government would have to confiscate as many as 105 million firearms. The 310 million guns in America are not owned by 310 million Americans. Just how many Americans own guns, though, is controversial. The General Social Survey shows gun ownership on a four-decade downward trajectory, to 32 percent of households in 2015. A 2011 Gallup poll, on the other hand, found gun ownership at a two-decade high, with 47 percent of Americans stating they possessed a firearm. As Harry Enten of The Guardian observed, the answer to the gun ownership question seems heavily dependent on wording and methodology: phone surveys consistently find higher rates. Moreover, and this is the key point, those rates, however the surveys are conducted, have been static for at least 15 years, while background checks have soared. A third to a half of the U.S. population translates to 105 to 160 million people. A fifth to a third of guns is 60 to 105 million. Now that we see what is required for an American buyback scheme to work on an Australian scale, we can at last we confront the question gun-control advocates never ask, let alone answer: how do you take 60 to 105 million firearms from 105 to 160 million Americans? The answer to that question is the answer to the question of whether the Australian example really is valid for America after all. If the experience of “blue” states which introduced gun regulations that have nearly universal approval on the Left is any indication, liberals are likely to experience keen disappointment. Americans Resist Gun Confiscation Both New York and Connecticut imposed strict new rules on the possession and sale of guns after Sandy Hook. Among these were requirements for the registration of so-called assault rifles in both states and in New York a ban on “high-capacity” magazines regardless of when they were manufactured or purchased. Compliance with the registration requirement has been modest at best, as hundreds of thousands of gun owners in both states refused to register their weapons. So far, then, the laws have been most successful in creating hundreds of thousands of lawbreakers who feel obligated to break the law. New York and Connecticut are two of the “bluest” states in the Union, states with staunchly liberal Democratic governors and legislatures dominated by Democrats and Northeastern Republicans who vote for gun control. Yet the residents of these states have refused to go along with the kinds of laws that gun-control advocates view as a minimum for what they would like to see adopted at the federal level. If New York and Connecticut won’t go along, what do they expect would happen in “red” states? Progressives will not answer that question because they never ask it, not even to themselves, lest somehow they say it out loud. On guns, the Left is incoherent, even insincere. It won’t say what it wants because what it wants is “a nonstarter politically, unfeasible in reality, and, by the way, completely unconstitutional”—that is, confiscation on the Australian model. Liberals refuse to confront the implications of their Australian dream because doing so would force them to give that dream up. Those implications are easy to spell out, though. A national gun buyback law would turn a significant portion of the American people into criminals. Residents of New York and Connecticut snubbed their new laws. The other 48 states are not New York and Connecticut. Civil disobedience on a national scale would ensue. The Australia Plan Would Require Coercion and Conflict New York and Connecticut authorities so far have shown no inclination to enforce their laws by going door to door to round up unregistered guns and arrest their owners. But that’s what would be necessary to enforce the law. A federal law, therefore, would require sweeping, national police action involving thousands of lawmen and affecting tens of millions of people. If proponents of gun control are serious about getting guns out of Americans’ hands, someone will have to take those guns out of Americans’ hands. Australian-style gun control, in other words, would require government force and coercion on a massive scale. Now, progressives don’t understand the nature of coercion, so maybe they would not see police action to enforce gun confiscation as coercion. Or, perhaps, they actually do understand that their ideal form of gun control requires it, which is why they keep speaking in code and talk about “Australia” and not “wholesale confiscation.” Let there be no doubt. Gun confiscation would have to be administered by force of arms. I do not expect that those who dismissed their fellow citizens for clinging bitterly to their guns are so naive that they imagine these people will suddenly cease their bitter clinging when some nice young man knocks on their door and says, “Hello, I’m from the government and I’m here to take your guns.” As though somehow those who daily espouse their belief that the purpose of the Second Amendment is to allow citizens to resist government oppression and tyranny will not use the Second Amendment to resist what they see as government oppression and tyranny. Or maybe they are so naive. Many on the Left—and for this they are to be commended—have voiced their opposition to the increasing militarization of America’s police. Yet only a militarized police could enforce an Australian gun-control scheme in the United States. To take arms from men requires men with arms. There’s no other way to do it. Yet because of the numbers of guns and men with guns in this country, any policy to remove those guns will inevitably depend on some measure of coercion, quite possibly a heavy measure. Does anyone honestly believe this country has the will or resources to seize 60 to 105 million firearms from 105 to 160 million Americans? “Progressives believe it,” I hear you answer. Yes, but the ones who do, believe this dishonestly. New York and Connecticut authorities so far have shown no inclination to enforce their laws by going door to door to round up unregistered guns and arrest their owners. But that’s what would be necessary to enforce the law. A federal law, therefore, would require sweeping, national police action involving thousands of lawmen and affecting tens of millions of people. If proponents of gun control are serious about getting guns out of Americans’ hands, someone will have to take those guns out of Americans’ hands. Australian-style gun control, in other words, would require government force and coercion on a massive scale. Now, progressives don’t understand the nature of coercion, so maybe they would not see police action to enforce gun confiscation as coercion. Or, perhaps, they actually do understand that their ideal form of gun control requires it, which is why they keep speaking in code and talk about “Australia” and not “wholesale confiscation.” Let there be no doubt. Gun confiscation would have to be administered by force of arms. I do not expect that those who dismissed their fellow citizens for clinging bitterly to their guns are so naive that they imagine these people will suddenly cease their bitter clinging when some nice young man knocks on their door and says, “Hello, I’m from the government and I’m here to take your guns.” As though somehow those who daily espouse their belief that the purpose of the Second Amendment is to allow citizens to resist government oppression and tyranny will not use the Second Amendment to resist what they see as government oppression and tyranny. Or maybe they are so naive. Many on the Left—and for this they are to be commended—have voiced their opposition to the increasing militarization of America’s police. Yet only a militarized police could enforce an Australian gun-control scheme in the United States. To take arms from men requires men with arms. There’s no other way to do it. Yet because of the numbers of guns and men with guns in this country, any policy to remove those guns will inevitably depend on some measure of coercion, quite possibly a heavy measure. Does anyone honestly believe this country has the will or resources to seize 60 to 105 million firearms from 105 to 160 million Americans? “Progressives believe it,” I hear you answer. Yes, but the ones who do, believe this dishonestly.

A handgun ban causes massive policing and incarceration of black people which creates worse militarism in a more insidious form. **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.

Outweighs – the police state is a more powerful and violent institution that individual gun violence.

The US doesn’t have the funding or infrastructure to enforce gun bans. **Vainik 06**

Vainik 06 Vainik, Jennifer L.[ J.D. Candidate 2008, University of Minnesota Law School; B.A. 2002, Northwestern] "Kiss, Kiss, Bang, Bang: How Current Approaches to Guns and Domestic Violence Fail to Save Women's Lives." Minn. L. Rev. 91 (2006): 1113. NS

Recent federal and state actions to disarm batterers are not saving women's lives. 125 Surprisingly, men appear to be experiencing the greatest benefit from recent domestic violence policies. 126 Since the 1970s, the number of men killed by their intimate partners decreased substantially while the number of women murdered in domestic violence incidents did not decline. 127 Recent changes that make it easier for women to escape violent relationships-such as the liberal issuance of restraining orders, 28 increased recognition of no-fault divorce, 29 and the proliferation of battered women's shelters 13 0 -likely account for the reduction in female-perpetrated homicides against intimate partners. Major flaws in federal and state approaches to disarming batterers cause women to continue to face deadly violence. At the state level, laws banning gun ownership by batterers are either non-existent or difficult to enforce. Overall, twenty-six states currently have no laws ordering batterers to disarm.' 3 ' In states that do have such laws, **conditions and qualifications reduce the likelihood of disarming batterers. For instance, a judge might decide that the gun removal provision "is not important" and refuse to impose the ban**.132 **If the batterer did not use the gun in the domestic violence incident, he might legally be able to continue to possess guns or purchase new ones.** 133 In many cases, the batterer may only be disarmed for a couple of days, 134 and, in states where the abuser must turn in his guns, he might simply refuse to comply. 135 **Even if states can legally disarm a batterer, many states lack the bureaucratic and physical infrastructure to actually remove the guns. Many states do not have gun repositories where the guns can be stored. 136 Nor do they have the extra law enforcement officers necessary to confiscate the weapons, catalogue them, store them in the repository, and return them once an order for protection terminates or a misdemeanant's record is expunged. 137 Some states have no system in place to inform victims, abusers, employers, and police officers of the gun bans.** 13s Other states do not have a common database wherein they may flag the abuser as a "prohibited person."' 39 Thus, gun dealers and police may not know whether an individual can or cannot possess or purchase a **gun. While the federal disarmament laws were enacted to ameliorate the inadequacies of the state laws, the federal gun bans also fail to achieve their goal. The federal bans are severely underenforced, enabling batterers to continue to possess guns.** From 2000 to 2002, 630 suspects were referred to U.S. Attorneys for violations of a firearms-related domestic offense, representing just three percent of the 18,653 federal suspects referred for alleged violent crimes. 140 This is a small fraction of the number of cases that can be prosecuted. Judge Posner of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit estimates that approximately **forty thousand people violate the gun bans each year by possessing firearms while subject to a protection order.**141 A much smaller percentage of suspects are actually convicted. 142 The federal time and money spent on enforcing weapons offenses is not commensurate to the scope of the problem. Additionally, Congress undermines the unique, national representative capacity of federal law. 194

A focus on gun control masks and reifies the problem. **Giroux 13**

Henry Giroux. “Violence is Deeply Rooted in American Culture: An Interview With Henry A. Giroux.” Truthout. January 17, 2013. CC

After every national tragedy involving guns, the American public is being inundated with figures about gun violence, ranging from the fact that more than 84 people are killed daily with guns, to the shocking statistic that there are more than 31,000 gun-related deaths annually. In 2010, for example, there were 8,775 murders by firearms in the U.S., while in Britain there were only 638. Moreover, there are 300 million firearms in a country of just over 311 million and just over 47 percent of Americans own guns. Most disturbingly, as pointed out by the Children’s Defense fund, is the fact that in 2010, “2694 children and teens were killed by gunfire [and] since 1979 …a shocking 119,079 children and teens have been killed by gun violence. That is more child and youth deaths in America than American battle deaths in World War I (53,402) or in Vietnam (47,434) or in the Korean War (33,739) or in the Iraq War (3,517).”[1] These are startling figures, but they do not tell us enough about the cult and spectacle of violence in American society. Nor do they make visible the myriad of forces that has produced a country drenched in bloodshed and violence. There is little doubt that the role of the NRA is instrumental in the violence haunting American culture, or that gun control is important, but it is only one factor in the culture of symbolic and institutional violence that has such a powerful grip on the everyday cultural apparatuses and workings of American society. The issue of violence in America goes far beyond the issue of gun control. When gun control is the focus — instead of a broader consideration of violence — it can actually serve to deflect the most important questions that need to be raised. The grave reality is that violence saturates almost every aspect of North American culture. Domestically, violence weaves through the cultural and social landscape like a highly charged forest fire burning everything in its path. Popular culture, extending from Hollywood films and sports thuggery, to video games, embraces the spectacle of violence as the primary medium of entertainment. The real issue here is the existence of a pedagogy of violence that actually makes the power of deadly violence attractive. Representations of violence dominate the media and often parade before viewers less as an object of critique than as a for-profit spectacle, just as the language of violence and punishment now shapes the U.S. culture — with various registers of violence now informing school zero-tolerance policies, a bulging prison-industrial complex, and the growing militarization of everyday life. There is also the fact that as neoliberalism and its culture of cruelty weaves its way through the culture it makes the work place, schools, and other public spheres sites of rage, anger, humiliation, and misery, creating the foundation for blind rebellion against what might be termed intolerable conditions. Accepting the logic of radical individual responsibility, too many Americans blame themselves for being unemployed, homeless, and isolated and end up perceiving their misery as an individual failing and hence are vulnerable to forms of existential depression and collective rage. We have seen such violence among students reacting to bullying and among postal workers responding to intolerable work conditions. There is no one cause of violence, but a series of a number of causes that range from the war on drugs and the militarization of police departments to mass incarcerations in prisons to the return from brutal wars of many trained killers suffering with PTSD.[2] All of these factors combine in an explosive mix to create an dangerous culture of violence and cruelty and as Jeff Sparrow points out a “willingness of ordinary people to commit unthinkable atrocities.”[3]

A huge illicit market would be prominent with at least 100 million or more handguns – empirically confirmed. **Jacobs 02**

Jacobs, James B. Can gun control work?. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. CC

National Handgun Prohibition, whether actively or passively enforced, would have to contend with a black market.26 If the lawful supply of fire­ arms was shut down, consider how easily guns could migrate into the [illegal] black market. In the United States, there exists a black market in handguns that are stolen, purchased for unlawful sale, or otherwise diverted from lawful owners to criminals. According to Gary Kleck, “There appears to be stronger evidence pointing to theft as a major source of guns for criminals than illicit trafficking.” Perhaps half of the guns obtained by crimi­ nals have been stolen at some time in the past, though not necessarily by the criminal who most recently possessed it and used it in a crime. Kleck estimates that as many as 750,000 guns are stolen each year.27 Of the in­ mates interviewed by sociologists James Wright and Peter Rossi in 1986, thirty-two percent said that they stole their most recently acquired hand­ gun; 46% stated that their most recently acquired handgun was “definitely stolen,” while another 24% said the gun was “probably stolen.”28 Even in countries with strong prohibitory regimes (like Japan and Holland), criminals are able to obtain handguns relatively easily on the [illegal] black market. We can reasonably estimate that there would be a stock of some 100 million or more handguns in private hands by the time National Handgun Prohibition was enacted (assuming booming sales in the 4–5 years leading up to prohibition). The handgun black market would be supplied by im­ ports, stolen handguns, handguns illegally produced in clandestine work­ shops, and handguns given away or sold by lawful owners, who oppose the law or who, for a profit, are willing to risk getting caught.

Massive review of literature proves gun control doesn’t affect violence. **Kates and Mauser 07**

(Don B. Kates (LL.B., Yale, 1966) is an American criminologist and constitutional lawyer associated with the Pacific Research Institute, Gary Mauser (Ph.D., University of California, Irvine, 1970), WOULD BANNING FIREARMS REDUCE MURDER AND SUICIDE?, Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy [Vol. 30 No. 2], 2007. NS

In this connection, two recent studies are pertinent. In 2004, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences released its evaluation from a review of 253 journal articles, 99 books, 43 government publications, and some original empirical research. It failed to identify any gun control that had reduced violent crime, suicide, or gun accidents.15 The same conclusion was reached in 2003 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control’s review of then-extant studies.16

### A2 Donahue/Australia

Australia was not a gun ban – it was regulations – and Australia had a cultural shift before gun control. **Beck 15**

Katie Beck, "Are Australia's gun laws the solution for the US?," BBC News, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-35048251, December 9, 2015. CC

Drop in shootings Less than two weeks after the Port Arthur massacre, all six Australian states agreed to enact the same sweeping gun laws banning semi-automatic rifles and shotguns - weapons that can kill many people quickly. They also put more hurdles between prospective gun owners and their weapons. Australia has 28-day waiting periods, thorough background checks, and a requirement to present a "justifiable reason" to own a gun. Unlike in the US, self-protection is not accepted as a justifiable reason to own a gun. In the 19 years since the laws were passed, about one million semi-automatic weapons - roughly one third of the country's firearms - were sold back to the government and destroyed, nearly halving the number of gun-owning households in Australia. The number of Australia's mass shootings dropped from 11 in the decade before 1996, to zero in the years since. And although the laws were designed specifically to reduce mass shootings, the rates of homicide and suicide have also come down since 1996. Philip Alpers, a professor at Sydney School of Public Health, has done studies showing that aside from the victims of the Port Arthur shooting, 69 gun homicides were recorded in 1996 compared with 30 in 2012. Despite the reduction in incidence though, gun violence has not disappeared in Australia. And gun ownership is actually on the rise. Since 1996, Australians have been steadily replacing the outlawed firearms they sold back with legal ones, and gun ownership here has now risen back to pre-1996 levels. Australian firearms rights groups say that the laws go too far and restrict personal freedom. They argue that gun violence was on a downward trajectory before the 1996 laws were passed, and reject any link between lower incidence of gun deaths and the tighter legislation. Diana Melham, executive director of the Sporting Shooters Australia Association in New South Wales, argues the 1996 laws fuelled a sense of alienation among gun owners, which, she says "rallied the shooters". The organisation, which is the country's largest gun lobby group, has grown rapidly since 1996 and its numbers are still on the rise. But Tim Fischer, who was Prime Minister Howard's deputy in 1996 and instrumental in getting the National Firearms Agreement passed, argues the US should follow Australia's lead. "Plain and simple, what we've done works," he told the BBC. The big question So could it work in the US? The simple answer is - probably not. Although Australia does have a long history of hunting and sport, there is no equivalent to America's Second Amendment right to bear arms here. Another significant difference is the speed of government action. In 1996 John Howard managed to get all six Australian states to agree to and pass uniform sweeping gun control legislation in just 12 days. It is hard to fathom the US government ever being able to get all 50 states to agree to something, let alone act that quickly. But according to Prof Alpers, the bigger difference is the cultural mindset. "I don't for a moment think it would happen in the US," he says. "Australia already had a pre-disposition to doing something about it." He explains that although by far the deadliest, the Port Arthur shooting was not the first Australia had experienced. He says the country had lost nearly 150 people in the years running up to 1996 in mass shootings, and the national mood was changing. "Port Arthur was the straw that broke the camel's back. You have to go back to those years to remember how visceral that backlash was."

Australia’s gun control policies were drastically different – more urbanization, no NRA or constitutional right to guns – their solvency isn’t applicable. **Mehta 15**

Varad Mehta [GWU History department], "The Australia Gun Control Fallacy," Federalist, http://thefederalist.com/2015/06/25/the-australia-gun-control-fallacy/, June 25, 2015. CC

Modeling Australia Means Civil War When someone says the United States ought to adopt Australia’s gun laws as its own, he is really saying the cause of gun control is so important that he is willing to impose these laws even at the cost of violent insurrection. Make no mistake, armed rebellion would be the consequence. Armed men would be dispatched to confiscate guns, they would be met by armed men, and blood would be shed. Australia is a valid example for America only if you are willing for that blood to be spilled in torrents and rivers. To choose Australia is to choose civil war. In an op-ed for the New York Times written after Sandy Hook, John Howard, the prime minister who oversaw the passage of Australia’s current gun laws, implored Americans to consider his nation’s example. Yet Howard fully understood the fundamental irrelevance of his country’s laws to the United States, and undermined his case by highlighting the differences between the two countries. Our challenges were different from America’s. Australia is an even more intensely urban society, with close to 60 percent of our people living in large cities. Our gun lobby isn’t as powerful or well-financed as the National Rifle Association in the United States. Australia, correctly in my view, does not have a Bill of Rights, so our legislatures have more say than America’s over many issues of individual rights, and our courts have less control. Also, we have no constitutional right to bear arms. (After all, the British granted us nationhood peacefully; the United States had to fight for it.) Leave aside that Australia had—and has—far fewer guns and people than we do. Forget the bits about the gun lobby or Australia’s greater urbanization. The crucial point is the final one: Australia does not have a bill of rights, and that, ultimately, is the reason it was able to confiscate guns. Australians have no constitutional right to bear arms, so seizing their weapons did not violate their constitutional rights. Gun confiscation in the United States would require violating not only the Second Amendment, but the fourth and fifth as well, and possibly even the first. Progressives generally have no compunction about breaching the Second Amendment, but one wonders how many others they would be eager to violate in their quest to nullify the second. Civil war and a tattered Constitution: such are the consequences of invoking “Australia.” It is not a model; it is a mirage. There is an essential mendacity, whether intentional or not, to all suggestions that Australia’s system of gun control is suitable for the United States. Conjuring Australia isn’t innocent. But this trick does serve one valuable purpose: when gun controllers perform it they reveal what they truly desire. An Australian-style gun-control regime, it must be abundantly clear by now, would not only be impractical in the United States, it would be immoral. We would all be better served if American gun-control advocates acknowledged this reality and left their fantasy Down Under where it belongs.

Multitude of studies prove Australia’s program had no effect on violence rates – disproves their literal one sentence assertion. **Wright 15**

Mark Antonio Wright, "Australia’S 1996 Gun Confiscation Didn’t Work – And It Wouldn’t Work In America," National Review Online, October 2, 2015. CC

I noted at the time that: While the chart does show a steady decline in gun-related suicides, the reduction occurred at the same time as an overall reduction in the Australian suicide rate. What’s more, firearm-related suicides had been declining in Australia for nearly ten years before the 1996 restrictions on gun ownership. Vox’s own chart does not appear to show a causal link between gun control and a reduction in suicide rates in Australia. Moreover, a look at other developed countries with very strict gun-control laws (such as Japan and South Korea) shows that the lack of guns does not lead to a reduced suicide rate. Unfortunately, people who want to kill themselves often find a way to do so — guns or no guns. Did the Australian model at least reduce gun-related homicides? That is hotly disputed. University of Melbourne researchers Wang-Sheng Lee and Sandy Suardi concluded their 2008 report on the matter with the statement, “There is little evidence to suggest that [the Australian mandatory gun-buyback program] had any significant effects on firearm homicides.” “Although gun buybacks appear to be a logical and sensible policy that helps to placate the public’s fears,” the reported continued, “the evidence so far suggests that in the Australian context, the high expenditure incurred to fund the 1996 gun buyback has not translated into any tangible reductions in terms of firearm deaths.” A 2007 report, “Gun Laws and Sudden Death: Did the Australian Firearms Legislation of 1996 Make a Difference?” by Jeanine Baker and Samara McPhedran similarly concluded that the buyback program did not have a significant long-term effect on the Australian homicide rate. The Australian gun-homicide rate had already been quite low and had been steadily falling in the 15 years prior to the Port Arthur massacre. And while the mandatory buyback program did appear to reduce the rate of accidental firearm deaths, Baker and McPhedran found that “the gun buy-back and restrictive legislative changes had no influence on firearm homicide in Australia.”

### A2 Kahan

Kahan’s study is flawed – cultural attitudes are not significant for gun control and doesn’t account for empirical factors that change cultural opinions. **Fremling and Lott 3**

Fremling, Gertrud M., and John R. Lott. "The surprising finding that" cultural worldviews" don't explain people's views on gun control." University of Pennsylvania law review 151.4 (2003): 1341-1348. CC

Kahan and Braman reach two closely related conclusions: (1) "individuals' attitudes toward gun control are derivative of the type of social order they prize"; r and (2) "those interested in resolving the gun debate should turn their attention away from quantifying the consequences of gun control."' ' These conclusions are based on the two regressions reported in Table 1 of their article Their reasoning points to the statistically significant coefficients that they obtain for their "hierarchy-egalitarianism" and "individualism-solidarism" indexes.8 They are indeed correct that these coefficients are statistically significant. But statistical significance is not the same as importance: it is incorrect to claim that these variables explain much of people's views on gun control. The indexes developed by Kahan and Braman increase our ability to predict people's opinions on gun control by merely 1.6 percentage points (the difference in the two R s, equal to .08 minus .064, representing the change in how much of the variation in people's opinions on gun control can be explained by adding these two variables)." In other words, cultural attitudes explain less than 2% of attitudes on guns. (Our guess is that if Kahan and Braman's data set allowed a more precise control of stateor area-code-fixed effects, they would find an even smaller percentage of the variation explained by their two desired control variables, and the statistical significance might well drop too.) Thus, Kahan and Braman prove the opposite of what they intended. Instead of demonstrating that people's views of social order explain a lot of the variation in positions on gun control, they show that these views matter very little. Possibly, the unexplained 92% of the variation in people's views (the remainder after factoring the .08 R2 variable reflecting people's opinions on gun control that can be explained) could be completely due to randomness. Yet, it is very conceivable that some of the 92% figure could be explained by what information people receive. The central problem here is that Kahan and Braman actually do not test whether information matters. They test whether attitudes matter. Obviously, there is no logic that rules out that both matter. To solve this problem, they need a measure of what information people receive. Perhaps they could include a dummy variable such as whether or not respondents have read More Guns, Less Crime,' seen certain news shows, or seen some major news event. If we identify a reasonable variable of that nature and show it to be statistically significant, then we can conclude that information matters. At that point, we could compare relative magnitudes: does the influence stemming from "attitudes" exceed that stemming from "information"? (Unfortunately, the task would probably encounter great complexity due to collinearity between the two explanatory variables-the information channels we seek out also depend on our preexisting attitudes.) However, without showing the statistical significance of information, its importance remains unknown. Another theoretical problem we have with Kahan and Braman's conclusions is their lack of consideration for the potential of empirical evidence to determine whether gun control helps people obtain their social goals. For example, suppose that research showed that gun ownership was consistent with egalitarianism. Right-to-carry laws allow the most vulnerable in society to protect themselves: those most vulnerable to crime (the poor who live in high crime urban areas); the physically weak (women and the elderly); and those who face racial or other hatreds (African Americans and homosexuals).' These are the exact segments of society for which egalitarians exhibit concern." Even if people only care about social values, don't they care about whether the regulations that they propose help them obtain their goals?

### Framework

Omitted

### A2 Threat Construction

Omitted

## Specific Cards

### Giroux 1/10

1. Drone strikes is not related to gun violence – solving one doesn’t solve the other – Chris Christie was pro-gun control in Jersey and super hawkish in foreign policy, and Donald Trump is pro-gun but dove-ish in foreign policy

2. This says violence results from mass shootings and a lack of response but the shootings it identifies were committed with assault rifles, not handguns

3. The card identifies tons of alt causes – multiple lines from the card they strategically didn’t underline are very telling :

“Focusing merely on mass shootings or the passing of potentially dangerous gun legislation does not get to the root of the systemic forces that produce the United States' love affair with violence and the ideologies and criminogenic institutions that produce”

says imperialist policies, state repression, overpolicing, lack of oversight in criminalization, neolib – these are the root causes of militarism

Moderate calls for reining in the gun culture and its political advocates do not go far enough because they fail to address the roots of the violence

### Giroux 14

They shot themselves in the foot with this one – “real problems” and “concrete solutions” requires them to win solvency – if the plan makes material problems worse, they lose

### Gahman

Armed self defense is a key tool for women to uproot patriarchy- only a radicalstance recognizes women as truly equal. **Charles 11**

Lindsay Charles, FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?, Cardozo Law and Gender, 2011. CC

Some women’s issues affect only a particular class of women: maternity leave and parental benefits affect only women who choose to become mothers, access to abortion affects only women of child-bearing age, and pay discrepancies affect only women in the work force. However, the fear of violence affects all women.27 Some women may respond to this fear with denial or a pacifist determination to succumb rather than fight back, and that is their choice. Others may decide, after careful consideration, that their bodies and lives are worth defending. These women must have a full range of self-defense tools in order for their choice to be meaningful. Pervasive acceptance of women’s armed self-defense could help change the current rape culture and encourage women to take responsibility for their own safety, while working for equality and an end to patriarchy. Guns are safe when used by responsible adults, and are the most effective tool for self-defense. Furthermore, removing restrictions on women’s choices increases individual freedom and can lead to greater personal autonomy. Women need to get angry about being targeted for victimization just because they are women.29 Rape and domestic violence are not simply the results of many individual decisions; they are also a product of the patriarchal system that allows the systematic domination and disrespect of women.30 Rape has been compared to lynching31 because it is on the one hand pervasive and systemic (it is overwhelmingly women who are targeted for rape) and on the other hand arbitrary and random (all kinds of women are raped, young and old, regardless of race or class, in a broad variety of circumstances, thus making formulaic solutions like “avoid X to avoid rape” impossible),32 so fear is omnipresent. Thus, men use rape to subjugate women, much like lynching was used to subjugate southern blacks: the knowledge that one could be targeted quells every member of the group.33 Professor MacKinnon said it best: “[w]hat [women] need is change: for men to stop hurting them and using them because they are women, and for everyone to stop letting them do it because they are men.”34 Feminists have worked for reforms aimed at recognizing women as people worthy of equality and respect, and this endeavor has been quite successful in some areas,but there is still much work to be done.36 Changing hearts and minds is the ultimate goal. However, until that dream becomes a reality, women’s armed self-defense may be both a strategy for achieving the goal, and a stopgap measure to prevent violence by men who refuse to see all women as fully human. Rape is tolerated, in part, because most of the time only women are hurt and no one dies. If women began defending themselves with firepower, the authorities might sit up and take notice. This strategy provided some benefits for Ku Klux Klan victims in the 1930s: [A]rmed self-defense brought police intervention which martyrdom would not have done. African-Americans, Catholics, Jews, immigrants, and radicals were neither popular nor powerful in the areas in which the KKK thrived. Public authorities and influential private citizens might well have been content to see unarmed victims brutalized or slain, if the violence could have been so confined. When victims arm themselves, however, authorities are compelled to act lest incidents lead to widespread bloodshed and disorder.37 The point is simple: while protecting the powerless may not be a high priority for public authorities, preserving order is. Police are likely to pay more attention to a man’s death than a woman’s rape; perhaps society would care more about the latter if it had the potential to impact the former. Widespread firearm ownership would also show that women are serious about putting an end to gender-based violence, and willing to take responsibility for their own safety.38 Should they have to? No. A woman should have the absolute right to walk down a dark, deserted city street at 2:00 in the morning, wearing a short skirt, without threat of assault.39 But that is not currently a woman’s reality. Though rape is never the victim’s fault, women may be the only ones who can put a stop to it; more women should get a gun, learn how to use it, and cultivate a don’t mess-with-me attitude. Few men would dare assault a woman with a .38 in her hands and determination in her eyes—and those who do attempt it should immediately regret their decision. Most men cannot comprehend the grievous harms of rape and domestic violence,40 but a widespread movement to prevent victimization “by any means necessary” might help them begin to understand the consequences—both for women who are abused, and for men who attempt to harm an armed woman.41 If women defended themselves violently, the amount of damage they were willing to do to would-be assailants would be the measure of their seriousness about the limits beyond which they would not be pushed. If more women killed husbands or boyfriends who abused them or their children, perhaps there would be less abuse. A large number of women refusing to be pushed any further would erode, however slowly, the myth of the masochistic female which threatens all our lives.42 It is reasonable to believe that violence against women would decrease once men begin to realize that attacking a seemingly-defenseless woman could be their destruction. The ideal, naturally, is a society of men and women who respect each other as equals and do not use the threat of violence to dominate and control any group. Until then, the best strategy may be to achieve “a social equilibrium of nonviolence” by arming women.43 Offensive violence may beget more violence, but unyielding self-defense begets détente.44 Peace would be preferable, but cessation of violence is essential.

Gun rights are a key component of autonomy that challenges patriarchy. **Charles 11**

Lindsay Charles, FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?, Cardozo Law and Gender, 2011. CC

There was a time in this country when women had few choices about any facet of their lives—perhaps the biggest choice a woman would ever make involved which man to marry as she moved from her father’s house to her husband’s house. American women today have many important choices: whether to pursue higher education, where and what kind; with whom to share her life and whether she ought to marry; her vocation; where she will live; whether to become a mother; and even how to vote, thanks to the Nineteenth Amendment, ratified a mere ninety years ago. Choices are necessary for the freedom “to do, not do, become, or not become something.”65 Freedom to make choices, as well as freedom from external forces such as patriarchy and violence, are both necessary for autonomy: the ability of an individual to define her own conception of the good and exercise control over her own life.66 There are many factors that can reduce a woman’s choices in life, and therefore her freedom. Economic status, education level, others’ prejudice, even past choices, can all reduce available choices; this is unfortunate, but perhaps unavoidable. However, there is no reason for a government to reduce the self defense choices available to an individual, because “gun control laws do not reduce crime.”67 Women can be trusted to make good decisions for themselves, even—or perhaps especially—in difficult situations. The most morally or politically difficult choices to allow may be the most important for a woman in crisis. Abortion rights and gun rights “allow what might be crucial private choices in extreme personal crises. However we come down politically, in truly desperate circumstances many of us might want for ourselves or someone we love the option offered by these two most controversial rights.”68 The vast majority of women, if they were honest with themselves, could imagine a worst-case scenario in which they might want the option of an abortion. The same holds true for guns, and in fact, may involve less of a moral dilemma because the criminal aggressor has a malicious intent that the fetus lacks.69 Therefore, even women who currently have no desire to own a gun should support the right to keep and bear arms, just as women not currently experiencing an unwanted pregnancy should support abortion rights. Since the crucial moment for an individual cannot be predicted in advance, the rights must always be available and meaningful— rather than a hollow guarantee, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Both freedom from and freedom to are necessary for women’s autonomy. Achieving freedom from the forces of patriarchy and its resulting evils will continue to be a long, difficult, uphill climb. By contrast, the freedom “to do, not do, become, or not become something” can be easily realized by removing the restrictions on women’s choices.

Government regulations do nothing to protect women and mask state violence. **Silko 03**

Leslie Marmon Silko, In the Combat Zone, 2003.

It isn't height or weight or strength that make women easy targets; from infancy women are taught to be self-sacrificing, passive victims. I was taught differently. Women have the right to protect themselves from death or bodily harm. By becoming strong and potentially lethal individuals, women destroy the fantasy that we are sitting ducks for predatory strangers. In a great many cultures, women are taught to depend upon others, not themselves, for protection from bodily harm. Women are not taught to defend themselves from strangers because fathers and husbands fear the consequences themselves. In the United States, women depend upon the courts and the police; but as many women have learned the hard way, the police cannot be outside your house twenty-four hours a day. I don't want more police. More police on the streets will not protect women. A few policemen are rapists and killers of women themselves; their uniforms and squad cars give them an advantage. No, I will be responsible for my own safety, thank you. Women need to decide who has the primary responsibility for the health and safety of their bodies. We don't trust the State to manage our reproductive organs, yet most of us blindly trust that the State will protect us (and our reproductive organs) from predatory strangers. One look at the rape and murder statistics for women (excluding domestic incidents) and it is clear that the government FAILS to protect women from the violence of strangers. Some may cry out for a "stronger" State, more police, mandatory sentences, and swifter executions. Over the years we have seen the U.S. prison population become the largest in the world, executions take place every week now, inner-city communities are occupied by the National Guard, and people of color are harassed by police, but guess what? A woman out alone, night or day, is confronted with more danger of random violence from strangers than ever before. As the U.S. economy continues "to downsize," and the good jobs disappear forever, our urban and rural landscapes will include more desperate, angry men with nothing to lose. Only women can put a stop to the "open season" on women by strangers. Women are TAUGHT to be easy targets by their mothers, aunts, and grandmothers who themselves were taught that "a women doesn't kill" or "a woman doesn't learn how to use a weapon." Women must learn how to take aggressive action individually, apart from the police and the courts. Presently twenty-one states issue permits to carry concealed weapons; most states require lengthy gun safety courses and a police security check before issuing a permit. Inexpensive but excellent gun safety and self-defense courses designed for women are also available from every quality gun dealer who hopes to sell you a handgun at the end of the course. Those who object to firearms need trained companion dogs or collectives of six or more women to escort one another day and night. We must destroy the myth that women are born to be easy targets.

### Carr/Predictions

1. The AFF doesn’t change or deconstruct narratives – they don’t solve any of this

2. No connection to gun culture – military industrial complex including lobby and neoconservative DC foreign policy establishment still exist, and those narratives of threat unrelated to gun culture still exist

### Dixon 99

1. The last time gun policy was endorsed regardless of consequences was the ineffective 1994 assault weapons ban – but it was just repealed and convinced more americans that gun control was ineffective – try or die is idiotic because it leads to failure and major setbacks

2. The card’s mistagged – it just says don’t succumb to political realities – but that doesn’t mean endorsing gun bans when they’re harmful is good – Dixon wrote multiple articles about guns and their impact on crime