# \*\*\*AT DAs Specific\*\*\*

## AT: Substitution DA

#### There will be *no shift* to long guns because concealability is more important, so the aff outweighs and still solves the DA’s impacts better than the squo. Dixon 93:

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

**Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homicides is that long guns are obviously much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will cause everyone in sight to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, a bank robber carrying a long gun will be immediately detected by security guards, alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful robbery greatly diminished**. Handguns are obviously much more convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson point out that most homicides occur in the home, where concealability is "irrelevant." 95 However, concealability would seem to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even in the home. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle. Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes such arguments more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape. Another reason that the concealability of handguns is not a good reason for a handgun-only ban is proposed by Hardy and Kates in their discussion of the impact of handgun control on robberies. They point out that "[t]he difference between a long gun and a handgun is ten minutes and a hacksaw."' Even robberies, then, would not be diminished by a handgun ban. **However, this contention runs directly counter to the evidence collected by the B**ureau of **A**lcohol, **T**obacco and **F**irearm**s' Project Identification. Seventy-one percent, or 7,538, of** the **handguns** submitted for tracing, **had a barrel length of 3 inches or less. Sixty-one percent, or 6,476, had a caliber of .32 or less. Since both of these factors relate to the size of the weapon, these figures indicate that concealability is an overriding factor in selecting a handgun for use in crime. Sawed-off shotguns will be much longer and much bulkier than any of these short and small-caliber handguns**, especially "Saturday Night Specials," which combine a caliber of .32 or less with a barrel length of three inches or less, comprised 44% of all the weapons successfully traced, and fit into the palm of an average sized hand. We may conclude, then, that **because of the difficulty of concealment, neither long guns nor sawed-off versions** of the same **are likely to be used in great numbers to replace handguns in the commission of crimes. The difficulty of concealment factor will outweigh the greater lethalness of long gun shots**. Consequently, **a ban on handguns will** indeed **result in a decrease in** firearms-related **homicide and other violent crimes. Since firearms are the most lethal weapons, and they were used in 64.1% of homicides in the United States in 1990,98 such a ban is, therefore, likely to result in a reduction in the overall murder rate**.'

#### The concealability differential matters for both criminals and still matters in the home. Dixon 93:

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

**Another reason** to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homicides **is that long guns are** obviously **much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger** roaming the streets **wielding a long gun will cause everyone** in sight **to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested** when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, **a bank robber carrying a long gun will be immediately detected** by security guards, alarm systems will be triggered, and the **chances of** a **success**ful robbery **greatly diminish**ed. Handguns are obviously much more convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson point out that most homicides occur in the home, where concealability is "irrelevant." However, **concealability would seem to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even in the home**. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle.

#### Even the few times a shift has been observed to occur, there was no impact - firearms in general miss and are non-fatal. Hardy 78:

Hardy, David T. Professor, William and Mary “Firearm Ownership and Regulations – Tackling Old Problems” William and Mary Law Review, Volume 20, Issue 3. 1978.

There is also strong evidence that restrictions on the type of weapon induce substitution with other weapons. Both the CUE and California reports suggest that once their availability is restricted, handguns are exchanged for long-arms,31 7 which can be considerably more deadly.318 The Harvard Gun Project also documents a tendency to shift from firearms to other weapons when the supply of firearms is restricted.319 This shift to other weapons may not be as desirable as previously supposed. **When used to threaten or in defense, firearms often are never fired, and, if they are, the result is usually a complete miss or a non-fatal wound**.32 0 **The California study found no significant difference in fatality rates between robberies accomplished by firearms and those accomplished by other weapons**. 31 Despite reductions in firearm carrying and a massive increase in compliance with the Massachusetts law, 2 **the Harvard study could find little evidence of** a direct **impact on crime rates**. 33 **Murray's study was in accord, finding few** statistically demonstrable **relationships between firearms use** and **regulation and homicide rates**.34

## AT: Substitution DA V.2

#### 1. Turn - handguns are more dangerous than long guns:

#### (a) Concealability - they’re less likely to be detected which means more time to inflict damage

#### (b) Cost - handguns are more cost effective than long guns which means criminals can reliably dispose of them to evade investigations and inflict more damage long term

#### (c) Operability - long guns have more kick and are harder to master whereas handguns are much easier - there’s always more risk of a lethal shot with handguns

#### (d) Range - either people switch to assault rifles which are already hard to get in the squo and there’s only a risk of the aff reducing deaths, or people switch to the next-most-concealable long gun, shotguns, which have far less range than handguns

#### 2. Muddy Link Uniqueness - the people that would be motivated enough to rebuy a gun after the aff would already probably be predisposed to use their status quo gun, but there’s always a risk that they don’t rebuy because it’s an inconvenience - you can’t adjudicate the internal link differential to deaths confidently.

## AT: Substitution DA – Purpose

#### The unique purpose of a handgun is to kill people, whereas the purpose of long guns is to kill animals. Honeywell 2k14:

Ken Honeywell [Editor-in-Chief] “What is the Purpose of a Gun?” Punchnels. July 17, 2014. Accessed February 20, 2016. SHSBR

What, after all, is the purpose of a gun? **The purpose** of a gun–if we’re being honest–**is to kill** something. It’s a tool that has enough power, when used properly (and very often improperly) to kill. **Hunting rifles and shotguns are for killing animals. Handguns**–if we’re being honest–**are for killing people**. That’s the purpose behind their design–**they are portable, concealable, easy-to-use tools for killing a person. You may feel protected when you carry a gun, but guns are not for protection**: They are for killing. **Were I** a **paranoid** person or on some sort of mystery-solving adventure, **I might** also **feel safer if I carried my** eight-inch **chef’s knife that is for chopping vegetables**. I might feel safer carrying a baseball bat or accompanied by a dog. (P.S.: The purpose of a dog is not to protect you. As far as I can tell, the purpose of a dog is to be a dog.) **But guns are only for killing**. So we have laws that make it easy for you and me and just about anybody to go to the gun store and buy a gun, and carry it damn near anywhere we please in Indiana, including our state parks. It only stands to reason that when lots of people are walking around the streets with tools that are made to kill people, people are going to die. I’m sure that if people were walking around with butcher knives, more people would get stuck. I’m also pretty sure that if more people were walking around with shovels, more people would get whacked in the melon with shovels. But I’ll bet more holes would get dug, too. And a gun is not for anything else. Except killing. **Yes, target practice. But there’s a reason** those **targets are shaped like humans**.

## AT: Substitution – Kleck

#### Treat Kleck as an assertion – the survey was probably wrong and the burden of proof is high. Dixon 93:

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

Widespread substitution of long guns for handguns in the commission of crimes would dramatically increase the number of homicides and violent crimes. They calculate that if only 30% of those who attempt homicide were to switch from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% "downgrade" to knives, there would still be a "substantial increase" in homicide. If the ratio were instead 50:50, the number of homicides would double, even if none of those who used knives succeeded in killing their victims. **Kleck asserts that a**n even **high**er **substitution rate is likely. He quotes a** **survey** by Wright and Rossi, **in which prisoners who had committed several crimes with guns were asked whether they would carry a sawed- off shotgun** (which would be much easier to conceal than a regular shotgun) **if they were denied access to handguns**. Seventy-two percent said they would, and Kleck feels justified in concluding that such a rate of long gun substitution would in fact occur. **One has to doubt the reliability of the statements of prisoners as to what firearms they would carry in certain circumstances**. Macho **bragging and** outright **lying are** very **likely** in such situations, **and relegate Kleck's projections to** the status of **unsupported conjecture**. In view of the fact that such **a small percentage of** the actual **murders** in the United States in 1990 **were committed with long guns, the burden on Kleck** to prove his hypothetical speculation **is even heavier**.

## AT: Black Panthers DA

#### 1. Turn – niche groups like the ones the DA discusses fragment people of color resistance. Croatoan 2k12:

Croatoan, a self-described “group of people of color, women, and queers”. "Who Is Oakland: Anti-Oppression Activism, the Politics of Safety, and State Co-optation." Escalating Identity. Apr. 2012. Web. 2 Feb. 2016. <https://escalatingidentity.wordpress.com/2012/04/30/who-is-oakland-anti-oppression-politics-decolonization-and-the-state/>.

“**No demographic category of people could possibly share an identical set of political beliefs, cultural identities, or personal values**. Accounts of racial, gender, and sexual oppression as ‘intersectional’ continue to treat identity categories as coherent communities with shared values and ways of knowing the world. **No individual or organization can speak for people of color**, women, the world’s colonized populations, workers, or any demographic category as a whole – **although activists of color**, female and queer activists, and labor activists from the Global North **routinely and arrogantly claim this right**. **These ‘representatives’ and institutions speak on behalf of social categories which are not**, in fact, **communities of shared opinion**. **This** representational politics **tends to eradicate any space for political disagreement between individuals subsumed under the same identity categories**... Demographic categories are not coherent, homogeneous ‘communities’ or ‘cultures’ which can be represented by individuals... Representing significant political differences as differences in privilege or culture places politics beyond critique, debate, and discussion.”

#### An example that applies this specifically would be all of the people of color that *don’t* like handguns. Once groups like this get more specific they undermine their base. Johnson 2k13:

Johnson, Nicholas J. Professor of Law, Fordham University School of Law “Firearms Policy and the Black Community: An Assessment of the Modern Orthodoxy.” Connecticut Law Review, Vol. 45, No. 5, July 2013. MZ

**Guns are a scourge on the black community**. That is the conventional wisdom. Black-on-Black gun crime imposes terrible costs.3 So it is no surprise that **many in the Black community and most of the Black leadership endorse stringent gun control measures**. This translates into broad support for the most aggressive supply restrictions and gun bans like those recently overturned in Washington D.C. and Chicago.4 **Black mayors of big cities and Black legislators have overwhelmingly favored gun bans and restrictions that go substantially beyond prohibiting guns to criminals and the untrustworthy**.5 The National Urban League is a sustaining member of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, previously the National Coalition to Ban Handguns.**6 The NAACP pressed** a **stringent gun control** agenda in NAACP v. AccuSport, 7 **arguing that gun makers** negligently supplied and **market**ed **firearms that ravage poor Black communities**. In Chicago, Jessie Jackson advanced the point with protests of legal gun sales in the suburbs of Chicago.8 In an amicus brief in District of Columbia v. Heller, 9 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (“NAACP”) urged the Supreme Court to uphold the District’s gun ban.10 In the wake of the Court’s ruling that the District’s regulations violated of the Second Amendment, the author of the Association’s Heller brief has argued that diminishing Heller should be part of “any civil rights agenda.”11 This includes, for example, a proposal for limiting the constitutional right to keep and bear arms to enable isolated de jure gun prohibition in Black enclaves.12 Within the broader Black community general support for stringent gun laws can be inferred roughly from party allegiance. **The Democratic Party has been a comfortable home for advocates of gun prohibition and** stringent controls.13 **No group of voters has been more loyal to the modern Democratic Party than Blacks**.14

#### 2. Turn - Black Panther-esque actions distract from and undermine resistance – a former Black-Panther agrees. Anarchist Library 2k9:

Ervin, Lorenzo. "Anarchism and the Black Revolution." The Anarchist Library (2009): Web. 2 Feb. 2016. <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/lorenzo-kom-boa-ervin-anarchism-and-the-black-revolution>.

We alluded to this point in “We shouldn’t work with white people...” included in this issue. In “Anarchism and the Black Revolution” (1993), **former-Black-Panther-turned- Black-anarchist Lorenzo Kom’boa Ervin** reminds us of the importance of class analysis in understanding racial politics: “**The continual subjugation of the masses depends on competition and internal disunity**. **As long as** discrimination exists, and **racial or ethnic minorities are oppressed, the entire working class is oppressed and weakened**. This is so because **the Capitalist class is able to use racism to drive down** the **wages** of individual segments of the working class **by inciting racial antagonism** **and forcing a fight** for jobs and services. This division is a development that ultimately undercuts the living standards of all workers**.** Moreover**, by pitting whites against Blacks and other oppressed nationalities, the Capitalist class is able to prevent workers from uniting against their common class enemy.** As long as workers are fighting each other, Capitalist class rule is secure.”

#### 3. Turn - Gun supporters are disproportionately white, and handgun ownership correlates with racist beliefs. Aff outweighs on scope and strength of link. Osborne 2k13:

Osborne, Hannah Science editor at the International Business Times UK “White Racists in US 'Most Likely to Own Guns and Oppose Control Measures'” International Business Times. November 2013. RP

**White racists in the US are most likely to own a gun and** to **oppose gun control** measures, a study has found. Published in the journal PLOS One, researchers looked at the most recent data from the North American National Election Study to look at the relationship between racism, gun ownership and attitudes to gun control among white people. **As well as finding white racists were more likely to own guns, they also found the level of racist attitudes correlated with likelihood of gun ownership**. The authors said that in 2011, there were 32,163 gun-related deaths in the US, including 11,101 homicides and 19,776 suicides. They note that **opposition to gun control is considerably stronger in whites than blacks, with white people twice as likely to own a gun** than black people. They also say that, paradoxically, white people are considerably more likely to kill themselves with these guns than be killed by others. **Using the data from the election study, researchers looked at social variables, such as age, gender, education, income, location and political beliefs, as well as racial attitudes** - they looked **particularly** at "**symbolic racism**", **which is** considered an **explicit but subtle** form of racism that replaced blatant racism, which openly says black people are amoral and inferior. The **researchers then compared this data with if they had a gun in their home, if they were opposed to policies banning guns and how they felt about** permits to carry concealed **handguns**. "**After accounting for all explanatory variables, logistic regressions found that for each 1 point increase in symbolic racism there was a 50% increase in the odds of having a gun at home**," the authors said. "After also accounting for having a gun in the home, there was still a 28% increase in support for permits to carry concealed handguns, for each one point increase in symbolic racism." Concluding, they said: "The results indicate that **symbolic racism is associated with gun-related attitudes and behaviours in US whites**. The statistics on firearm-related suicides and homicides in the US might reasonably be expected to convince US citizens that action on reducing gun ownership and use would be beneficial to their health. "Yet, US whites oppose strong gun reform more than all other racial groups, despite a much greater likelihood that whites will kill themselves with their guns (suicide), than be killed by someone else. Black-on-black homicide rates would benefit most from gun reform, and, quite logically, blacks support these reforms even if whites do not. "Symbolic racism appears to play a role in explaining gun ownership and paradoxical attitudes to gun control in US whites. In other words, despite certain policy changes potentially benefitting whites, anti-black prejudice leads people to oppose their implementation."

#### Black Panther groups insulate “resistance” circles, making resistance inaccessible to nonconformists. Ottowa 2k14:

Ottowa, Common Cause. "With Allies Like These: Reflections on Privilege Reductionism." The Anarchist Library (2014): Web. 2 Feb. 2016. <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/common-cause-ottawa-with-allies-like-these-reflections-on-privilege-reductionism>.

“**The culture** of anti-oppression politics **lends itself to the creation and maintenance of insular activist circles**. **A so-called ‘radical community**’—consisting of collective houses, activist spaces, book-fairs, etc.— **premised on anti-oppression politics fashions itself as a refuge from the oppressive relations** and interactions of the outside world. **This notion of ‘community**,’ along with anti-oppression politics’ intense focus on individual and micro personal interactions, **disciplined by ‘call-outs’ and privilege checking, allows for the politicization of a range of trivial lifestyle choices**. This leads to a bizarre process in which everything from bicycles to gardens to knitting are accepted as radical activity. Call-out culture and **the fallacy of community accountability creates a disciplinary atmosphere in which people must adhere to a specific etiquette. Spaces then become accessible only to those** who are familiar with, and **able to express themselves with, the proper language and adhere to the dominant customs**. **Participation in the discourse** which shapes and directs this language and customs **is mostly up to** those who are able to spend too much time debating on activist blogs, or who are **academics or professionals well- versed in the dialect... The containment of radical discourse to the university further insulates the ‘activist bubble’ and subcultural ghetto**. **In addition to creating spaces that are alienating to those outside of our milieu**, anti-oppression discourse, call-out culture, and **the related ‘communities’ leads activists to perceive themselves as an ‘enlightened’ section of the class** (largely composed of academics, students, professionals, etc. who have ‘worked on their shit’ and checked their privilege) **who are tasked with acting as missionaries to the ignorant and unclean masses**. **This anarchist separatist orientation is problematic for any who believe in the possibility of mass liberatory** social **movements** that are capable of social change.

#### Gun homicides disproportionately hurt blacks. Cohn 2k13:

Cohn, D'Vera. "Chapter 2: Firearm Deaths." Social and Demographic Trends. Pew Research Center, 7 May 2013. Web. 2 Feb. 2016. <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/05/07/chapter-2-firearm-deaths/?beta=true&utm\_expid=53098246-2.Lly4CFSVQG2lphsg-KopIg.1&utm\_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F>.]

Looked at by race, **blacks are over-represented among gun homicide victims; blacks were 55% of shooting homicide victims in 2010, but 13% of the population**. By contrast, **whites are underrepresented; whites were 25% of the victims of gun homicide in 2010, but 65% of the population**. For Hispanics, the 17% share of gun homicide victims was about equal to their 16% proportion of the total population. The black homicide death rate has declined 50% since its peak in 1993, and the number of black homicide deaths fell by more than a third (37%) from 1993 to 2010. The white homicide death rate has declined by 42% over that time, and the number of white homicide deaths declined 39%. The Hispanic shooting homicide rate fell 69% from 1993 to 2000, and the number of deaths declined by 40%. From 2000 to 2010, when the overall gun homicide rate decline slowed, the Hispanic rate fell 32%, while the black and white rates declined only 4%.

## AT: Court Clog DA

#### 1. Courts are clogged with 2nd Amendment legislation post Heller and McDonald, and 2nd Amendment arguments are failing. LCPGV 15:

LawCentertoPreventGunViolence, . “POST -HELLER LITIGATION SUMMARY.” 03-31-15. Web. December 08, 2015. <http://smartgunlaws.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Post-> Heller-Litigation-Summary-March-2015-Final-Version.pdf.

**Because of** the Supreme Court's decisions in **Heller and McDonald**, **the nation's lower courts have been inundated with a substantial volume of Second Amendment litigation**. However, as described above, **the vast majority of this litigation has been unsuccessful because most** federal, state and local **firearms laws satisfy the established standards of constitutional review**. Nevertheless, going forward, the gun lobby will likely continue to employ the threat of litigation to obstruct state and local efforts to enact common sense gun violence prevention measures. Policymakers should rest assured, however, that nothing in either Heller or McDonald prevents the adoption of a wide variety of reasonable laws to reduce gun violence.

#### That means uniqueness overwhelms the link - either their impacts are inevitable or wrong. That’s also a link takeout and turn - 2nd Amendment claims are constantly failing in courts so there will probably be landside victories in the world of the aff in favor of gun control.

#### 2. Non-unique – Their uniqueness evidence cites multiple things overburdening courts. Each of those things is just as likely to cause the impacts.

#### 3. Non-unique – Things like Obamacare lead to an increase in court cases too so either it’ll happen regardless or it would have, but their impact is wrong.

#### 4. No impact - court cases usually only last 1-2 days, which means if there were to be a time increase, it’d still be miniscule.

#### 5. No impact – when courts get overburdened they defer cases to other courts.

#### 6. No impact – when courts get overburdened prosecutors are more likely to use plea bargaining which means the problem solves itself.

#### 7. No impact – courts have been overburdened in the past, like times when a new law that incriminates a bunch of people gets passed. We still didn’t see their impacts. Considering the legal system has been around for so long, we should’ve seen their impact at least once.

## AT: Crime DA

#### 1. Turn - concealed handguns being common adds tension to police encounters leading to distrust in the law, failed law enforcement, and is the root cause of police shootings. Badger 2k14:

Badger, Emily. "How guns make police less safe, their jobs more difficult and communities less trusting." The Washington Post. 22 Dec. 2014. Web. 3 Dec. 2015. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/12/22/how-guns-make-police-less-safe-their-jobs-more-difficult-and-communities-less-trusting/>.

**Guns** change the equation in so many ways. They **make it harder for police to retreat, and more likely that a stand-off that might have been resolved peacefully will escalate [and]**. They **make it harder for police to give suspects the benefit of the doubt**, and more likely that a suspected criminal may not deserve it. They make it easier for a mentally ill man to forever alter two families' lives in the name of "revenge." After the killing of New York police officers Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos over the weekend, it feels perhaps more satisfying to place blame elsewhere: on protesters who've cried for better policing, on public officials who acknowledge that the protesters' grievances are valid. But both claims deflect attention toward a vague culprit — "anti-police rhetoric" — and away from a more concrete and systemic one: the ever-presence and easy availability of guns. Ismaaiyl Brinsley killed Liu and Ramos with a semi-automatic pistol. NYPD Officials couldn't immediately determine how Brinsley had obtained the gun — only that it was purchased at a Georgia pawn shop by another man more than 15 years ago. We also know that Brinsley was previously convicted in Georgia and sentenced to two years in prison for illegal gun possession. Today we should be talking about the guns not simply because one was used Saturday in the shooting deaths of two police officers, but because **guns underlie the very tension between police and communities** in America that voices saner than Brinsley have been trying to resolve. **In other countries, homicides, police shootings**, shootings by police, **and gun violence are much more rare. It's more rare that patrolmen even carry guns. It's more rare that the civilians they encounter will be carrying one**, too. **In this country**, by contrast, **the** ubiquity of firearms — the **possibility of a gun**, legal or illegal, **in any coat pocket or waist band** — **injects a level of tension into police encounters** that may be hard to entirely disarm even with the most thoughtful community policing reforms. **In the U**nited **S**tates, **the ever-presence of guns makes it seem plausible that a 12-year-old boy handling a toy might actually possess one. And it makes it more likely that an officer responding to him would pull [the]** his own **trigger. The ever-presence of guns also makes it plausible that an officer** interacting with a teenager **might** fear for his life — and **act in that fear**. And it makes it plausible — even responsible — that communities who often encounter law enforcement feel they must teach their sons how to respond to policemen capable of killing them. In comparing American police tactics and relations to other countries, it's hard to separate the role of guns here from all of the mistrust, defensiveness and aggression that arise around them. "**There’s not a big gun culture in Australia**," Geoffrey Alpert, a professor at the University of South Carolina who has studied police use of force there, recently told me. "So **the cops don’t have to worry the way our cops do**. There’s not always a gun in every encounter. They don’t have to think about that." **They're freer to retreat, to reassess, to leave their own weapons holstered**. This doesn't mean that we can't ever improve police tactics in a county where guns are commonplace. Alpert believes policing reforms are possible and worth pursuing. But this does mean that we can't really address police-community relations without talking about the fear of guns tugging at both sides — and how guns make the job of policing that much harder, how guns fatally narrow the margin of error for poor police work, how guns turn misunderstandings, mental illness and suspicion into something terribly deadly.

#### 2. Turn - Guns increase aggressive behavior and make the will to hurt others more common. Bushman 2k13:

Bushman, Brad. “The "Weapons Effect." Psychology Today 18 Apr. 2013: Web. 1 Dec. 2015. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/get-psyched/201301/the-weapons-effect>.

In 1967, Leonard Berkowitz and Anthony LePage conducted a fascinating study.[1] First, participants were angered by a person pretending to be another participant (called a confederate). Next, **participants were seated at a table that had a** shot**gun** and a revolver **on it—or**, in the control condition, **badminton racquets** and shuttlecocks. **The items on the table were described as part of another experiment that the researcher had supposedly forgotten to put away. The participant was supposed to decide what level of electric shock to deliver** to the confederate who had angered them, and the electric shocks were used to measure aggression. **The experimenter told participants to ignore the items on the table, but apparently they could not. Participants who saw** the **guns were more aggressive than were participants who saw the sports items. This effect was dubbed the “weapons effect.” The weapons effect occurs outside of the lab too**. In one field experiment,[2] a confederate driving a pickup truck purposely remained stalled at a traffic light for 12 seconds to see whether the motorists trapped behind him would honk their horns (the measure of aggression). The truck contained either a .303-calibre military rifle in a gun rack mounted to the rear window, or no rifle. The results showed that motorists were more likely to honk their horns if the confederate was driving a truck with a gun visible in the rear window than if the confederate was driving the same truck but with no gun. What is amazing about this study is that you would have to be pretty stupid to honk your horn at a driver with a military rifle in his truck—if you were thinking, that is! But people were not thinking—they just naturally honked their horns after seeing the gun. **The mere presence of a weapon automatically triggered aggression**. Research also shows that **drivers with guns in their cars more likely to drive aggressively**.[3] A nationally representative sample of over 2,000 American drivers found that **those who had a gun in the car were significantly more likely to** make obscene gestures at other motorists (23% vs. 16%), **aggressively follow another vehicle too closely** (14% vs. 8%), or both (6.3% vs. 2.8%), **even after controlling for many other factors related to aggressive driving** (e.g., gender, age, urbanization, census region, driving frequency).

## AT: Econ DA

#### 1. Link turn - the threat of gun restrictions actually causes more gun sales and outweighs other motivations. Aisch and Keller 2k15:

Aisch and Keller, Dec. 10, 2015 http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/12/10/us/gun-sales-terrorism-obama-restrictions.html?\_r=1, What Drives Gun Sales: Terrorism,Politics and Calls for Restrictions, By GREGOR AISCH and JOSH KELLER DEC. 10, 2015

Estimates based on an analysis of federal background checks by The New York Times. For gun makers, it was a familiar story. **On Sunday**, President **Obama called for making it harder to buy** assault **weapons** after the terrorist attack in San Bernardino, Calif. **On Monday, the stock prices of two top gun makers**, Smith and Wesson and Ruger, **soared**. “President **Obama has actually been the best salesman for firearms**,” said Brian W. Ruttenbur, an analyst with BBandT Capital Markets, a financial services firm. **Fear of** gun-buying **restrictions has been the main driver of spikes in gun sales, far surpassing the effects of mass shootings and terrorist attacks** alone, according to federal background-check data analyzed by The New York Times. When a man shot and killed 26 people at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Conn., gun sales did not set records until five days later, after President Obama called for banning assault rifles and high-capacity magazines. “It would be like you’ve never owned a toaster, you don’t really want a toaster, but the federal government says they’re going to ban toasters,” Mr. Ruttenbur said. “So you go out and buy a toaster.” Gun Control Proposals **Gun sales rose in New Jersey in 2013 after** Gov. Chris **Christie proposed measures that included expanding background checks** and banning certain rifles. (Mr. Christie later vetoed one of the most stringent parts of the proposals.) The dynamic shows a Catch-22 for gun control proponents: **Pushing for new restrictions can lead to an influx of new guns. When Maryland approved one of the nation’s strictest gun-control measures** in May 2013, **gun sales jumped as buyers tried to beat the October deadline** specified in the measure, which banned most semiautomatic rifles. As police officers evacuated people from New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, legally registered guns were confiscated from civilians. The confiscations outraged gun owners and prompted an increase in gun sales in the area. Conservatives responded by pushing for a federal law prohibiting the seizure of firearms from civilians during an emergency, and many states followed with similar legislation. A National Increase Gun sales have more than doubled in a decade, to about 15 million in 2013 from about seven million in 2002. More firearms are sold to residents in the United States than in any other country, according to Jurgen Brauer, a professor at Georgia Regents University. These estimates undercount total sales because they omit some purchases in states that do not require background checks for private sales. They also exclude permits that allow people in some states to buy multiple guns with a single background check. The increase is mostly due to higher sales of handguns, which are typically bought for self-defense. Two of the fastest-growing segments of the market are women and gun owners with concealed carry permits. Looser Restrictions Legal changes at the local level can lead to abrupt changes in sales. When Missouri repealed a requirement that gun buyers obtain a permit to buy a handgun in 2007, estimated gun sales went up and stayed up, by roughly 9,000 additional guns per month. The influx shifted gun-trafficking patterns, increasing the number of guns bought in Missouri that were later traced to crimes.

#### 2. Guns are losing investments now, so nonunique, and gun distributors and producers can just diversify their investments. That solves and would actually appeal to more people so it’d be more profitable. Other industries prove. Cardello 2k13:

Cardello, Hank. [senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, a consultant to industry, public policy institutes, and government agencies on socially responsible products and practices] "The Gun Industry Needs to Reinvent Itself Before It's Too Late." Forbes. 14 Jan. 2013. Web. 4 Jan. 2016. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesleadershipforum/2013/01/14/the-gun-industry-needs-to-reinvent-itself-before-its-too-late/>.

**Public sentiment and investors are turning against the gun industry**, and anti-gun activists are howling for their heads. Still, **gunmakers** can appease the anti-gun activists, become a meaningful part of the solution to curb gun violence, gain new customers, and strengthen their bottom line—but only if their survival doesn’t depend on selling more guns and ammunition. That means they need to reload in three different ways. First, **should redefine their business model from being purveyors of guns and ammunition to encompass all personal protection products. That would open them up to a host of new and existing nonlethal devices and markets that could very well generate much greater revenue and profit than the sale of guns and ammunition generates today**. For example, the U.S. electronic security market is about the same size today as the gun market, according to figures from the Freedonia Group, and is expected to hit $17 billion by next year. Some reports estimate that **the global market for home security will reach more than $34 billion in 2017. Broadening the notion of the needs they fill has been a successful strategy in numerous other industries whose core products were under attack for safety, health, or environmental reasons**. For example, **Chevron, which once concentrated solely on fossil fuels, now focuses on natural gas, solar power, and biofuels, and touts its “human energy” platform**. Danone jettisoned less healthy products to focus solely on nutritious ones such as bottled water and infant formula. Our research shows that Danone’s financial and shareholder performance has outpaced its peers’. Former **soda companies such as Coca-Cola and Pepsi have redefined themselves as beverage companies, reaping new business from products like bottled water and sports drinks. Today they enjoy some of the highest operating profit margins in the food industry**.

#### 3. No link - The resolution bans ownership, not production, within the US. Private ownership of handguns is illegal in the UK, but BAE Systems, a firearms distributer based in the UK, was the second most successful arms-producing and military services company in the world. Sedghi 2k12:

Sedghi, Ami. "Arms sales: who are the world's 100 top arms producers?" The Guardian. 2 Mar. 2012. Web.4 Jan. 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2012/mar/02/arms-sales-top-100-producers>.

**The highly-concentrated industry is** also **highlighted by the report**, which states that the top 10 arms producing companies account for 56% of the total top 100 arms sales. This amounts to $230bn of the total arms sales. **You can find the full top 100 list along with their 2010 and 2009 rankings in the spreadsheet as well as trends** in arms sales of companies in the SIPRI top 100 arms-producing companies for 2002-2010. Arms sales as % of total sales, profit and total employment numbers are also in the spreadsheet to download. What can you do with this data? Data summary The SIPRI Top 100 arms-producing and military services companies in the world excluding China, 2010 Rank, 2010 Rank, 2009 Company Country Arms sales, 2010 Arms sales, 2009 Arms sales as % of total sales, 2010 1 1 Lockheed Martin USA 35,730 33,430 78 **2** 2 **BAE Systems UK** 32,880 32,540 95 3 3 Boeing USA 31,360 32,300 49 4 4 Northrop Grumman USA 28,150 27,000 81 5 5 General Dynamics USA 23,940 23,380 74 6 6 Raytheon USA 22,980 23,080 91 S S BAE Systems Inc. (BAE Systems, UK) USA 17,900 19,280 100 7 7 EADS Trans-European 16,360 15,930 27 8 8 Finmeccanica Italy 14,410 13,280 58 9 9 L-3 Communications USA 13,070 13,010 83 10 10 United Technologies USA 11,410 11,110 21 11 11 Thales France 9,950 10,200 57 12 12 SAIC USA 8,230 8,030 74 13 27 Oshkosh Truck USA 7,080 2,770 72 14 13 Computer Sciences Corp. USA 5,940 6,050 37 15 14 Honeywell USA 5,400 5,380 16 16 16 Safran France 4,800 4,740 34 S S Sikorsky (United Technologies) USA 4,530 3,980 68 17 19 Rolls-Royce UK 4,330 4,260 26 18 18 General Electric USA 4,300 4,700 3 S S Pratt & Whitney (United Technologies) USA 4,080 3,940 32 19 17 ITT Corp. USA 4,000 4,730 36 20 22 Almaz-Antei[d] Russia 3,950 3,260 89 S S MBDA (BAE Systems, UK/EADS, trans-European/Finmeccanica, Italy) Trans-European 3,710 3,610 100 21 28 United Aircraft Corp.[d] Russia 3,440 2,710 82 22 21 DCNS France 3,320 3,340 100 23 15 KBR[e] USA 3,310 4,990 33 24 26 URS Corp. USA 3,030 2,770 33 25 24 Mitsubishi Heavy Industries[f] Japan 2,960 2,810 9 S S Eurocopter Group (EADS, trans-European) France 2,940 3,050 46 S S AgustaWestland (Finmeccanica) Italy 2,920 2,800 61 26 23 Alliant Techsystems USA 2,870 2,810 59 27 33 Rockwell Collins USA 2,860 2,580 61 28 31 Saab Sweden 2,780 2,640 82 29 42 Babcock International Group UK 2,770 2,010 62 30 34 Textron USA 2,740 2,570 26 31 32 Rheinmetall Germany 2,660 2,640 50 32 51 Hewlett-Packard USA 2,570 1,580 2 33 47 ManTech International Corp. USA 2,490 1,920 96 34 38 Hindustan Aeronautics India 2,480 2,130 90 35 29 Elbit Systems Israel 2,480 2,700 95 S S EADS Astrium (EADS, trans-European) France 2,450 2,400 37 36 25 Navistar USA 2,410 2,800 20 37 41 Israel Aerospace Industries Israel 2,400 2,030 76 38 30 DynCorp International (Cerberus Capital)[g] USA 2,390 2,650 71 39 40 CACI International USA 2,320 2,080 74 40 36 Cobham UK 2,260 2,260 77 41 44 Goodrich USA 2,230 2,010 11 42 37 CEA France 2,200 2,160 40 S S MBDA France (MBDA, trans-European) France 2,190 1,740 100 43 48 Harris USA 2,130 1,900 41 44 39 Serco UK 2,130 2,110 32 45 45 Navantia Spain 2,010 1,980 96 46 55 Indian Ordnance Factories[h] India 1,960 1,440 80 S S Alenia Aeronautica (Finmeccanica) Italy 1,920 1,810 67 47 73 Vertolety Rossii (OPK Oboronoprom)[d] Russia 1,910 810 71 48 20 AM General[i] USA 1,900 3,720 . . 49 53 ST Engineering (Temasek) Singapore 1,750 1,450 40 50 49 QinetiQ UK 1,730 1,770 69 51 – United Shipbuilding Corp.[d] Russia 1,650 . . 70 52 50 Krauss-Maffei Wegmann[j] Germany 1,590 1,630 94 53 62 Kongsberg Gruppen Norway 1,500 1,090 58 54 53 Rafael Israel 1,470 1,570 98 55 57 Nexter France 1,430 1,230 100 S S BAE Systems Australia (BAE Systems, UK) Australia 1,380 1,090 100 S S Sukhoi (United Aircraft Corp.)[d] Russia 1,360 1,440 93 56 44 ThyssenKrupp Germany 1,340 1,980 2 S S Irkut Corp. (United Aircraft Corp.)[d] Russia 1,330 1,060 86 57 – IHI Group[f] Japan 1,330 280 10 58 36 Agility Kuwait 1,310 2,480 23 59 89 Fluor[k] USA 1,300 710 6 60 59 Samsung South Korea 1,290 1,170 1 61 55 Groupe Dassault France 1,270 1,360 23 62 91 United Engine Corp.[d] Russia 1,250 680 44 S – Sevmash (United Shipbuilding Corp.)[d] Russia 1,240 530 90 63 64 Diehl Germany 1,210 1,070 34 64 46 Mitsubishi Electric[f] Japan 1,160 1,950 3 65 – Triumph Group USA 1,080 480 37 S S Thales Nederland (Thales, France) Netherlands 1,060 880 100 66 60 GKN UK 1,050 1,110 13 S S Samsung Techwin (Samsung) South Korea 1,030 930 46 67 69 Jacobs Engineering Group[l] USA 1,020 880 10 68 59 Kawasaki Heavy Industries[f] Japan 1,020 1,110 7 69 68 TRV Corp.[d] Russia 1,010 910 90 70 77 NEC[f] Japan 980 770 3 71 67 Bharat Electronics India 970 920 80 72 66 Moog USA 960 920 46 73 71 Fincantieri Italy 940 860 25 S S IHI Marine United (IHI Group)[f] Japan 890 . . 41 74 80 Chemring Group UK 890 750 96 75 74 Ultra Electronics UK 880 810 80 76 87 CAE Canada 840 710 53 77 84 RUAG Switzerland 830 730 48 S S Selex Galileo (Finmeccanica) Italy 820 770 91 78 61 Shaw Group[m] USA 810 1,100 12 79 81 LIG Nex1 South Korea 810 750 99 80 70 Precision Castparts Corp. USA 810 880 13 81 86 Cubic Corp. USA 810 710 68 82 75 Meggitt UK 780 810 44 83 – Hawker Beechcraft USA 780 600 28 84 65 Indra Spain 780 940 23 85 79 Curtiss-Wright Corp. USA 780 760 41 86 83 Alion Science and Technology USA 770 740 93 87 95 Aselsan Turkey 760 640 97 S S Selex Communications (Finmeccanica) Italy 750 810 80 88 90 Mitre[n] USA 740 700 57 89 76 Uralvagonzavod[d] Russia 730 800 40 90 78 SRA International USA 700 760 42 91 98 Esterline Technologies USA 690 640 45 92 – MMPP Salyut[d] Russia 690 490 95 S S Thales Australia (Thales, France) Australia 680 630 100 93 72 VSE Corp. USA 680 840 78 94 – Embraer Brazil 670 470 12 95 85 Teledyne Technologies USA 670 720 41 96 93 Patria Finland 660 660 88 97 64 Force Protection USA 660 980 100 98 99 AAR Corp. USA 650 610 48 99 100 GenCorp USA 650 610 77 S S MBDA Italia (MBDA, trans-European) Italy 640 610 100 100 82 MTU Aero Engines Germany 640 740 18 S S Raytheon Australia (Raytheon, USA) Australia 640 490 100

#### 4. Contracted production for the government solves since it’s not private ownership. Shah 2k13:

Shah, Anup. "The Arms Trade is Big Business." Global Issues. 5 Jan. 2013. Web. 4 Jan. 2016. <http://www.globalissues.org/article/74/the-arms-trade-is-big-business>.

**Industrialized countries negotiate** free trade and **investment agreements with other countries**, but exempt military spending from the liberalizing demands of the agreement. Since only the **wealthy countries can afford to devote billions on military spending, they will always be able to give their corporations hidden subsidies through defence contracts**, and maintain a technologically advanced industrial capacity. And so, in every international trade and investment agreement one will find a clause which exempts **government programs and policies deem**ed **vital for national security**. Here is the loophole that allows the maintenance of **corporate subsidies** through virtually unlimited military spending.

#### 5. Outsourcing solves – the resolution is just the US.

#### 6. Omitted

## AT: Federalism DA V.2

Omitted

## AT: Federalism DA

Omitted

## AT: Heg DA

#### Turn - Gun violence kills soft power - solvency doesn’t matter - it’s the not-trying-to-do-anything about it that makes us look bad. Freeland 2k13:

Jonathan Freedland - the Guardian's executive editor: “Washington DC shootings: America's gun disease diminishes its soft power” The Guardian 9/17/13;<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/17/washington-dc-shootings-america-gun-diseaseIG> 12/15/15

But that would be to miss the wider point. **America's gun sickness** – which has turned massacres of this kind into a fairly regular, rather than exceptionally rare occurrence – **endangers the US** not solely **because it can lead military personnel to lose their lives**, nor even because it can lead to the murder of schoolchildren, as it did at Sandy Hook elementary school last year, or the death of young movie-goers, as it did in Aurora, Colorado, also last year – dreadful though those losses are. The **foreign policy experts** who gather in the thinktanks and congressional offices not far from the navy yard often **define national security to encompass** anything that touches on America's standing in the world. That ranges from its ability to project military force across the globe to its attractiveness, its **"soft power". For decades, this latter quality has been seen as one of the US's primary assets, central to its ability to lead and persuade other nations**. But **America's gun disease** diminishes its soft power. It **makes the country seem** less like a model and more like a basket case, **afflicted by a pathology other nations strive to avoid. When similar** gun **massacres have struck elsewhere** – including in Britain – **lawmakers** have **acted swiftly to tighten control**s, watching as the gun crime statistics then fell. In the decade after the rules were toughened in Australia in 1996, for example, firearm-related homicides fell by 59, while suicides involving guns fell by 65. **But the US stays stubborn**ly where it is, refusing to act. When President **Obama** last tried, following the deaths of 20 children and six staff at Sandy Hook at the end of 2012, his bill fell at the first senate hurdle. He **had not proposed banning a single weapon or bullet** – merely expanding the background checks required of someone wanting to buy a gun. But even that was too much. The national security pundits who worry how a US president is perceived when he is incapable of protecting the lives of innocent Syrians abroad should think how it looks when he is incapable of protecting the lives of innocent Americans at home. **On guns, the US – so often the world leader** in innovation and endeavour – **is the laggard**, stuck at the bottom of the global class. Bill Clinton perfectly distilled the essence of soft power when he said in 2008, "People the world over have always been more impressed by the power of our example than by the example of our power." He was right. But every time a disturbed or angry individual is able to vent his rage with an assault weapon, killing innocents with ease, the power of America's example fades a little more.

#### Soft power & perception is key other countries capitulating to hard power exercises – a shared vision is the most powerful. Jervis 2k9:

(professor of international politics at Columbia University. (Robert, Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective, World Politics Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009)

To say that the system is unipolar is not to argue that the unipole can get everything it wants or that it has no need for others. American power is very great, but it is still subject to two familiar limitations: it is harder to build than to destroy, and success usually depends on others’ decisions. This is particularly true of the current system because of what the U.S. wants. If Hitler had won World War II, he might have been able to maintain his system for some period of time with little cooperation from others because “all” he wanted was to establish the supremacy of the Aryan race. The U.S. wants not only to prevent the rise of a peer competitor but also to stamp out terrorism, maintain an open international economic system, spread democracy throughout the world, and establish a high degree of cooperation among countries that remain juridically equal. Even in the military arena, the U.S. cannot act completely alone. Bases and overflight rights are always needed, and support from allies, especially Great Britain, is important to validate military action in the eyes of the American public. When one matches American forces, not against those of an adversary but against the tasks at hand, they often fall short. Against terrorism, force is ineffective without excellent intelligence. Given the international nature of the threat and the difficulties of gaining information about it, international cooperation is the only route to success. The maintenance of international prosperity also requires joint efforts, even leaving aside the danger that other countries could trigger a run on the dollar by cashing in their holdings. Despite its lack of political unity, Europe is in many respects an economic unit, and one with a greater gdp than that of the U.S. Especially because of the growing Chinese economy, economic power is spread around the world much more equally than is military power, and the open economic system could easily disintegrate despite continued unipolarity. In parallel, on a whole host of problems such as aids, poverty, and international crime (even leaving aside climate change), the unipole can lead and exert pressure but cannot dictate. Joint actions may be necessary to apply sanctions to various unpleasant and recalcitrant regimes; proliferation can be stopped only if all the major states (and many minor ones) work to this end; unipolarity did not automatically enable the U.S. to maintain the coalition against Iraq after the first Gulf War; close ties within the West are needed to reduce the ability of China, Russia, and other states to play one Western country off against the others. But in comparison with the cold war era, there are fewer incentives today for allies to cooperate with the U.S. During the earlier period unity and close coordination not only permitted military efficiencies but, more importantly, gave credibility to the American nuclear umbrella that protected the allies. Serious splits were dangerous because they entailed the risk that the Soviet Union would be emboldened. This reason for avoiding squabbles disappeared along with the USSR, and the point is likely to generalize to other unipolar systems if they involve a decrease of threats that call for maintaining good relations with the superpower. This does not mean that even in this particular unipolar system the superpower is like Gulliver tied down by the Lilliputians. In some areas opposition can be self-defeating. Thus for any country to undermine American leadership of the international economy would be to put its own economy at risk, even if the U.S. did not retaliate, and for a country to sell a large proportion of its dollar holding would be to depress the value of the dollar, thereby diminishing the worth of the country’s remaining stock of this currency. Furthermore, cooperation often follows strong and essentially unilateral action. Without the war in Iraq it is not likely that we would have seen the degree of cooperation that the U.S. obtained from Europe in combating the Iranian nuclear program and from Japan and the PRC in containing North Korea. Nevertheless, many of the American goals depend on persuading others, not coercing them. Although incentives and even force are not irrelevant to spreading democracy and the free market, at bottom this requires people to embrace a set of institutions and values. Building the world that the U.S. seeks is a political, social, and even psychological task for which unilateral measures are likely to be unsuited and for which American military and economic strength can at best play a supporting role. Success requires that others share the American vision and believe that its leadership is benign.

#### Soft power outweighs – it’s useful for a wider variety of leadership challenges. Hanna 2k2:

(Julia Hanna, Kennedy School Bulletin, “Going It Alone,” Spring, 2002, http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/ksgpress/bulletin/spring2002/features/alone.html)

It’s more than a matter of staying one step ahead of our enemies in a technological game of cat and mouse, he continues. “When the Pan Am flight exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland, the cause was a bomb in unaccompanied luggage. “So now the airline employees ask if we packed our bag ourselves. A Mohammed Atta would say, ‘Yes, I packed my bag myself,’ so we’ve created new security procedures. Unfortunately, each time you find a solution, someone will be looking for a chink in your armor. That dynamic is bound to continue.” Military power is an essential part of the response, but an equally productive focusing point, Nye continues, would be the cultivation of what he calls “soft power,” or the ability to advance one’s agenda through attraction rather than coercion. “Soft power arises from our culture, values, and policies,” he states. Given its proper weight, soft power can serve as a much-needed balance to our economic and military might, two examples of “hard power” that can overwhelm and alienate other countries. The thousands of international students who come to study at U.S. institutions are an example of this country’s soft power. Our government’s democratic values and promotion of peace and human rights influence how other countries perceive us. For better or worse, so does the latest Bruce Willis action flick. America’s use of capital punishment and relatively permissive gun control laws undercut its soft power in European countries. While its intangible quality makes soft power much more difficult to use and control, observes Nye, that fact does not diminish its importance. “American pre-eminence will last well into this century, but our attitudes and policies will need to encompass a very different means of meeting challenges and achieving our goals,” he says. While a strong military presence will continue to be essential to maintaining global stability, it proves less adequate when confronting issues such as global climate change, the spread of infectious diseases, and international financial stability. “We must not let the illusion of empire blind us to the increasing importance of soft power,” Nye cautions. “A unilateralist approach to foreign policy fails to produce the right results, and its accompanying arrogance erodes the soft power that is often part of the solution.”

## AT: Informal Market DA

#### 1. Turn - People are afraid of using the informal market, a majority of handgun ownership will be way better deterred by a ban. Johnson 2k8 bracketed for discourse:

Johnson, Nicholas J. "Imagining Gun Control in America: Understanding the Remainder Problem Article and Essay." FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. FordHam Law School, 2008. Web. 3 Dec. 2015. <http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1438&context=faculty\_scholarship>.

It is still plausible to bet that **black-market manufacturers will be few in number and generally less competent than commercial manufacturers**, **thus producing a relatively** **small number of unreliable weapons. Also, many people will be afraid to access the** black **[informal] market that supplies these guns.** **The average homeowner, who has much to lose by breaking the law, might never enter the market for such guns.** **This means** that **the distressed teen could not so readily take the family gun to answer some schoolyard offense**. Likewise, **gun accidents involving children in good homes and those where June mistakes Ward for a burglar should decline**. **Demand might be so slim, limited to a relatively few bad men, that the illegal manufacturers' incentives to supply the market** with decent-quality contraband guns **would be low**. Criminals, left to their own devices, might end up with low-powered, unreliable renditions of the infamous zip gun, giving police an advantage in confrontations.

#### 2. Turn - The weak gun laws that are in place now are what fuel the informal market, if strict gun laws were enacted, the informal market would be diminished because manufacturing handguns would be too difficult. Beard 2k9:

Beard, Mike. "The Myth of the "Black Market"" Coalition to Stop Gun Violence. Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, 22 June 2009. Web. 03 Dec. 2015. <http://csgv.org/blog/bullet-counter-points/2009/myth-black-market/>.

The cities of Washington, D.C. and Chicago have been under siege in recent months by **the** National Rifle Association (**NRA**), which **is attempting to overturn** gun laws in both jurisdictions. The NRA’s battle with Chicago has been in the courts, where the gun lobby is seeking to have the Supreme Court’s Second Amendment ruling in the case of D.C. V. Heller incorporated at the state level. This would have the practical effort of repealing **Chicago’s handgun ban**. After the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals rejected the NRA’s lawsuit, it appears headed to the Supreme Court on appeal. D.C. v. Heller, of course, already repealed the District of Columbia’s handgun ban, but the Supreme Court’s ruling did not go far enough for the NRA. They are now seeking to have the city’s new, constitutional gun laws repealed through an amendment that was initially attached to the “D.C. House Voting Rights Act” by Senator John Ensign (R-NV). That bill has yet to be considered by the House of Representatives, and the amendment’s next likely target is the D.C. appropriations bill, which Congress will likely take up this summer. Time and time again, **the NRA has blamed violence** in the two cities **on** their **tough laws, despite evidence that shows that criminals are totally unable to acquire firearms inside Chicago and Washington. So why is it so easy for criminals and gun traffickers to get firearms outside the borders of cities?** A fascinating new essay by David Kairys, a professor of Law at Temple University, provides some answers. Against the WallThe essay, entitled “Why are Handguns So Accessible on Urban Streets?” is a chapter in the new book Against the Wall: Poor, Young, Black and Male. Kairys argues that we need to avoid a “pervasive acceptance and strange sense that the extraordinary level of death and killing is a normal or inevitable aspect of life in urban America,” and that only after understanding why guns are so readily available in cities can we begin to correct the problem. Kairys explains that **“the market makes** new **handguns** so easily **available**—often for less than one hundred dollars new, right out of the box—that it makes no sense to steal one.” In fact, “anyone who does not have a record can go to a licensed gun store in most states, legally buy as many handguns as he or she wants, and walk out the door with them.” Kairys also points out that there are no “meaningful limits on the resale of handguns,” because private individuals, unlike federally licensed gun dealers, are not required to run Brady background checks on purchasers. In Kairys’ words: “The bottom line is this. **Under federal law and the law of most states, any person so inclined can buy huge quantities of cheap, easily concealed handguns and sell them to others** indiscriminately, **often without violating any law and usually without having to worry about getting arrested, prosecuted or convicted. Nor are the identities of owners of handguns, or the persons to whom they transfer ownership, registered or maintained by government, unless state law so provides—and most do not**.” **Capitalizing on this weak regulation, gun manufacturers produce “more guns than could be sold to law-abiding people**,” **knowing full well their product will be distributed to criminals and other prohibited purchasers downstream**. So what can we do to address this problem? **Kairys advocates for** registering handguns and licensing handgun owners; adopting **strong, clear and specific** “straw purchase” **laws** that make all of the parties to a straw purpose criminally and civilly responsible; **limiting** multiple **purchases of handguns** in a given period; and providing large urban areas with the authority to regulate handguns within their borders. All of **these measures would help to reduce the flow of handguns to criminals** on America’s streets. But most importantly, we must learn to overcome our own misconceptions of the problem. As Kairys writes, “the common image of an underground, illegal market is largely fictional.” **The ability of dangerous people to easily obtain guns is the result of our weak gun laws, which [we] do little to regulate** the firearms industry. The good news? Significant progress can be made in reducing gun violence as soon as our elected officials are made to realize that “the loss of life, the economic and social costs, and the undermining of the safety and the quality of life in America are unacceptable.”

#### 3. Turn - Banning handguns crushes the informal market because it results informal market prices skyrocketing, leading to them being extremely inaccessible, and also increases the legal risks of illegal sales. Wilson 2k11, bracketed for discourse:

Wilson, James Q. "Crime and Public Policy." Google Books. Oxford University Press, 25 Jan. 2011. Web. 3 Dec. 2015. <https://books.google.com/books?id=C3Gi1ob0W4oC&pg=PA273&lpg=PA273&dq=banning+guns+makes+black+market+guns+more+expensive&source=bl&ots=oUIzuLdu-9&sig=YjpTri0Ya1Qv185ocL4Qt65quns&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiindeEjMHJAhUG2SYKHW\_1B7Q4ChDoAQguMAQ#v=onepage&q=banning%20guns%20makes%20black%20market%20guns%20more%20expensive&f=false>.

Many **gun-control measures have an effect on the overall supply of guns or ammunition.** **If guns** (**or ammunition) become** less readily available, or **more expensive** to purchase, **then** some **violence-prone people will** arguably **decide to rely on other weapons instead, and gun violence will be reduced.** Commentators have suggested that this strategy is doomed but the huge arsenal of guns currently in private hands. How can we discourage dangerous people from obtaining guns when there are already enough in circulation to arm every teenager and adult in the country (Wilson 1994; Polsby 1994; Wright 1995)? In response, we not that the number of guns in circulation is only indirectly relevant to weather supply restriction can hope to succeed; of direct consequence is the price and difficulty of obtaining a gun. Basic **economic reasoning suggests that if the price of new guns is increased** by raising the federal tax or other means, **the effects will ripple through all** the black markets in which guns are transferred, including **the** black **[informal] market** for stolen guns (Cook and Leitzel 1996).**The average prices of guns go up**, some people- including **some violence-prone people**- **will decide that there are better uses for their money**. **Others will be discouraged if, in addition to raising the** money **price, the amount of time or risk required to obtain a gun increases**. While there are no reliable estimate of the elastically of demand for guns but violent-prone people, we submit that they are likely to be more responsive to price then to more remote costs (such as possibility of arrest and punishment). Those who argue that offenders will do whatever is necessary to obtain their guns may have some hard-core group of violent gang members and drug dealers in mine; but surely not much larger group who get into fights from time to time (Sheley and Wright 1995; Smith 1996; Cook et al 2007)

#### 4. Frame the disad as defense – there’s only a risk of a decrease in guns.

## AT: Minority Protection DA

#### Turn - The presence of handguns, which are easily concealed, creates tension between the police and the people, which explains worse response times as well as police shootings. Badger 2k14:

Badger, Emily. "How guns make police less safe, their jobs more difficult and communities less trusting." The Washington Post. 22 Dec. 2014. Web. 3 Dec. 2015. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/12/22/how-guns-make-police-less-safe-their-jobs-more-difficult-and-communities-less-trusting/>.

**Guns** change the equation in so many ways. They **make it harder for police to retreat, and more likely that a stand-off that might have been resolved peacefully will escalate [and]**. They **make it harder for police to give suspects the benefit of the doubt**, and more likely that a suspected criminal may not deserve it. They make it easier for a mentally ill man to forever alter two families' lives in the name of "revenge." After the killing of New York police officers Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos over the weekend, it feels perhaps more satisfying to place blame elsewhere: on protesters who've cried for better policing, on public officials who acknowledge that the protesters' grievances are valid. But both claims deflect attention toward a vague culprit — "anti-police rhetoric" — and away from a more concrete and systemic one: the ever-presence and easy availability of guns. Ismaaiyl Brinsley killed Liu and Ramos with a semi-automatic pistol. NYPD Officials couldn't immediately determine how Brinsley had obtained the gun — only that it was purchased at a Georgia pawn shop by another man more than 15 years ago. We also know that Brinsley was previously convicted in Georgia and sentenced to two years in prison for illegal gun possession. Today we should be talking about the guns not simply because one was used Saturday in the shooting deaths of two police officers, but because **guns underlie the very tension between police and communities** in America that voices saner than Brinsley have been trying to resolve. **In other countries, homicides, police shootings**, shootings by police, **and gun violence are much more rare. It's more rare that patrolmen even carry guns. It's more rare that the civilians they encounter will be carrying one**, too. **In this country**, by contrast, **the** ubiquity of firearms — the **possibility of a gun**, legal or illegal, **in any coat pocket or waist band** — **injects a level of tension into police encounters** that may be hard to entirely disarm even with the most thoughtful community policing reforms. **In the U**nited **S**tates, **the ever-presence of guns makes it seem plausible that a 12-year-old boy handling a toy might actually possess one. And it makes it more likely that an officer responding to him would pull [the]** his own **trigger. The ever-presence of guns also makes it plausible that an officer** interacting with a teenager **might** fear for his life — and **act in that fear**. And it makes it plausible — even responsible — that communities who often encounter law enforcement feel they must teach their sons how to respond to policemen capable of killing them. In comparing American police tactics and relations to other countries, it's hard to separate the role of guns here from all of the mistrust, defensiveness and aggression that arise around them. "**There’s not a big gun culture in Australia**," Geoffrey Alpert, a professor at the University of South Carolina who has studied police use of force there, recently told me. "So **the cops don’t have to worry the way our cops do**. There’s not always a gun in every encounter. They don’t have to think about that." **They're freer to retreat, to reassess, to leave their own weapons holstered**. This doesn't mean that we can't ever improve police tactics in a county where guns are commonplace. Alpert believes policing reforms are possible and worth pursuing. But this does mean that we can't really address police-community relations without talking about the fear of guns tugging at both sides — and how guns make the job of policing that much harder, how guns fatally narrow the margin of error for poor police work, how guns turn misunderstandings, mental illness and suspicion into something terribly deadly.

## AT: Racist Incarceration DA

#### 1. Non-unique – mandatory minimums already exist.

#### 2. Gourevitch is talking about squo gun control which means it’s non-unique.

#### 3. Incarceration is high now and increases significantly with status quo law enforcement like drugs and other things – means you can’t confidently evaluate an aff link because you don’t know how much of it was already the squo.

#### 4. Nonunique and inevitable – any new criminal law passed today would link because it’s the police that are the problem, not the laws. Both are inevitable.

#### *[Race answers]*

#### 1. The neg doesn’t get to determine what the aff looks like. It applies to all people – it’s the squo policies that are selective.

#### 2. Only moderate gun control links – a ban classifies any handgun as criminal. Bovy 2k15:

Phoebe Maltz Bovy, Writer at The Atlantic and New Republic, “It’s Time to Ban Guns. Yes, All of Them”, New Republic, December 10, 2015, DDA}

There’s also a more progressive version of this argument, and a more contrarian one, which involves suggesting that an anti-gun position is racist, because crackdowns on guns are criminal-justice interventions. Progressives who might have been able to brush off accusations of anti-rural-white classism may have a tougher time confronting arguments about the disparate impact gun control policies can have on marginalized communities. **These**, however, **are criticisms of** certain tentative, **insufficient gun control measures—the ones that would leave small-town white families** with legally-acquired guns well enough **alone**, allowing them to shoot themselves or one another and to let their guns enter the general population. **Ban** Guns, meanwhile, **is not discriminatory** in this way. **It’s not about dividing society into “good” and “bad” gun owners. It’s about placing gun ownership itself in the “bad” category**. It’s worth adding that the anti-gun position is ultimately about police not carrying guns, either. That could never happen, right? Well, certainly not if we keep on insisting on its impossibility.

#### 3. Turn - The suspected presence of handguns, which are easily concealed, creates tension between the police and the people. Aff makes it harder for police to justify racial violence. Badger 2k14:

Badger, Emily. "How guns make police less safe, their jobs more difficult and communities less trusting." The Washington Post. 22 Dec. 2014. Web. 3 Dec. 2015. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/12/22/how-guns-make-police-less-safe-their-jobs-more-difficult-and-communities-less-trusting/>.

**Guns** change the equation in so many ways. They **make it harder for police to retreat, and more likely that a stand-off that might have been resolved peacefully will escalate. They make it harder for police to give suspects the benefit of the doubt**, and more likely that a suspected criminal may not deserve it. They make it easier for a mentally ill man to forever alter two families' lives in the name of "revenge." After the killing of New York police officers Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos over the weekend, it feels perhaps more satisfying to place blame elsewhere: on protesters who've cried for better policing, on public officials who acknowledge that the protesters' grievances are valid. But both claims deflect attention toward a vague culprit — "anti-police rhetoric" — and away from a more concrete and systemic one: the ever-presence and easy availability of guns. Ismaaiyl Brinsley killed Liu and Ramos with a semi-automatic pistol. NYPD Officials couldn't immediately determine how Brinsley had obtained the gun — only that it was purchased at a Georgia pawn shop by another man more than 15 years ago. We also know that Brinsley was previously convicted in Georgia and sentenced to two years in prison for illegal gun possession. Today we should be talking about the guns not simply because one was used Saturday in the shooting deaths of two police officers, but because **guns underlie the very tension between police and communities** in America that voices saner than Brinsley have been trying to resolve. **In other countries, homicides, police shootings**, shootings by police, **and gun violence are much more rare. It's more rare that patrolmen even carry guns. It's more rare that the civilians they encounter will be carrying one**, too. **In this country**, by contrast, **the** ubiquity of firearms — the **possibility of a gun**, legal or illegal, **in any coat pocket or waist band** — **injects a level of tension into police encounters** that may be hard to entirely disarm even with the most thoughtful community policing reforms. **In the U**nited **S**tates, **the ever-presence of guns makes it seem plausible that a 12-year-old boy handling a toy might actually possess one. And it makes it more likely that an officer responding to him would pull his** own **trigger. The ever-presence of guns also makes it plausible that an officer** interacting with a teenager **might** fear for his life — and **act in that fear**. And it makes it plausible — even responsible — that communities who often encounter law enforcement feel they must teach their sons how to respond to policemen capable of killing them. In comparing American police tactics and relations to other countries, it's hard to separate the role of guns here from all of the mistrust, defensiveness and aggression that arise around them. "**There’s not a big gun culture in Australia**," Geoffrey Alpert, a professor at the University of South Carolina who has studied police use of force there, recently told me. "So **the cops don’t have to worry the way our cops do**. There’s not always a gun in every encounter. They don’t have to think about that." **They're freer to retreat, to reassess, to leave their own weapons holstered**. This doesn't mean that we can't ever improve police tactics in a county where guns are commonplace. Alpert believes policing reforms are possible and worth pursuing. But this does mean that we can't really address police-community relations without talking about the fear of guns tugging at both sides — and how guns make the job of policing that much harder, how guns fatally narrow the margin of error for poor police work, how guns turn misunderstandings, mental illness and suspicion into something terribly deadly.

## AT: Discriminatory Enforcement DA

#### 1. Only moderate gun control links – a ban classifies any handgun as criminal. Bovy 2k15:

Phoebe Maltz Bovy, Writer at The Atlantic and New Republic, “It’s Time to Ban Guns. Yes, All of Them”, New Republic, December 10, 2015, DDA}

There’s also a more progressive version of this argument, and a more contrarian one, which involves suggesting that an anti-gun position is racist, because crackdowns on guns are criminal-justice interventions. Progressives who might have been able to brush off accusations of anti-rural-white classism may have a tougher time confronting arguments about the disparate impact gun control policies can have on marginalized communities. **These**, however, **are criticisms of** certain tentative, **insufficient gun control measures—the ones that would leave small-town white families** with legally-acquired guns well enough **alone**, allowing them to shoot themselves or one another and to let their guns enter the general population. **Ban** Guns, meanwhile, **is not discriminatory** in this way. **It’s not about dividing society into “good” and “bad” gun owners. It’s about placing gun ownership itself in the “bad” category**. It’s worth adding that the anti-gun position is ultimately about police not carrying guns, either. That could never happen, right? Well, certainly not if we keep on insisting on its impossibility.

#### 2. Nonunique and inevitable – any new criminal law passed today would link because it’s the police that are the problem, not the laws. Both are inevitable.

## AT: Stop and Frisk DA

#### 1. Nonunique – stop and frisk is already spreading nationwide regardless of Constitutional rulings and the wills of state governments. Reese 2k13:

Frederick Reese. [lead staff writer for Mint Press specializing in race, poverty, congressional oversight and technology. An award winning data journalist and creative writer for over 15 years, Frederick has written about and worked for social advocacy projects and personal awareness efforts. Frederick is a jack-of-all-trades, with work experience as a teacher, a pastry chef and a story writer] “Stop-And-Frisk Concerns Spread Nationwide.” Mint Press News. 22 November 2013. Accessed 25 December 2015. Web.

But **while “stop-and-frisk” is slowing** to acceptable levels **in New York** City, **elsewhere** across the nation **it is** ratcheting **up. In Baltimore, the A**merican **C**ivil **L**iberties **U**nion **has called on** the **Baltimore Police** Department **to acknowledge the large gap between the number of stops** the department has conducted under its “stop-and-frisk” program **and the amount of guns and drugs they** are actually **find**ing. “Our concern is that there’s been a wholly improper misuse of the tactic,” said Sonia Kumar, staff attorney for the ACLU of Maryland. According to 2012 records, the police department made more than 123,000 stops, with only 494 searches conducted, ten incidents of drugs were found, nine guns and one knife. There is the fear that the Baltimore Police is engaging in unjustified extralegal searches. More damningly is the fact that **the B**altimore **P**olice **does not track its use of “stop-and-frisk,” allowing officers to use the tactic at their own discretion**. “This has been an issue for more than half a decade and is a pressing concern for the agency,” said Police Commissioner Anthony Batts to CBS affiliate WJZ. He said he has since implemented long-needed reforms. Baltimore has since stopped using the term “stop-and-frisk,” preferring to call their stops “investigative stops” in an attempt to escape criticism of the practice. “Whether we call it ‘stop and frisk’ or something else makes no difference to the Baltimore residents stopped and searched without any reasonable suspicion that they have done something wrong,” wrote Kumar in a statement after the announcement. “The problem isn’t the name – it’s how police are treating people.” **In Detroit, the long-standing practice** of stopping “suspicious” individuals on the street **is being defended — despite the Second Circuit’s ruling of unconstitutionality**. “There has been no change,” said Detroit Police Chief James Craig. “I should remind the ‘public’ that we’re under consent judgment and part of that is that we adhere to the best policing practices. Any time we stop someone, certainly that stop is documented and is based on reasonable suspicion and is articulated in a report.” In light of growing crime in the Motor City — where a deteriorating tax base and a lack of infrastructure development has led the city to bankruptcy, state oversight and a general sense of despair — the police department hired the Bratton Group and the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research — a conservative group funded in part by the Koch brothers who helped develop New York City’s “stop-and-frisk” program. The department paid the groups more than $600,000, suggesting that Detroit is seeking to institute NYC-style “stop-and-frisk” in a city that is 85 percent black. “Based on reasonable suspicion, the Detroit Police Department is already a stop-and-frisk policing agency,” wrote Detroit Assistant Chief Erik Ewing in a statement to My FOX Detroit. “Detroit’s population is mostly African American, so it stands to reason that a high number of African Americans will be stopped, based on reasonable suspicion. This is not racial profiling, just officers doing good constitutional police work.” “Terry v. Ohio” Since the 1968 Supreme Court case Terry v. Ohio — in which it was held that the police may stop a person if they have a reasonable suspicion that the person has committed or is about to commit a crime, and may frisk the suspect for weapons if they have reasonable suspicion that the suspect is armed and dangerous, without violating the Fourth Amendment prohibition on unreasonable searches and seizures — 24 states have integrated provisions permitting police officers to conduct “Terry stops,” or the stopping of an individual simply on the grounds of the officer’s suspicion with the intent of stopping an illegal act, and/or the requirement that stopped individuals must respond to police inquiries — including telling the stopping officer his/her name — into their police operating procedures. **Despite the** wide swath of **states** that have these laws, typically, **the decision** to utilize the laws **is left to individual police departments. An exception** to this **is Arizona, where the state’s new**ly-enacted “**stop-and-frisk**” **law is being used to** bolster the state’s **crackdown on** illegal **immigrants**. In most states that have this law, it is used as intended — as a rarely-used tool to stop and control a criminal situation. But **in a growing number of cities** — **including L**os **A**ngeles**, Cincinnati, Salt Lake City and Pittsburgh — there has been** a **recent escalation of “stop-and-frisk” cases**. In cities where there is no “Terry stop” law on the state level — such as Baltimore, Pittsburgh and Detroit — **this** recent growth **represents these police** departments **assuming** possibly **discriminatory practices outside of their states’ consent**.

#### Three implications:

#### (a) there’s probably very little difference between the aff and the squo on this question,

#### (b) you cannot prove the aff would result in an increase because that could just be attributed to stop and frisk growing already, and

#### (c) there’s no hope of solving it – empirics prove federal courts and states have no control over police departments on the issue.

#### 2. Stop and frisk can be used responsibly. Most of the lit ignores Philadelphia, which was worse off than New York, but has improved significantly. Reese 2:

Frederick Reese. [lead staff writer for Mint Press specializing in race, poverty, congressional oversight and technology. An award winning data journalist and creative writer for over 15 years, Frederick has written about and worked for social advocacy projects and personal awareness efforts. Frederick is a jack-of-all-trades, with work experience as a teacher, a pastry chef and a story writer] “Stop-And-Frisk Concerns Spread Nationwide.” Mint Press News. 22 November 2013. Accessed 25 December 2015. Web.

**The solution**, oddly enough, **may come from Philadelphia, which had a higher “stop and frisk” rate** proportionately **than New York**, with 253,276 stops in 2009. **But in recent years it has became a model for responsible use of the policy. A year ago, the city settled litigation by agreeing to install a number of safeguards on its “stop-and-frisk” program — including data collection on all stops and adequate training and supervision on stop administration. Since then, the number of stops has decreased**. But as the homicide rate increased, **it became obvious that “stop-and-frisk” is not inherently wrong** and may even be needed but must be used responsibly.

#### Two implications:

#### (a) their evidence is totalizing – just because stop and frisk may be used does not inherently mean discriminatory practices would be used, and

#### (b) their evidence lacks nuance with respect to the different flavors of stop and frisk that could be used – certain measures can make it work.

## AT: Recreation DA

#### 1. Turn - there is no guarantee that the person using a gun for recreational use does not have a dual purpose - always a risk of aff offense.

#### 2. Turn - the notion of recreational use of handguns probably increases the risk of accidental death because guns are trivialized.

#### 3. No link - people can target shoot with snipers and things like that, which are actually more engaging recreationally and limited in ownership to people with very specific licenses - best of both worlds.

#### 4. No link - long guns work for the same purposes.

#### 5. Just because something makes someone happy doesn’t make it okay for them to endanger other peoples’ lives - their argument is deplorable.

#### 6. Their only preempt to life first is death inevitable, but even inevitable things like death can still be net worse in a linear sense.

#### 7. Death precludes the happiness from recreation.

#### 8. Turn - Being around guns probably inhibits a lot of people’s recreation because they don’t feel comfy.

## AT: Protectionism DA

#### 1. Protectionism is inevitable – consensus of economists and policymaker logic. Ikenson 2k9:

Ikenson, Daniel J. "A Protectionism Fling: Why Tariff Hikes and Other Trade Barriers Will Be Short-Lived." Cato Institute. CATO Institute, 12 Mar. 2009. Web. 24 Jan. 2016. <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/protectionism-fling-why-tariff-hikes-other-trade-barriers-will-be>.

During the past six months **governments** have **intervene**d massively **in the financial and real sectors of their economies**, reviving debate over policies long considered vanquished. Some **governments have turned to protectionism, raising** tariffs and other **barriers to trade**. Others are subsidizing industries or more quietly finessing regulatory policies to advantage domestic “champions.” Surely, **the temptation to placate powerful domestic interests will lead** other **governments toward protectionism** in the months ahead. A sense of foreboding seems to have enveloped the trade policy community, where **a common view among** scholars, **economists**, and journalists **is that** a resurgence of **protectionism is inevitable**, and that it will cause serious economic damage. In the newspaper columns and in the think tank reports, there is little evidence of any faith that the rules-based system of trade-established in part for the purpose of containing and defusing protectionist outbursts-is equipped to rise to what is arguably the first major challenge in its 62-year existence. But that view does not adequately reflect the fact that most governments prefer policies that keep their economies open to trade and investment. Despite some episodes of backsliding, the world is unlikely to witness a significant departure from the trend toward trade and investment liberalization that has been evident since the end of World War II. An increasing number of governments have come to recognize that optimal economic outcomes arise under conditions where policies enhance-rather than limit-the freedom of people to transact with others, including foreigners. Protectionism limits choices and thereby undermines human liberty and economic efficiency. Reasonably well-respected trade rules and the reality of a global economic system that renders trade openness an imperative for success are some of the reasons to believe that any protectionist outbreak will be fleeting. Indeed, **policymakers would be advised to respond to the downturn by reducing their trade** and investment barriers **unilaterally because doing so expands choices**, reduces costs, **and spurs** the kinds of **structural reforms** that facilitate economic growth. A System to Bend but Not Break One of **the reason**s **for the** creation of the **rules-based system of trade was to ensure that** the scenario of spiraling, retaliatory **protectionism of the 1930s never played out again**. Starting with the General Agreement on Tariffs an Trade in 1947, through seven subsequent multilateral rounds of trade liberalization culminating in the establishment of the World Trade Organization in 1995, and into the present, that objective has been upheld. The WTO/GATT rules encourage trade liberalization, but also grant governments some flexibility to manage their own paces of liberalization and to re-impose or raise barriers under certain circumstances. The rules distinguish between “Bound” and “Applied” tariff rates. The bound rate is the maximum rate of duty (per product category) that a member can assess against imports, and the applied rate is the prevailing rate of duty (per product category). Generally, the bound rates of developed countries are significantly lower than the bound rates of developing countries. That is, the highest allowable tariffs in richer countries are much lower than the highest allowable tariffs in poorer countries.1 Within the rules, developing country economies are considered more vulnerable to potentially disruptive effects of rapid changes brought about by increased trade and investment. Accordingly, governments of developing countries are afforded greater latitude to respond to those changes. How much latitude depends, to some extent, on the differences between each country’s bound and applied rates. If the applied rate relative to the bound rate is low, then there may be vast room for backsliding and raising tariffs in response to a perceived crisis. For many developing countries, the differences are vast. India’s simple average bound tariff rate is 50.2 percent, but its simple average applied rate is 14.5 percent. Thus, the Indian government could almost quadruple its tariffs without violating its WTO obligations. Likewise, Brazil has a lot of “overhang” with an average bound rate of 31.4 percent and an average applied rate of 12.2 percent. By contrast, China has far less latitude for backsliding. Its average bound rate is 10.0 percent, and its average applied rate is 9.9 percent. The institutional restraint on China’s backsliding is similar to that on developed countries. The bound and applied rates of the United States are both 3.5 percent, and for the European Union (27) the bound rate is 5.4 percent and the applied is 5.2 percent.2 Many factors affect a member’s bound rates, including its level of development, its duration as a member of the WTO/GATT, and its past negotiating positions, to name a few.3 Other forms of temporary backsliding also are permitted within the system. Members can raise tariffs in excess of their bound rates, impose quotas, and even ban imports altogether under various WTO agreements. The Agreement on Safeguards permits members to impose duties or quotas in response to unforeseen import surges, which seriously injure a domestic industry. Under the Anti-dumping Agreement, duties can be imposed when a domestic industry is materially injured by reason of imports that have been sold at prices below “normal value.”4 The Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures permits members to impose duties to offset the injurious effects on a domestic industry from imports that benefit from foreign government subsidies. Under the rules, imports also can be banned in the interest of public health or safety. Some member countries have used these provisions to exclude imports of beef that were suspected of contamination from “mad cow” disease. Others have banned genetically modified agricultural products on the grounds that the risks of consumption are presently unknown.

#### 2. No uniqueness – if their link is true then any ban of anything in the squo is protectionism. That overwhelms the link.

#### 3. Be skeptical of their impacts; many nations including Australia, Japan, Canada, and other European nations have long had handgun restrictions, yet, that did not spark any sort of trade wars. In fact, many of them are of the most peaceful countries on the globe. The US will be no different. Prefer my 100% probable side constraint impacts.

#### 4. Guns are losing investments now, so nonunique - trade will decline, and gun distributors and producers can just diversify their investments to stay fresh. That solves and would actually appeal to more demographics so it’d be more profitable and better for trade. Other industries prove. Cardello 2k13:

Cardello, Hank. [senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, a consultant to industry, public policy institutes, and government agencies on socially responsible products and practices] "The Gun Industry Needs to Reinvent Itself Before It's Too Late." Forbes. 14 Jan. 2013. Web. 4 Jan. 2016. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesleadershipforum/2013/01/14/the-gun-industry-needs-to-reinvent-itself-before-its-too-late/>.

**Public sentiment and investors are turning against the gun industry**, and anti-gun activists are howling for their heads. Still, **gunmakers** can appease the anti-gun activists, become a meaningful part of the solution to curb gun violence, gain new customers, and strengthen their bottom line—but only if their survival doesn’t depend on selling more guns and ammunition. That means they need to reload in three different ways. First, **should redefine their business model from being purveyors of guns and ammunition to encompass all personal protection products. That would open them up to a host of new and existing nonlethal devices and markets that could very well generate much greater revenue and profit than the sale of guns and ammunition generates today**. For example, the U.S. electronic security market is about the same size today as the gun market, according to figures from the Freedonia Group, and is expected to hit $17 billion by next year. Some reports estimate that **the global market for home security will reach more than $34 billion in 2017. Broadening the notion of the needs they fill has been a successful strategy in numerous other industries whose core products were under attack for safety, health, or environmental reasons**. For example, **Chevron, which once concentrated solely on fossil fuels, now focuses on natural gas, solar power, and biofuels, and touts its “human energy” platform**. Danone jettisoned less healthy products to focus solely on nutritious ones such as bottled water and infant formula. Our research shows that Danone’s financial and shareholder performance has outpaced its peers’. Former **soda companies such as Coca-Cola and Pepsi have redefined themselves as beverage companies, reaping new business from products like bottled water and sports drinks. Today they enjoy some of the highest operating profit margins in the food industry**.

## AT: Tyranny DA

#### 1. Framing issue - If tyranny is bad then it’s try or die for militias to take control, otherwise tyranny is inevitable and you ignore the DA because the government does things that control us by act or omission hundreds of times a day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Three implications:

#### (a) when everyone has a gun, there’s no social cohesion, meaning militias can’t function – it’s try or die for the government to provide sufficient order,

#### (b) that’s an epistemological indict on their arg – gun ownership promotes circular epistemology that self-verifies external threats, such as tyranny or misconduct, and

#### (c) since gun ownership promotes racism, militias would likely be extremely racist and produce just as much suffering as the government ever could.

## AT: Womxn Self-Defense DA

#### Most womxn don’t own handguns anyway—the aff’s reduction in violence against womxn outweighs. Dixon 93:

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

Let us concede for the sake of argument that the combination of all of the alternative methods of self-defense that I have proposed would still be marginally less effective than handguns in protecting women against violence in the 10% or so of assaults that involve firearms. The inference to the conclusion that a handgun ban would decrease protection for women results from a comparison between a world in which handguns are banned, and an imaginary world in which most women arm themselves with handguns. In the actual world **women may** now legally **own handguns, but the vast majority choose not to** do so. The relevant comparison is between the actual world, in which handguns are used in hundreds of thousands of violent crimes every year, yet in which few women own handguns; and, on the other hand, a world in which a handgun ban substantially reduced the number of handguns owned by both women and their potential assaulters. **Whatever protection would be lost by disarming the small number of women who** currently **own handguns is outweighed by the reduction in violence against women that would be effected by a handgun ban, which would take one of the most potent weapons out of the hands of many potential assaulters**. It is true that 50% of those who own guns solely for defense are female.' However, **far more men than women own guns**." Given women's extra vulnerability, and the fact that there are now many more female-headed households than in the mid-sixties, one would expect more women to own guns. In fact, a Harris poll showed that gun ownership in female-headed households was less than a half of that in homes in which an adult male lived. 35 The indications are that women themselves, whatever their extra vulnerability may be, are generally unconvinced of the need to own handguns for self-defense. The alleged protection for women resulting from the defensive ownership of handguns, then, falls to provide a serious objection to a handgun ban. In contrast, throughout my paper I have detailed the substantial reduction in murder and violent crime that is likely to result from a handgun ban. Women, too, are the beneficiaries in a society in which far fewer of their loved ones are killed and maimed.

## AT: National Wildlife DA

#### 1. Most of the money that accesses their impacts comes from hunting license fees, and other consumption of goods by *non-hunters* fills in. Fish and Wildlife Service - most credible - 2k10:

FWS. "Fish and Wildlife Service | Southeast Region." Fish and Wildlife Service | Southeast Region. Fish and Wildlife Service, 21 Jan. 2010. Web. 27 Jan. 2016. <http://www.fws.gov/southeast/federalaid/pittmanrobertson.html>.

Breakthrough: Pittman-Robertson Act Then a remarkable thing happened. At the urging of organized sportsmen, State wildlife agencies, and the firearms and ammunition industries, Congress extended the life of an existing 10 percent tax on ammunition and firearms used for sport hunting, and earmarked the proceeds to be distributed to the States for wildlife restoration. The result was called the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration act, better known as the Pittman-Robertson (or "P-R") Act after its principal sponsors, Senator Key Pittman of Nevada, and Representative A. Willis Robertson of Virginia. The measure was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on September 2, 1937. Since then, numerous species have rebuilt their populations and extended their ranges far beyond what they were in the 1930's. Among them are the wild turkey, white-tailed deer, pronghorn antelope, wood duck, beaver, black bear, giant Canada goose, American elk, desert bighorn sheep, bobcat, mountain lion, and several species of predatory birds. Shared Costs, Shared Benefits Federal Funding from P-R pays for up to 75 percent of project costs, with the States putting up at least 25 percent. The assurance of a steady source of earmarked funds has enabled the program's administrators, both State and Federal, to plan projects that take years to complete, as short-term strategies seldom come up with lasting solutions where living creatures are involved. **In** the **more than 50 years since P-R began, over $2 billion in Federal** excise **taxes has been matched by more than $500 million in State funds (chiefly from hunting license fees) for wildlife restoration**. Benefits to the economy have been equally impressive. **National surveys show that hunters** now **spend some $10 billion every year on equipment** and trips. **Non-hunting nature lovers spend even larger sums to enjoy wildlife, on travel and on items that range from bird food to binoculars, from special footwear to camera equipment. Areas famous for their wildlife have directly benefited from this spending**, but so have sporting goods and outdoor equipment manufacturers, distributors and dealers. Thousands of jobs have been created.

#### 2. Double-bind - either (a) funding is on track to be redirected in the squo because the government doesn’t care enough for wildlife, which means no impact uniqueness, or (b) different funding would fill in post-aff.

#### 3. Empirics disprove - Canada has banned all sorts of firearms and preserves nature significantly - there’s no reason gun excise taxes are key.